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PHILLIPS, EDWARD C., S.J., Ph.D., WOODSTOCK COLLEGE, MARYLAND: Neri, Antonio.

POHLE, JOSEPH, S.T.D., Ph.D., J.C.L., PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF BREISLAU: Mass, Sacrifice of the; Merit; Molina, Luis de; Molinism.

POLLEN, JOHN HUNGERFORD, S.J., LONDON: Molyneux, Sir Caryll; More, Henry; Morris, John.


POULAIN, AUGUSTIN, S.J., PARIS: Mohammedan Confraternities.
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REILLY, THOMAS A. K., O.P., S.T.L., S.S.L., Professor of Sacred Scripture, Dominican
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REMY, ARTHUR F. J., M.A., Ph.D., Adjunct-
Professor of Germanic Philology, Columbia
University, New York: Miracle Plays and
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Franz Joseph von.

REZEK, ANTOINE IVAN, Houghton, Michigan:
Mrak, Ignatius.

ROMPEL, JOSEF HEINRICH, S.J., Ph.D., Stella
Mattutina College, Feldkirch, Austria: Molina, Juan Ignacio; Mutis, José Celestino.

RYAN, JOHN A., S.T.D., Professor of Moral
Theology, St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Min-
nesota: Monopoly, Moral Aspects of.

SAINTE BEATRICE, SISTER, Sisters of the Mis-
ericorde, Montreal: Misericorde, Congrega-
tion of the Sisters of.

SALAVILLE, SÉVÉRIEN, A.A., Professor of
Liturgy, Greek Catholic Seminary of Kadi-
Keui, Constantinople: Memphis; Methymna;
Miletus; Mitylene; Mylasa; Mytra.

SAUVAGE, G.M., C.S.C., S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of
Dogmatic Theology, Holy Cross College,
Washington: Mysticism; Necessity.

SCANNELL, THOMAS B. CANON, S.T.D., Editor,
"Catholic Dictionary", Weybridge,
England: Maury, Jean-Siffrein.

SCHIEDEL, N., S.J., Stella Mattutina College,
Feldkirch, Austria: Morel, Gall; Morell, Juli-
sus; Münter, Thomas.

SCHLAGER, HEINRICH PATRICIUS, O.F.M.,
St. Ludwig's College, Dalheim, Germany:
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SLOANE, CHARLES WILLIAM, New York:
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SOLLIER, JOSEPH FRANCIS, S.M., S.T.D., San
Francisco, California: Mérode, Frédéric-
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"Etudes", Paris: Matteo da Siena; Messina,
Antonello da; Morales, Luis de; Moroni, Gio-
vanni Battista.

SOUVAY, CHARLES L., C.M., S.T.D., Ph.D., Pro-
fessor, Sacred Scripture, Hebrew, and
Liturgy, Kenrick Seminary, St. Louis, Mis-
souri: Nabuchodonosor; Nahum; Names, He-
brew; Nephtali.
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Michigan.

SULLIVAN, WILLIAM CLeARY, LL.B., Secret-
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Washington: National Union, Catholic Young
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TALLON, WILLIAM THOMAS, S.J., Woodstock
College, Maryland: Melis, Pius.
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Imperial Academy of Sciences, Professor,
Polish Literature, University of Krakow:
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THURSTON, HERBERT, S.J., London: Medals,
Devotional; Menologium; Minister; Missal;
Monk; Morone, Giovanni; Nails, Holy; Names,
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TIERNEY, JOHN J., M.A., S.T.D., Professor of
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Melchisedech; Mesa.

TOKE, LESLIE ALEXANDER ST. LAWRENCE,
B.A., Stratton-on-Fosse, Bath, England:
Mauriste, The; Melk, Abbey and Congregation of.

TURNER, WILLIAM, B.A., S.T.D., Professor of
Logic and the History of Philosophy, Catho-
lic University of America, Washington:
Megarians; Melissus of Samos; Metaphysics;
Michael Scotus; Monad; Monism; Neo-Plato-
nism; Neo-Fythagorean Philosophy.
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# 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. <em>ad annum</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an., ann.</td>
<td>the year, the years (Lat. <em>annus</em>, <em>annis</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ap.</td>
<td>in (Lat. <em>apud</em>)</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>Authorized Version (i.e. tr. of the Bible authorized for use in the Anglican Church—the so-called “King James”, or “Protestant” Bible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk.</td>
<td>Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bl.</td>
<td>Blessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C., c.</td>
<td>about (Lat. <em>circa</em>); canon; chapter; compagnie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can.</td>
<td>canon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cap.</td>
<td>chapter (Lat. <em>caput</em>—used only in Latin context)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>compare (Lat. <em>confer</em>)</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><em>Lat. constitutio</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curs.</td>
<td>by the industry of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dict.</td>
<td>dictionary (Fr. <em>dictionnaire</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disp.</td>
<td>Lat. <em>disputatio</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diss.</td>
<td>Lat. <em>dissertatio</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dist.</td>
<td>Lat. <em>distinction</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. V.</td>
<td>Douay Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed.</td>
<td>edited, edition, editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep., Epp.</td>
<td>letter, letters (Lat. <em>epistola</em>)</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. <em>ibidem</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Id.</td>
<td>the same person, or author (Lat. <em>idem</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf.</td>
<td>below (Lat. <em>infra</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. c., loc. cit.</td>
<td>at the place quoted (Lat. <em>loco citato</em>)</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. <em>liber</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long.</td>
<td>longitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon.</td>
<td><em>Lat. Monumenta</em></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. <em>opera citato</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ord.</td>
<td>Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. T.</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p., pp.</td>
<td>page, pages, or (in Latin references) pars (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>par.</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passim.</td>
<td>in various places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt.</td>
<td>part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Quarterly (a periodical), e.g. “Church Quarterly”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q., QQ., quest.</td>
<td>question, questions (Lat. <em>qustio</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. v.</td>
<td>which (title) see (Lat. <em>quod vide</em>)</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. <em>Sanctus, Sancti</em>, “Saint”, “Saints”—used in this Encyclopedia only in Latin context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sess.</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skt.</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sq., sqq.</td>
<td>following page, or pages (Lat. <em>sequens</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St., Sta.</td>
<td>Saint, Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup.</td>
<td>Above (Lat. <em>supra</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. v.</td>
<td>Under the corresponding title (Lat. <em>sub voce</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tom.</td>
<td>volume (Lat. <em>tomus</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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tr. ................. translation or translated. By itself it means "English translation", or "translated into English by". Where a translation is into any other language, the language is stated.

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

II.—Abbreviations of Titles.
Acta SS. .......... Acta Sanctorum (Bollandists).
Ann. pont. cath. ....... Battandier, Annaire pontifical catholique.

Dict. d'arch. chrét. .. Cabrol (ed.), Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie.
Dict. de théol. cath. .. Vacant and Mangenot (ed.), Dictionnaire de théologie catholique.
Kirchenlex. .......... Wetzler and Welte, Kirchenlexicon.
P. G. ................ Migne (ed.), Patres Graeci.
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 chapters. Arabic numerals standing alone indicate pages. In other cases the divisions are explicitly stated. Thus "Rashdall, Universities of Europe, I, ix" refers the reader to the ninth chapter of the first volume of that work; "I, p. ix" would indicate the ninth page of the preface of the same volume.

Notes II.—Where St. Thomas (Aquinas) is cited without the name of any particular work the reference is always to "Summa Theologiae" (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. Ecclesiasticus 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 X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frontispiece in Colour</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Matthew</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya—Tablet with Hieroglyph Inscription, etc.</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal Mazarin—Philippe de Champagne</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosimo de' Medici—Laurentian Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoration of the Magi—Memling</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. David's Cathedral, St. David's Wales</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messina (1907)</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Work</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Doors, Ravello (1179)—Barifano of Trani</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral, City of Mexico</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral, Milan</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Angelus—Millet</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitres of Bl. Nicolò Albergati, etc.</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietà—Montagna</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount-Saint-Michel</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Map of Christian Palestine and Egypt</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murillo</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples—Drying Macaroni, etc</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoleon—Paul Delaroche</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narni</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Henry, Cardinal Newman</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastical Provinces of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Kingston</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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M A S S, M U S I C O F T H E.—Under this heading will be considered exclusively the texts of the Mass (and not, therefore, the Asperges, Vidi aquam, Litanies, Prophecies, etc., which in the Roman Missal are found more or less closely associated with the Mass in certain seasons of the Church Year), which receive a musical treatment. These texts comprise those which are sung (that is, recited in musical monologue with occasional cadences or inflections) by the celebrant and the sacred ministers (who will be referred to as priest, deacon, and sub-deacon) and which are styled "Accentus"; and those which are assigned to the choir and which are styled "Concentus". For the sake of convenience of reference the Concentus may be divided into the following classes: first, those which are found in the section of the Roman Missal under the heading "Ordinarium Missae" (namely, the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Benedictus, Agnus Dei) and which will be briefly referred to as the Ordinary; second, those texts which are found under the headings "Proprium de Tempore", "Proprium Sanctorum", "Commune Sanctorum" (namely, the Proper of the Mass and the Proper of the Day, namely: Introit, Kyrie, Sequence, Tract, Offertory, Communion) and which will be referred to briefly as the Proper, a serviceable but ambiguous term frequently used to describe these texts.

The "Graduale Romanum" (together with the Missal) provides plain-song melodies for all the texts stated above. These texts are found in the present typical edition, styled the Vatican Edition, of the "Roman Gradual". The Concentus, if sung to plain-song melodies, must also be in the approved form found in the Vatican Edition of the "Gradual"; but these texts may employ "modern" (sacred) music. Indeed, the use of music in the sacred liturgy is modern, and the serviceable distinction will be employed throughout this article: chart, chanting, chant, will refer to plain-song melodies; music, musical, to figured music.

I. Accentus.—These chants should never be accompanied by the organ or any other instrument. The priest intones the Gloria (Gloria in excelsis Deo) and the Credo (Credo in unum Deum). The choir must not repeat these words of the intonation, but must begin with Et in terra pac, etc., and Patrem omnipotentem, etc., respectively. The priest also sings the Collects and post-Communions and the Dominus vobiscum and Oremus preceding them. Amen is sung by the choir at the end of these prayers, as also after the Per omnia secuta seculum preceding the Preface, the Pater noster and the Pax Domini...vobiscum. The choir responds with Et cum spiritu tuo to the Dominus vobiscum preceding the prayers, the Gospel, and the Preface. Both of these choir responses vary from the usual monotone when occurring before the Preface; and the Amen receives an upward inflection before the Pax Domini, etc. Indeed, the Dominus vobiscum and its response vary in melody for all the three forms of the Preface (the Tonus Dominus, the Tonus Perialis, the Tonus Solennior found in the "Cantus Missalis Romanii"), as do also the chants and responses of the Sursum corda, etc., preceding the Preface. It would be highly desirable that choirs be well practised in these special "tones" since exact correspondence with the form used by the priest is not only of esthetic but of practical value; for any deviation from one of the "tones" into another may easily lead the priest astray and produce a lamentable confusion of forms which ought to be kept distinct.

At the end of the priest's chant of the Pater noster the choir responds with Sed libera nos a malo. The sub-deacon chants the Epistle, the deacon the Gospel. The respective responses (Deo Gratias and Laus tibi Domine) are merely to be recited by the Pater noster, Epistle, Sequence, Tract, Offertory, Communion and Mass, and are not to be sung or recited by the choir. This is clear from the fact that the "Roman Gradual" does not assign any notation to these responses (see "Ecclesiastical Review", Nov., 1903, p. 539). To the deacon's chant of the Ite missa est (or Benedictus Domino) the choir responds with Deo gratias. A choral recitation of the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Benedictus is permitted if the organ is to supply for this response wherever this is customary (see "Church Music", May, 1909, 175-6), provided the response be "recited" in a clear voice (see "Church Music", May, 1907, 229). The chants melodies for all these choir-responses are given in the "Roman Gradual" under the heading "Toni Communes Missae". It will be apparent that these melodies are fitted to harmonize the chant-responses and even to depart in some details from the melodies officially assigned to the chant-responses. In summing up the legislation in this matter, the "Motu Proprio" says (No. 12): "With the exception of the melodies proper to the celebrant at the altar and to the ministers, which must be always sung only in Gregorian chant, and without the accompaniment of the organ, all the rest of the liturgical chant belongs to the choir of Levites and, therefore, singers in church, even when they are laymen, are really taking the place of the ecclesiastical choir. Hence the music rendered by them must, at least for the greater part, retain the character of sacred music." But while the choir is thus permitted to respond in music or in harmonized chant, good taste might suggest the desirability of responding in unharmonized chant according to the exact melodies provided in the "Toni Communes Missae".

Inasmuch as the Vatican "Gradual" is meant merely for the use of the choir, the complete Accentus of the celebrant and ministers will not be found there. The Missal contains these chants in full (except, of course, the chants for the prayers, prophecies, etc., which are...
to be recited or sung according to certain general forms which are indicated in the "Toni Com. Mis."

However, a number of changes made in the Missal melodies by order of the Vatican Commission on Chant have been comprised in a separate publication entitled "Cantus Missalis Romani" (Rome, Vatican Press, 1907), which has been edited in various styles by competent liturgical scholars. Henceforth no publisher is permitted to print or publish an edition of the Missal containing the melodies in use heretofore, but must insert the new melodies according to the scheme found in the "Cantus Missalis Romani". Some of the new melodic forms are to appear in the places occupied, in the typical edition of the Missal (1909), in the revised form of the liturgy in use at present, while some are to be placed in an Appendix.

The Decree of 8 June, 1907, contains the following clauses: (1) Dating from this day, the proofs containing the new typical chant of the Missal are placed by the Holy See without special conditions, at the disposal of the publishers, who can no longer print or publish the chant of the Missals in use at present. (2) The new typical chant must be inserted in the new editions exactly in the same place as the old. (3) It may, however, be published separately or it may be placed at the end of the older Missals now in print, and in both of these cases may bear the general title, "Cantus Missalis Romani iuxta editionem Vaticanam". (4) The Text of the missal and the rubrics, after being printed with the words only, without chant notation. (5) The intonations or chants ad libitum, Asparges me, Gloria in excelsis, and the more solemn tones of the Prefaces must not be placed in the body of the Missal, but only at the end, in the form of a supplement or appendix; to them (the ad libitum intonation or chants) may be added, either in the Missals or in separate publications of the chanted parts, the chants of the "Toni communes", already published in the "Gradual", which have reference to the sacred ministers. (6) No change is made in the words of the text or in the rubrics, which, therefore, must be reproduced without modification, as in the last typical edition (1909).

In the midst of the perplexities inevitably associated with such modifications of or additions to the former methods of rendering the Accentus, Dom Janssen, O.S.B., of the Beuron Congregation, has come to the assistance of clerics, by collecting into one convenient manual Missa brevis, Missa Missae Bis Ecclesiasticae, iuxta editionem Vaticanam", Ratisbon, 1909: 146 pages, 12 mo.) all of the Accentus (including the responses) found in the "Toni Commines Missae" of the "Graduale Romanum" (1908) and in the "Cantus Missalis Romani" (1908). These he has illustrated with appropriate extracts from the "Rubricae Missalis Romani", and has added comments and explanations of his own in brackets in order to distinguish them from official matter (e.g. pp. 14, 15, when discussing the festal tone of the Oratio). While such a volume is appropriate for the study or the class-room, the intonations of the priest and deacon have been issued for use in the sanctuary, in various forms. At Tournai, Belgium, is published "Tabulionem celebriatis Missae ad exemplar editionis Vaticanae" (containing the Asparges, Vidi aquam, Gloria, Credo, Ite Missa est, Benedictamus Domini, for all the masses contained in the "Kyriale") on seven cards of Bristolboard which are enclosed in a case and also in form of a pamphlet bound in cloth. At Düsseldorf is issued the intonation of the "Tabula Intonationum" (of the Gloria) (15), Credo (4), Ite Missa est and Benedictamus (17), and Requiescant in pace, pasted on thin but strong cardboard (cloth-covered) of four pages each, merely as illustrations of the practical means at hand for actually inaugurating the reform of the Accentus; official editions of the chant books may be consulted for other forms for use in the sanctuary.

Some of these forms of chant-intonations are for use ad libitum. The various intonations of the Gloria and Credo bear a close relation to the succeeding chant of the choir, while those of the Ite Missa est or Benedictamus are frequently identical in melody with the chant of the Kyrie. Hence, these chant-intonations are assigned to definite seasons of the Church Year or to peculiar kinds of rite (solemn, double, semi-double, ferial, etc.), but inasmuch as permission has been given to use the chants of the "Kyriale" indifferently for any rite or season, the only requirement to be met by the priest is the artistic one, of sung the Intonation of Mass which the choice of the intonation actually render in chant. Thus it will be seen that the many intonations furnished do not represent an obligatory burden but merely a large liberty of choice. The chant of the Ite missa est by the deacon would seem similarly to be a matter of artistic appropriateness rather than of liturgical law.

II. The Concentus. These texts may be sung in chant or in music. If chant be used, it must be either that contained in the "Vatican Gradual," or some other approved form of the "traditional melodies" (see "Motu Proprio" of 25 April, 1904; d; the Decree of the S. R. C., 11 August, 1905; VI; the Decree prefixed to the "Kyriale", dated 14 August, 1905, and paragraph): these meet all the requirements summarized in the "Motu Proprio" of 22 November, 1903 (see Music, ECCLESIASTICAL). Under the heading of Concentus must be considered (a) the Ordinary, (b) the Proper.

(a) The Ordinary. The texts are those of the Kyrie, the Gloria, the Credo, the Sanctus, the Benedictus, the Agnus Dei. Addition to these, or a portion of them, is styled simply a "Mass". When several "Masses" are written by the same composer, they are differentiated numerically (e.g. Mozart's No. 1, No. 2, No. 17) or by dedication to some particular feast (e.g. Gounod's "Messe de Paques"), or saint (e.g. Gounod's "St. Cecilia" Mass), or devotion (e.g. Gounod's "Messe du Sacré Cœur"), or musical association (e.g. Gounod's "Messe des Orphéonistes", Nos. I, II), or musical patron (e.g. Palestrina's "Missa Papae Marcelli"), or special occasion (e.g. Cherubini's "Third Mass in A" entitled the "Coronation Mass", as it was composed for the coronation of King Charles X.). The Mass composed for the Mass of the Dead requiring only a moderate time for its renditions (e.g. Palestrina's "Missa Brevis"; Andrea Gabrielli's printed in Vol. I. of Proske's "Musica Divina") although the term scarcely applies, save in another sense, to J. S. Bach's "Missa Brevis" (in A) comprising in its forty-four closely printed pages only the music of the Kyrie and Gloria. In some Masses, the place of the Benedictus is taken by an O Salutaris. A polyphonic Mass composed, not upon themes taken from chant melodies (as was the custom), was styled "sine nomine". Those founded upon chant subjects were thus styled (e.g. Palestrina's "Ecce Sacerdos Magnus", "Virtute Magna", etc.) or when founded on secular song themes unashamedly bore the appropriate title (e.g. Palestrina's "L'homme armé"). Masses were sometimes styled by the name of the chant-mode in which they were composed (e.g. "Primi Toni") or, founded on the hexachordal system, were styled "Missa super voce musicales" (Missa Ut, Re, Mi, Fa, Sol, La); or bore as title the number of voices employed (e.g. "Missa Quattuor thora").

This is not the place to rehearse the story of the gradual development and corruption of ecclesiastical music, of the many attempts at reform, and of the latest pronouncements of the Holy See which oblige consciences with all the force of liturgical law. An excellent summary of this history is given by Dr. Rockstro in Greve's "Dictionary of Music and Musi-
cianus" (a. v. Mass), which may be supplemented by the recent abundant literature of the reform-movement in Church Music. It is of more immediate and practical importance to indicate the various catalogues or lists of masses compiled by those who are seeking to reform the music of the Mass. It is interesting to reflect that in his earlier legislation on this subject, Leo XIII recommended a diocesan commission to draw up a diocesan Index of Repertories, or at least to sanction the performance of pieces therein indicated, whether published or unpublished. In the later Regolamento of 6 July, 1894, the S. C. of Rites does not refer to any such index but merely requires bishops to exercise appropriate supervision over the masses and pastores so that inappropriately music may not be heard in their churches. The present pope has nowhere indicated the necessity, or even the advisability, of compiling such an index or catalogue, but has required by an appointment, in every diocese, of a competent commission which shall supervise musical matters and see that the legislation of the "Motu Proprio" be properly carried out. Nevertheless, it was the stimulus of the Regolamento of 1894 which led to the compilation, in the Diocese of Chicago in 1895, according to the "Guida by Cardinal Spellmann," of that diocesan commission, which was made obligatory by Archbishop Elder in a letter dated 26 July, 1899, and which was to go into operation on the First Sunday of Advent (3 Dec.) of that year. The commission requested pastores to submit the music used, for inspection by the commission. The catalogue so compiled is noteworthy not only for the number of these compositions, but takes the trouble both to mark "rejected" after the various titles and to give, usually, the reason for the rejection. In the following year it issued its "Second Official Catalogue". Both catalogues are important as illustrating the exact musical conditions of one great diocese, and show forth more recently. The commission, said that its purpose was "to inform the faithful of the proper music for the singing of the Mass and the other divinae mysteries." These catalogues have been rendered obsolete by the more stringent recent legislation. But, although that legislation has not prescribed the compilation of lists of approved music, many such catalogues or lists have been compiled. They all pay great attention to the music of the Mass, and should prove of value. The following are noteworthy: "Church Music", Dec., 1905, 80–92; March, 1906, 157–168; Sept., 1906, 541–545, for an account of the two Cincinnati catalogues, and for those of Salford, Eng., Grand Rapids, Mich., Pittsburgh, Pa., Waterford and Lismore, Ireland, Covington, Ky., Liverpool, Eng., and Maastricht, Ger., see supplement to the "Encyclopedia of Catholic Church Music" (St. Francis, Wisconsin, 1905); Terry, "Catholic Church Music" (London, 1907), 201–213; the lists of publishers who understand and respect the provisions of the "Motu Proprio," and the review-pages of the many magazines, in various lands, devoted to the reform movement in sacred music. Correct and appropriate music for Mass, for all degrees of musical ability or choral attainment and of the greatest abundance and freshness and individuality of style, can now be easily obtained. In selecting a Mass it is always advisable to read the text in order to see that it is both complete and liturgically correct; that there should be no alteration, or inversion of the words, no undue repetition, no breaking of syllables. In addition, the "Motu Proprio" specifies [No. 11 (a)]: "The Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, etc., of the Mass must preserve the unity of composition proper to their text. It is not lawful, therefore, to compose them in separate pieces, in such a way that each part is sung in a separate style of chant in itself, and be capable of being detached from the rest, and substituted by another." It further remarks (No. 22): "It is not lawful to keep the priest at the altar waiting on account of the chant or the music for a length of time not allowed by the liturgy. According to the ecclesiastical prescriptions the Sanctus of the Mass should be over before the Elevation and therefore the priest must not sing anything, the Gloria and Credo ought, according to the Gregorian tradition, to be relatively short." Something remains to be said of the chant of the Ordinary which is found in the separate small volume entitled "Kyriale". It is issued by the various competent publishers in all styles of printing, paper, binding, in large and small forms; in medieval and in modern notation; with and without certain "rhythmical signs". (See "Church Music", passim, for review-notices of the various issues; and particularly March, 1906, pp. 235–249, for an elaborate article on the earlier issues.) The eighteen "Masses" it contains are nominally assigned to various qualities of rite; but, in accordance with ancient tradition and with the unanimous agreement of the pontifical Commission on the Chant, liberty has been granted to select any "Mass" for any quality of rite (see the note "Quos-libet cantus" etc., p. 64 of the Vatican Edition of the "Kyriale": "Any chant assigned in this Ordinarium to one Mass may be used in any other; in the same degree of solemnity, any one of those which follow [that is, in the section styled "Cantus ad libitum"] may be taken"). The decrees relating to the publishing of editions based on this typical edition, and to its promulgation, are given in Latin and English translation in "Church Music", March, 1906, pp. 250–256. But it is noteworthy that the "Masses" gives no direction about singing the Benedictus after the Elevation, but prints both chants in such juxtaposition as to suggest that the Benedictus might be sung before the Elevation. In the "Revue du Chant Grégorien" (Aug.–Oct., 1905), its editor, Canon Grospierré, who was one of the Consultors of the Gregorian Commission, wrote that if time permitted, the Benedictus might be sung immediately after the Sanctus. The Pontifical Commission at its meeting at Appuldurcombe, in 1904, unanimously accepted a resolution to this effect. The preface to the Vatican "Gradual", while giving minute directions for the ceremonial rendering of the Missal, merely says: "When the offertory is ended, the choir goes on with the Sanctus, etc." At the elevation of the Blessed Sacrament, the choir is silent like every one else. Nevertheless, inasmuch as the "Gradual" does not declare that the Benedictus is to be chanted after the Elevation, the "etc." is understood to imply that it is to be sung immediately after the Sanctus. The "Ceremonial Episcoporum", however, directs that it be sung "after the elevation of the chalice". The apparent conflict of authorities may be harmonized by supposing that the "Ceremoniale" legislated for the case of musically developed (e. g. polyphonic) settings of the Sanactus and the Benedictus, whose length would necessitate their separation from each other; while the "Gradual" contemplates, of course, the much briefer settings of the plain-song (see "Church Music", Jan., 1909, p. 87). (b) The Proper.—While the texts of the Ordinary do not (with the exception of the Agnus Dei, which is altered in Requiem Mass) change, those which commonly, but somewhat ambiguously, are called the "Proper", change in accordance with the character of the feast or Sunday or ferial day. These texts are the Introit, Gradual, Alleluia-Verse, Sequence, Tract, Offertory, Communio. Not all of these will be found in any one Mass. Thus, e. g. Holy Saturday has no Introit, Gradual, Offertory, Communio; from Low Sunday to Trinity Second in one year there is an Alleluia-Verse; from Septuagesima to Easter, as well as on certain penitential days, the Alleluia-Verse, which ordinarily follows the Gradual, is replaced by a Tract; in only a few Masses is a Sequence used; there
is no Introit on Whitewash Eve, while the customary Gloria Patri after the Introit is omitted during Passion-tide. In Requiem Masses the Gloria Patri is omitted after the Introit and a Tract and a Sequence follow the Gradual. Nor do the texts differ for every feast, as is illustrated by the division of the Sancorale into the "Proprium de Sanctis" and the "Commune Sancorale", the latterdivision grouping the feasts into classes, such as the feasts of confessors-bishops, confessors-not-bishops, martyrs, virgins, etc., in which the texts of the "Tract" serve for many feasts of the "Propers" in many churches. They are, however, an integral part of the duty of the choir, and must be sung, or at least "recited", in a clear and intelligible voice, the organ meanwhile sustaining appropriate chords.

In a Rescript dated 8 August, 1906, the S. R. C., answered a question proposed by the Abbot of Santa Maria Maggiore in Naples, declares that in solemn Mass, when the organ is used, the Gradual, Offertory, Communion, when not sung, must be recited in a high and intelligible voice, and that the Dec Gratias following the Ite missa est should receive the same treatment (see "Church Music", May, 1907, 229-235). The Proprietarian of the S. R. C. then suggests advising the Guérangerian Church to use the rubrics of the Coimbra decision. Thus (Coimbra, 14 April, 1753): in a "Community Mass" it is always necessary to sing the Gloria, Credo, all of the Gradual, the Preface, Pater noster; so, too, a question from Chiogia in 1875, as to whether the custom introduced into that diocese of omitting the chant of the Gradual, the Tract, the Sequence, the Offertory, the Benedictus, the Communion was contrary to the rubrics and decisions of the S. R. C., was answered affirmatively, and the question was remitted to the Coimbra decision. A specific difficulty was offered for solution by a bishop who declared that in his diocese where a single chanter was used, and where the people had to hurry to their daily work, the custom had obtained of making almost the entire Mass singing. In stigmatized Masses, the Gloria, Gradual, Tract, Sequence, Credo. He was answered (29 Dec., 1884) that the custom was an abuse that must be absolutely eliminated. The spirit of the Church legislation is summed up in the "Moot Proprio" (22 Nov., 1903, No. 3): "As the texts that may be rendered in music, and which therefore have an equal right to be rendered, are determined for every function, it is not lawful to confuse this order or to change the prescribed texts for those collected at will, or to omit them entirely or even in part, except when the rubrics allow that some verses of the text be supplied with the organ while these verses are simply recited by chant; but this is not to be done according to the custom of the Roman Church, to sing a motet to the Blessed Sacrament after the Benedictus in a solemn Mass. It is also permitted after the Offertory prescribed for the Mass has been sung, to execute during the time that remains a brief motet to words approved by the Church."

A practical difficulty is encountered in the fact that many choirs have met the limit of their capacity in preparing the chant or music of the Ordinary, whose texts are fixed and repeated frequently. How shall such choirs prepare for a constantly changing series of Proper texts, whether in chant or in music? Several practical solutions of the difficulty have been offered. There is, first of all, the easy device of recitation. For an elaborate discussion of the times when it may be used, the character it should assume, the legal aspects and decisions concerning it, see the Rev. Ludwig Bonvin's article in "Church Music", March, 1906, pp. 146-156. Then there is the solution offered in the excellent exposition found in the well-prepared simple psalm-like settings which could be easily mastered by a fairly equipped choir. The work "The Proper of the Mass for Sundays and Holidays" (New York, 1907-1908, Vol. II, No. 2928) is reviewed in "Church Music" Jan., 1907, 127-128; Mar., 1908, 171-178; see also June, 1906, "One Outcome of the Discussion", 409-415, including a specimen-four-page Toque sequence book of treatment of the Proper text. A third volume which will comprise various local texts is in course of preparation. Another method is that undertaken by Marcello Capra, of Turin, Italy, which provides musical settings for the Proper of the principal feasts, for one or two voices, and with easy organ accompaniment. Still another method is that of Giulio Bas, who has compiled a volume, "Graduale Versus Alleluiaetici et Tractus" (Düsseldorf, 1910), of plain-song settings from the Ambrosian, Aquelean, Greek, Mozarabic chant, for Sundays and Double Feasts, in order to facilitate the rendering of the more difficult portions of the Proper.

However rendered, these chants of the Proper must now be omitted, if that is not to be avoided. But apart from the liturgical necessity, they challenge admiration because of their devotional, poetic, aesthetic perfection: "If we pass in review before our musical eye the wonderful thoughts expressed in the Introit, Graduals, Alleluia Verses, Tracts, Offertories, and Communions of the whole ecclesiastical year, from the first Sunday in Advent to the last day of the year, from the numerous Masses of the saints, apostles, martyrs, confessors, virgins, we must feel that in the Roman Church we have an anthology worthy of our highest admiration" (Rev. H. Bewerunge, "Address at London Eucharistic Congress"). It should be a part of a choirmaster's business to translate and explain these texts to his choir, to lead them in with the understanding as well as with the voice. To this end the "Missal for the Laity", with its Latin and parallel English version, might be used. The spirit of the liturgy may also be largely acquired from the volumes of Dom Guéranger's "Liturgical Year". As such is, however, such an extensive work, the much briefer and didactic volume of the Proper with comment on the spirit, which ran serially through the issues of "Church Music", would prove highly serviceable.

With respect to the plain-song setting, two typical chants should be studied carefully (see Dom Eugène's articles in "Church Music", March, 1906, 222-235, on "the Gradual for Easter", "the Hee dies", and June, 1906, 360-373, on "the Introit Gaudeamus", which give the plain-song notation with transcription into modern notation, rhythmical and dynamical analyses, etc.). Such a study will encourage the present day musician to acquire a greater familiarity with the plain-song work of the Proper. Every student should have: "First, there is the Gregorian Chant. The more one studies these ancient melodies the more one is impressed by their variety and rare beauty. Take the distinctiveness of their forms, the characteristic style which distinguishes an Introit from a Gradual, an Offertory from a Communion. Then within each class what variety of expression, what amazing interpretation of the words, and above all what sublime beauty and mystical spirit of prayer! Certainly, anyone who has tasted the sweetness of these chants must envy the few privileged places where there is high Mass every day and thus a chance is given of hearing all of these divine strains at least once a year" (Bewerunge).

There is a large body of settings of the classical polyphonic schools, and of modern polyphony, as also much illustration of modern homophonic music, of the proper texts. Care should be taken to see that the texts thus treated are verbally correct. For in the return to the traditional melodies of the chants, the particular care to use the proper texts found in very many instances, omitted portions of text, and in various ways to restore to use the more ancient forms of the texts. In the "Proprium de Tempore", for instance, there are about 200 textual...
changes. A summary view of their general character is given in "Church Music" (July, 1908), pp. 232–235. Since these altered texts differ from those still retained in the Missal, choirs which "recite" the texts will do so "in the manner of the Gradual and is not "the Gradual. When the "Gradual" was first issued, it was noticed that the Propers of some American feasts (as also, of course, the Propers of many foreign dioceses as well) were omitted (see "Church Music," March, 1908, 132–134). Some publishers have added these Propers for America, in an appendix bound in with the work. It is very likely that in the future the use of women as organists; the adoption of a sanctuary choir, whether in place of, or in conjunction with, the gallery choir. Historically the reform movement in the chant was signalized by the issuance, first of all, of the "Kyrilla", which contains the Ordinary chants, and then of the "Graduale", which comprises all; chant; this matter also belongs to a more general treatment.


OTTEN, Literature of Mensuralism, ibid., 277; BONVIN, Obligation to Applied Mensuralism Examined (July, 1908), 223.

These references to Missal are not necessarily exhaustive for all Missals. To add to the list, the composers and editors of the Missal are highly prejudicial to the uniform restoration of the chant throughout the Church "the opinion which has held that chant must be sung according as the text is written and that the change in the words appeals to the evidence of the preface of the "Gradual", to pass on to a 'metrical chants' is a technical, indeed, rhythm, or that advocated in general by the Benedictines, Mensuralism, or "measured" rhythm, is not free. For a translation of a "metrical chants" is usually done, see the recent editions of Missals: Much omission of text. No Graduale, no Communio, no Libera. The Introit omits several, and the Interlude is very defective in purchase, the Introit and its repetition. The Sequence omits forty-two lines of text. The Offertory omits a tongue, to pass on to two additional measures of superfluous and superficially adds Amen at the end. The Sanctus omits Dominus. For the current edition of the Vatican chant books consult Church Music (pastoral).

H. T. HENRY.
The rite of the nuptial Mass and blessing is this:
The Mass has neither Gloria nor Creed. It counts as a 
voitive Mass not for a grave matter; therefore it has 
two collections: the first is a prayer of consecration of 
cardinals and bishops, and the third is the one chosen for semi-doubles 
at that time of the year, unless there be two com-
memorations. At the end Benedictus Domino and 
the Gospel of St. John are said. The colour is white. 
The bridegroom and bride assist near the altar (just 
outside the sanctuary), the man on the right. After 
the Psalter the celebrant genuflects and goes to the 
epistle side. Meanwhile the bridegroom and bride 
come up and kneel before him. Turning to them he 
says the two prayers Propitiae Domine and Deus qui 
potestate (as in the Missal) with folded hands. He 
then goes back to the middle and continues the Mass. 
They go back to their places. He gives them Commu-
nion at the usual time. This implies that they are 
fasting and explains the missae misa ("wedding 
breakfast") afterwards. But the Communion is not a 
strict law (S. R. C., no. 5582, 21 March, 1874). 
Immediately after the Benedictus Domino and its answer 
the celebrant again goes to the Epistle side and the 
bridegroom and bride kneel before him as before. 
They genuflect to the right of St. Paul, the prayer of 
Abraham (without Ôremus). He is then told to 
warn them with grave words to be faithful to one an-
other. The rest of the advice suggested in the rubric 
of the Missal is now generally left out. He sprinkles 
them with holy water; they retire, he goes back to 
the middle of the altar, says Placate tibi, gives the blessing 
and makes his usual exit.

In the cases in which the “Missa pro sponso et 
sponsa” may not be said but may be commemorated, 
the special prayers and blessing are inserted in the 
Mass in the same way. But the music must be that 
of the day. During the closed time it is, of course, 
quite possible for the married people to have a Mass 
solemnly said, or a Mass celebrated in the usual way, 
without Communion. The nuptial blessing in this Mass 
is quite a different thing from the actual celebration of 
the marriage, which must always precede it. The 
blessing is given to people already married, as the 
prayers imply. It need not be given (nor the Mass 
said) by the priest who assisted at the marriage. But 
both the prayers (assistance and blessing) are 
rights of the parish priest, which no one else may 
take without delegation from him. Generally 
they are so combined that the marriage takes place 
immediately before the Mass; in this case the priest 
may assist at the marriage in Mass vestiments, 
but without the manipule. In England and other countries 
with a well-defined form of marriage, in particular 
reservals are usually made in the sacristy between the marriage 
and the Mass. Canon Law in England orders that 
marrriages be made only in churches that have a district 
with the cure of souls (Conc. prov. Westm. I, decr. 
XXII, 4). This implies as a general rule, but does not 
command absolutely, that the nuptial Mass also be 
celebrated in such a church.

See Rubries of the Mass pro sponso et sponsa in the Missal: 
Rituale Romanum. Tu. VII: de sacrificio matrimonii; Le 
Venerable Servant, Liturgia Canticorum (1910) p. 195; 
de Hurd, Sacra Liturgia Praeita, III (Louvain, 1894), 381-377. 
ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

MASS, SACRIFICE OF THE.—A. The Dogmatic Doce-
trine of the Mass.—The word Mass (missa) first established itself 
as the general designation for the Eucharistic 
Sacrifice in the West after the time of Pope 
Gregory the Great (d. 604), the early Church having 
used the expression the "breaking of bread" (frac
tio panis) or "liturgy" (Acts, xiii, 2, ἑστασάμενοι); the 
Greek Church has employed the latter name for 
about sixteen centuries. There were current 
early days of Christianity other terms: "The Lord's 
Supper" (canna dominica), the "Sacrifice" (προσφορά, 
oblatio), "the gathering together" (ἐκδίον, congreg-
gatio), "the Mysteries", and (since Augustine) "the 
Sacrifice of the Altar". With the name "Love-
Feast" (ἀγάπη) the idea of the sacrifice of the Mass 
was presented in quite different terms. Etymolo-
gically, the word misa is neither (as Baraccas 
states) from the Hebrew מִסָּה nor from the Greek 
μίσσα, but is simply derived from misio, just as 
oblatio is derived from oblatio, collecta from collectio, 
and ulta from ultio (Du Cange, "Glossary," s. v. "Missa"). 
The reference was however not to a Divine "mission", 
but simply to a "dismission" (dismisio), as was also 
customary in the Greek rite (cf. "Canon. Apost.
VIII, XV: ἀπόδειξις ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ", and as is still echoed in 
the phrase ἡ ἐκκλησία εἰ ἐστι). This solemn form of leave-
-taking was not introduced by the Church as something 
new, but was adopted from the ordinary language of 
the day, as is shown by Bishop Avitus of Vienna as 
late as a.d. 500 (Ep. 1 in P. L., LIX, 199): "In 
churches and in the emperor's or the prefect's courts, 
Missa est is said when the people are released from 
attendance." In the sense of "dismission", or rather 
"close of prayer", misa is used in the celebrated 
Peregrinatio Silviae at least seventy times (Corpus 
scriptor. eccl. lat. nov., XXXVIII, 386 sq.), and the 
phrase and the Mass is often called "Compline", the regular formula: Et missae finis (prayers 
are ended). Popular speech gradually applied the 
ritual of dismissal, as it was expressed in both the 
Mass of the Catechumens and the Mass of the Faithful, 
by synecdoche to the entire Eucharistic Sacrifice, the 
whole being named after the part. The first certain 
mention of such an application is found in the 
usual form of it, xx, 4, in P. L., XVI, 995). We will use the word in 
this sense in our consideration of the Mass in its (1) 
existence, (2) essence, and (3) causality.

(1) The Existence of the Mass.—Before dealing 
with the proofs of revelation afforded by the Bible 
and tradition, certain preliminary points must first be 
settled. One reason why the Church intends the Mass 
to be regarded as a "true and proper sacrifice", and will not tolerate the idea that 
the sacrifice is identical with Holy Communion. 
That is the sense of a clause from the Council of Trent (Sess. 
XXII, can. i): "If any one saith that in the Mass a 
true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God; or, that 
that sacrifice is not offered in union with us; let him be anathema" (Denzinger, "Enchirid.
10th ed., 1908, n. 948). When Leo XIII in the 
dogmatic Bull "Apostolicn Cure" of 13 Sept., 1896, 
based the invalidity of the Anglican form of consecra-
tion on the fact among others, that in the consecrating 
formula of Edward VI (that is, since 1549) there is no 
reference to the sacrifice, he was in reality replying to 
the Eucharistic Sacrifio of the Mass, the Anglican archbishops 
answered with some irritation: "First, we offer the Sacrifice of praise and 
thanking and; next, we plead and represent 
before the Father the Sacrifice of the Cross... and, 
lastly, we offer the Sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator 
of all things, which we have already signified by the 
consecration of His creatures. This whole is more than 
the people has necessarily to take part with the priest, 
we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic Sacrifice." 
In regard to this last contention, Bishop Hedley of 
Newport declared his belief that not one Anglican in 
a thousand is accustomed to call the communion the 
"Eucharistic Sacrifice". But, even if they were all ac-
customed, they would have to interpret the terms 
in the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, which deny both 
the Real Presence and the sacrificial power of the 
priest, and thus admit a sacrifice in an unreal or 
figurative sense only. Leo XIII, on the other hand, 
in union with the whole Christian past, had in mind in 
the above-mentioned passage the "Eucharistic Sacrifice of the true Body and Blood of Christ" on the altar. This Sacrifio is certainly not 
identical with the Anglican form of celebration (see 
Anglicanism).
The simple fact that numerous heretics, such as Wyclif and Luther, repudiated the Mass as "idolatry", while retaining the Sacrament of the true Body and Blood of Christ, proves that the Sacrament of the Eucharist is something essentially different from the Sacrifice of the Mass. In truth, the Eucharist is intended primarily for the sanctification of the soul, whereas the sacrifice serves primarily to glorify God by adoration, thanksgiving, prayer, and expiation. The recipient of the one is God, who receives the sacrifice of His onlybegotten Son; of the other, man, who receives the sacrament for his own good. Furthermore, the unbloody Sacrifice of the Eucharistic Christ is in its nature a transient action, while the Sacrament of the Altar continues as something permanent after the sacrifice, and can even be preserved in monstrance and ciborium. Finally, this difference also deserves mention: communion under one form only is the reception of the whole sacrament, whereas, without the use of the sacrament of the Body and Blood, the mystical slaying of the Victim, and therefore the Sacrifice of the Mass, does not take place.

The definition of the Council of Trent supposes as self-evident the proposition that, along with the "true and real Sacrifice of the Mass", there can be and are in Christendom other kinds of sacrifice, such as prayers of praise and thanksgiving, alms, mortification, obedience, and works of penance. Such offerings are often referred to in Holy Scripture, e.g. in Eschus., xxxv, 4: "And he that doth mercy, offereth sacrifice"; and in Ps. exi, 2: "Let my prayer be directed as incense in thy sight; the lifting up of my hands as evening sacrifice." These figurative offerings, however, necessarily presuppose the real and true offering, just as a picture presupposes its subject and a portrait its original. The Biblical metaphors—a "sacrifice of jubilation" (Ps. xxvi, 6), the "calves of our lips" (Osee, xiv, 5), the "sacrifice of praise" (Heb., xii, 15)—expressions which apply sacrificial terms to actions in the symbolic plan of salvation, are the principle sacrificium the sacrificial intent is embodied in the spirit of prayer, inspires and animates the external offering as the body animates the soul, and without which even the most perfect offering has neither worth nor effect before God. Hence, the holy psalmist says: "For if thou hast desired sacrifice, I would indeed have given it: with burnt-offering would I have obiated thee. A broken spirit, O God, is an afflicted spirit" (Ps. i, 18 sqq.). This indispensable requirement of an internal sacrifice, however, by no means makes the external sacrifice superfluous in Christianity; indeed, without a perpetual oblation deriving its value from the sacrifice once offered on the Cross, Christianity, the perfect religion, would be inferior not only to the Old Testament, but even to the perfect form of natural religion. Since sacrifice is therefore essential to religion, it is all the more necessary for Christianity, which cannot otherwise fulfill its duty of showing outward honour to God in the most perfect way. Thus, the Church, as the mystical Christ, desires and must have her own permanent sacrifice, which, not only be either an independent addition to that of Golgotha or its intrinsic complement; it can only be the one selfsame sacrifice of the Cross, whose fruits, by an unbloody offering, are daily made available for believers and unbelievers and sacrificially applied to them.

If the Mass is to be a true sacrifice in the literal sense, it must realize the philosophical conception of sacrifice. Thus the last ordinary question arises: What is a sacrifice in the proper sense of the term? Without attempting to state and establish a comprehensive theory of sacrifice (q. v.), it will suffice to show that, according to the comparative history of religions, four things are necessary to a sacrifice: a sacrificial gift (res olbata), a sacrificing minister (minister legitimus), a sacrificial action (actio sacrificii), and a sacrificial end or object (finis sacrificii). In contrast with sacrifices in the figurative or less proper sense, the sacrificial gift must exist in physical substance, and must be really or virtually destroyed (animals slain, libations poured out, other things rendered unfit for ordinary uses), or at least really transformed, at a fixed place of sacrifice (ara, altare), and offered up to God. As regards the person offering, it is not permitted that any and every individual should offer sacrifice on his own account. In the revealed religion, as in nearly all heathen religions, only a qualified person (usually called priest, sacerdos, lepeta), who has been given the power by commission or vocation, may offer up sacrifices in the body and blood of Jesus. Thus, Moses, the priests authorized by law in the Old Testament belonged to the tribe of Levi, and more especially to the house of Aaron (Heb., v, 4). But, since Christ Himself received and exercised His high priesthood, not by the arrogation of authority but in virtue of a Divine call, there is still greater need that priests should be more scrupulously marked out by particular authority and sanctity through the Sacrament of Holy orders to offer up the sublime Sacrifice of the New Law. Sacrifice reaches its outward culmination in the sacrificial act, in which we have to distinguish between the proximate matter and the real form. The form lies, not in the real transformation or complete destruction of the sacrificial gift, but rather in its sacrificial oblation, in whatever way it may be transformed. Even where a real destruction took place, as in the sacrificial slayings of the Old Testament, the act of destroying was performed by the servants of the Temple, whereas the proper oblation, consisting in the "spilling of blood" (asperio sanguinis), was the exclusive function of the priests. Thus, the term "Sacrifice of the Cross" consisted neither in the killing of Christ by the Roman soldiers nor in an imaginary self-destruction on the part of Jesus, but in His voluntary surrender of His blood shed by another's hand, and in His offering of His life for the sins of the world. Consequently, the destruction or transformation constitutes at most the proximate matter; the sacrificial oblation, on the other hand, is the physical form of the sacrifice. Finally, the object of the sacrifice, as significant of its meaning, lifts the external offering beyond any mere mechanical action into the sphere of the spiritual and Divine. The object is the soul of the sacrifice, and, in a certain sense, its "metaphysical form." In all religions we find, as the "essence of the sacrifice, a complete surrender to God for the purpose of union with Him; and to this idea there is added, on the part of those who are in sin, the desire for pardon and reconciliation. Hence at once arises the distinction between sacrifices of praise and expiation (sacrificium laudentium et propitiatorium), and sacrifices of thanksgiving (sacrificium laudatum et presentatorium): hence also the obvious inference that, under pain of idolatry, sacrifice is to be offered to God alone as the beginning and end of all things. Rightly does St. Augustine remark (De civi. Dei, X, iv): "Who ever thought of offering sacrifice except to one whom he may know, or thought of giving a present to one whom he may know?" If then we combine the four constituent ideas in a definition, we may say: "Sacrifice is the external obla-
tion to God by an authorized minister of a sense-perceivable object, either through its destruction or at least through the real transfer, in acknowledgment of God's supreme dominion and for the appeasing of His wrath." We shall demonstrate the applicability of this definition to the Mass in the section devoted to the nature of the sacrifice, after settling the question of its existence.

(a) Scriptural Proof.—It is a notable fact that the Divine institution of the Mass was established, one might almost say, with greater certainty by means of the Old Testament than by means of the New.

(i) The Old Testament prophecies are recorded partly in types, partly in words. Following the precedent of many Fathers of the Church (see Bellarmine, "De Intron., v, 6), the Council of Trent especially (Session XXIII, can. 2) transferred on the prophetic relation that undeniably exists between the offering of bread and wine by Melchisedech and the Last Supper of Jesus. The occurrence was briefly as follows: After Abraham (then still called "Abram") with his armed men had rescued his nephew Lot from the four hostile kings who had fallen upon him and robbed him, Melchisedech, King of Salem, in the type of the Messiah, brought forth [proferens, Heb. נַעֲשֵׂה, Hiphil of מַעֲשֶׂה] bread and wine; for he was a priest of the Most High God; he blessed him (Abraham) and said: Blessed be Abram by the Most High God . . . And he [Abraham] gave him the tithe of all ." (Gen. xiv, 18-20). Catholic theologians (with very few exceptions) have from the beginning emphasized the correspondence between the sacrifice of Melchisedech and the Mass. Wherever the Church of Christ proffers the gifts of the Sacrament, not only and solely at the Last Supper, on that occasion He likewise made an unbloody food-offering, only that, as Antitype, He accomplished something more than a mere obliteration of bread and wine, namely the sacrifice of His Body and Blood under the mere forms of bread and wine. Otherwise, the shadows cast before the "good things to come" would have been more perfect than the things themselves, and the antitype at any rate no richer in reality than the type. Since the Mass is nothing else than a continual repetition, commanded by Christ Himself, of the Sacrifice accomplished at the Last Supper, it follows that the Sacrifice of the Mass partakes of the New Testament fulfillment of the prophecy of Melchisedech. (Concerning the Paschal Lamb as the second type of the Mass, see Bellarmine, "De Euchar.", V, vii; cf. also von Cichowski, "Das alte Testamentl. Pascha in seinem Verhältnis zum Opfer Christi", Munich, 1849.)

Passing over the more or less distinct references to the Mass in other prophets (Ps, xxi 27 sqq.; Is, lxvi, 18), we shall take the one principal incident. The Mass is undoubtedly that of Malchias, who makes a threatening announcement to the Levite priests in the name of God: "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts: and I will not receive a gift of your hand. For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles ((rotation, non-Jews), and in every place there is sacrifice and the bread transfer, in acknowledgment of God's supreme dominion and for the appeasing of His wrath."

(ii) We shall demonstrate the applicability of this definition to the Mass in the section devoted to the nature of the sacrifice, after settling the question of its existence.

(b) Reasoning Proof.—For he declared these three things that certainly come to pass: (1) The institution of Levitical sacrifices, and (2) the institution of an entirely new sacrifice. As God's determination to do away with the sacrifices of the Levites is adhered to consistently throughout the denunciation, the essential thing is to specify correctly the sort of sacrifice that is promised in their stead. In regard to this, the following propositions have to be established: (1) that the new sacrifice is to come about in the days of the Messiah; (2) that it is to be a true and real sacrifice, and (3) that it does not coincide formally with the Sacrifice of the Cross.

It is easy to show that the sacrifice referred to by Malchias did not signify a sacrifice of his time, but was rather a future sacrifice belonging to the age of the Messiah. For the phraseology of the original can be translated by the present tense (there is a sacrifice; it is offered), the mere universality of the new sacrifice—"from the rising to the setting," "in every place," "even among the Gentiles," i.e. heathen (non-Jewish) peoples—is irrefragable evidence that the Prophet held that present an event of the future. Wherever Jehovah was made known of His glorification by the "heathen," He can, according to Old Testament teaching (Ps, xxxi, 28; lxii, 10 sqq.; Is, xi, 9; xiii, 6; lx, 9; lxvi, 18 sqq.; Amos, ix, 12; Mich., iv, 2, etc.), have in mind only the kingdom of the Messiah or the future Church of Christ; every new kingdom of the Messiah or of the Church, even if all could a new sacrifice in the time of the prophet himself be thought of. Nor could there be any idea of a sacrifice among the genuine heathens, as Hittig has suggested, for the sacrifices of the heathen, associated with idolatry and impurity, are unclean and displeasing to God (1 Cor., x, 20). Again, it could not be a sacrifice of the dispersed Jews (Diaspora); for apart from the fact that the existence of such sacrifices in the Diaspora is rather problematic, they were certainly not offered the world over, nor did they possess the unusual significance attaching to special modes of honouring God. Consequently, the reference is undoubtedly to some entirely distinctive sacrifice of the Church, and such a sacrifice among genuine heathens, such as the Old Mexicans or the Congo negroes? This is as impossible as in the case of other heathen forms of idolatry. Perhaps then it was to be a new and more perfect sacrifice among the Jews? This also is out of the question, for since the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (A.D. 70), the whole system of Jewish sacrifice is irrevocably a thing of the past; and the new sacrifice, moreover, is to be performed by a priesthood of an origin other than Jewish (Is, lxvi, 21). Everything, therefore, points to Christianity, in which, as a matter of fact, the Messiah rules over non-Jewish peoples.

The second question now presents itself: Is the universal sacrifice thus promised "in every place" to be only a purely spiritual offering of prayer, in other words a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, such as Protestantism is content with; or is it to be a true sacrifice in the strict sense, as the Catholic Church maintains? It is with the clear that abolition and substitution must correspond, and accordingly that the word real sacrifice corresponds to a true unreal sacrifice. Moreover, prayer, adoration, thanksgiving, etc., are far from being a new offering, for they are permanent realities common to every age, and constitute the indispensable foundation of every religion whether before or after the Messiah. The last
doubt is dispelled by the Hebrew text, which has no fewer than three classic sacramental declarations referring to the promised sacrifice, thus designedly doing away with the possibility of interpreting it metaphorically. Especially important is the substantive הַנַּעַם. Although in its origin the generic term for every sacrifice, including the bloody offering and the prayer offering, came to be understood as a promised sacrifice (such as a prayer offering), but even became the technical term for an unbloody sacrifice (mostly of food offerings), in contradistinction to the bloody sacrifice which is given the name of אֱלֹהִים, Sebach (see Knabenbauer, “Commentar. in Prophet. minor.”, II, Paris, 1898, pp. 350 sqq.).

As to the third and last proposition, no lengthy demonstration is needed to show that the sacrifice of Melchisedech cannot be formally identified with the Sacrifice of the Cross. This interpretation is at once contradicted by the Minchah, i.e. unbloody (food) offering. Then, there are other cogent considerations based on fact. Though a real sacrifice, belonging to the time of the Messiah and the most powerful means conceivable for glorifying the Divine name, the Sacrifice of the Cross, so far from being offered “in every place” and among non-Jewish peoples, was confined to Golgotha and the midst of the Jewish people. Nor can the Sacrifice of the Cross, which was accomplished by Jesus through the fact of his being the representative priest, be identified with that sacrifice for the offering of which the Messiah makes use of priests after the manner of the Levites, in every place and at all times. Furthermore, he willfully shuts his eyes against the light, who denies that the prophecy of Malachi is fulfilled to the letter in the Sacrifice of the Mass. For in this union and characteristic of the promised sacrifice: its unbloody sacrificial rite as genuine Minchah, its universality in regard to place and time, its extension to non-Jewish peoples, its delegated priesthood differing from that of the Jews, its essential unity by reason of the identity of the Chief Priest and the Victim (Christ), and its intrinsic and essential purity which no Levitical or moral uncleanness can defile. Little wonder that the Council of Trent should say (Sess. XXII, cap. i): “This is that pure oblation, which cannot be defiled by unworthiness and impiety on the part of those who offer it, and concerning which God has predicted through Malachi, that there would be offered up a clean oblation in every place which would be great among the Gentiles” (see Denzinger, n. 930).

(ii) Passing now to the proofs contained in the New Testament, we may begin by remarking that many dogmatic writers see in the dialogue of Jesus with the Samaritan woman at Jacob’s well a prophetic reference to the Mass (John, iv, 21 sqq.). “Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither on this mountain [Garizim] nor in Jerusalem, adore the Father. . . . But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit and in truth.” Since the point at issue between the Samaritans and the Jews related, not to the ordinary, private offering of prayer practiced everywhere, but to the solemn, public, and communal sacrifice of the altar, it is clear Jesus really seems to refer to a future real sacrifice of praise, which would not be confined in its liturgy to the city of Jerusalem but would captivate the whole world (see Bellarmine, “De Euchar.”, v, 11). Not without good reason do most commentators appeal to Heb., xii, 26: “For without us we have an altar, wherefore they have no altar to eat.” (Ὡς γάρ ἐδόθη ἡ παρακολουθία τῆς θανάτου, ἐκεῖ ἐστὶν ἐδοθή.) Since St. Paul has just contrasted the Jewish food offering (βρῶματος, εσκία) and the Christian altar food, the partaking of which was denied to the Jews, the inference is obvious: where there is an altar, there is a sacrifice. But the Eucharist is the food which the Christians alone are permitted to eat: therefore there is a Eucharistic sacrifice. The objection that, in Apostolic times, the term altar was not yet used in the sense of the “Lord’s table” (cf. I Cor., x, 21) is clearly a begging of the question, since Paul might well have been the first to introduce the name, it being adopted from him by later writers (e.g. Ignatius of Antioch, died a. d. 107).

It can scarcely be denied that the entire mystical explanation of the “unbloody spiritual food from the altar of the cross,” favored by St. Thomas Aquinas, Estius, and Stentrup, is far-fetched (cf. Thalhofer, “Das Opfer des A. und N. Bundes,” Ratisbon, 1870, pp. 233 sqq.). It might on the other hand appear still more strange that in the passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where Christ and Melchisedech are compared, the two food offerings should be not only not placed in prophetic relation with each other, but not even mentioned. The reason, however, is not far to seek: such a parallel lay entirely outside the scope of the argument. All that St. Paul desired to show was that the high priesthood of Christ was superior to the Levitical priesthood of the Old Testament (cf. Heb., vii, 4 sqq.), and this he fully demonstrated by proving that Aaron and his priesthood stood far below the unattainable height of Melchisedech. So much more, therefore, must Christ as “priest according to the order of Melchisedech” excel the Levitical priesthood. The peculiar dignity of Melchisedech, however, was manifested not only in his offering of bread and wine, a thing which the Levites also were able to do, but chiefly through the fact that he blessed the great “Father Abraham and received the tithes from him” (for the proofs relating to the Sacrifice of the Mass in I Cor., x, 16-21, see Al. Schäfer, “Erklärung der beiden Briefe an die Korinther,” Münster, 1903, pp. 93 sqq.).

The main testimony of the New Testament lies in the account of the institution of the Eucharist, and most clearly in the words of consecration spoken over the chalice. For this reason we shall consider these words first, since thereby, owing to the analogy between the two formulae, clearer light will be thrown on the meaning of the words of consecration pronounced over the bread. For the sake of clearness and easy comparison we subjoin the four passages in Greek and English:


For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins.

(2) Mark, xiv, 24: Τώστο γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ ἄμωμον τῆς καρδίας διαθήκη τὸ ὅπερ πολλῶν ἐκχυμονοῦσον.

This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many.


This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you.

(4) I Cor., xi, 25: Τώστο τοῦ ἁγίου ἡ καρδιὰ διαθήκη εἰς τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι.

This chalice is the new testament in my blood.

The Divine institution of the sacrifice of the altar is proved by showing (1) that the shedding of blood spoken of in the enigma (ἐκχυμονοῦσον) and not for the first time on the cross; (2) that it was a true and real sacrifice; (3) that it was considered a permanent institution in the Church. The present form of the participle ἐκχυμονοῦσον in conjunction with the present ἐστι establishes the first point. For it is a grammatical rule of New Testament Greek, that, when the double present is used (Nom. and Participle and the finite verb, as is the case here), the time denoted is not the distant or near future, but strictly the present (see Fr. Blass, “Grammatik des N. T. Griech.,” p. 193, Göttingen, 1896). This rule does not apply to other constructions of the present tense, as when Christ says earlier (John, xiv, 12): “I go (ἐρχόμενος) to the father”. Alleged exceptions to the rule
are not such in reality, as, for instance, Matt., vi, 30: "And if the grass of the field, which is to-day and to-morrow is cast into the oven (βαλλόμενον) God doth so clothe (διψάτωσιν): how much more you, O ye of little faith?" For in this passage it is a question not of something in the future but of something now, in fact, in the mouth of the Saviour the words: "This do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me."

We are now in a position to appreciate in their deeper sense Christ's words of consecration over the bread. Since only St. Luke and St. Paul have made additions to the sentence, "This is My Body", it is only on them that we can base our demonstration. (1) Luke, xxii, 19: Hoe est corpus meum, quod pro vobis datur; τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα μου τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀμνίῳ διίκας; This is my body which is given for you. (2) I Cor., xi, 24: Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur; τοῦτο μόνον ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀμνίῳ (κλαμπιμον); This is my body which shall be broken for you. Once more, we maintain that the sacrificial "giving of the body" (in organic unity of course with the "pouring of blood" in the chalice) is here to be interpreted as a present sacrifice and as a permanent institution in the Church. Regarding the decisive point, i.e. indication of what is actually taking place, it is again St. Luke who speaks with greatest clearness, where, with the σῶμα, the ἐν τῷ ὀμνίῳ, he describes by which he describes the "giving of the body" as something happening in the present, here and now, not as something to be done in the near future.

The reading κλαμπιμον in St. Paul is disputed. According to the best critical reading (Tischendorf, Lachmann) the participle is dropped altogether, so that St. Paul is probably writing the following: "For his body, i.e. for you, i.e. for your salvation." There is good reason, however, for regarding the word κλαμπιμον (from κλαμερ) as a parallelism of the σῶμα, to break as Pauline, since St. Paul shortly before spoke of the "breaking of bread" (I Cor., x, 16), which for him meant "to offer as food the true body of Christ". From this however we may conclude that the "breaking of the body" not only confines Christ's action to the strictly present, especially as His natural Body could not be "broken" on the cross (cf. Ex., xii, 46; John, xix, 32 sq.), but also implies the intention of offering a "body broken for you" (ἐν τῷ ὀμνίῳ) i.e. the act constituted in itself a true food offering. All doubt as to its sacrificial character is removed by the expression τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀμνίῳ in Luke, xxii, 20, which quite correctly translates into the present: "quod pro vobis datur." But "to give one's body for others" is as truly a Biblical expression for sacrifice (cf. John, vi, 52; Rom., vii, 4; Col., i, 22; Heb., x, 10, etc.) as the parallel phrase, "the shedding of blood". Christ, therefore, at the Last Supper offered up His Body as an unbloody sacrifice. Finally, that He commanded the renewal for all time of the Eucharistic sacrifice through the Church is clear from the addition: "Do this for a commemoration of me" (Luke, xxxii, 19; I Cor., xi, 24).

(b) Proof from Tradition.—Harnack is of opinion that the early Church, up to the time of Cyprian (c. 210), contented itself with the purely spiritual offices of adoration and thanksgiving and that it did not possess the sacrifice of the Mass, as Catholicism now understands it. In a series of writings, Dr. Wieland, a Catholic priest, likewise maintained in the face of vigorous opposition from other theologians, that the early Christians confined the essence of the Christian subjective Eucharistic prayer of thanksgiving, till Irenaeus (d. 202) brought forward the idea of an objective offering of gifts, and especially of bread and wine. Here, according to this view, was the first to include in his expanded conception of sacrifice, the entire new idea of material offerings (i.e. the Eucharistic elements) which up to that time the early Church had formally repudiated. Were this assumption correct, the doctrine of the Council of Trent (Sesa.
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xxii, c. ii), according to which in the Mass the "priests offer up, in obedience to the command of Christ, His Body and Blood" (see Denzinger, "Enchiridion", n. 949), could hardly take its stand on Apostolic tradition; the bridge between antiquity and the present would thus have been broken by the abrupt intrusion of a completely contrary view. An impartial study of the earliest texts seems indeed to make this much clear, that the early Church paid most attention to the spiritual and subjective side of sacrifice and laid chief stress on prayer and thanksgiving in the Eucharistic function.

This admission, however, is not identical with the statement that the early Church rejected out and out the objective sacrifice, and acknowledged as genuine only the spiritual sacrifice as expressed in the "Eucharistic thanksgiving". That there has been an historical dogmatic development from the indefinite to the definite, from the implicit to the explicit, from the seed to the fruit, no one familiar with the subject will deny. An assumption so reasonable, the only one in fact consistent with Christianity, is, however, fundamentally different from the hypothesis that the Christian idea of sacrifice has veered from one extreme to the other. This is a prius improbable and unproved in fact. In the Didache or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" (Acta, xx, 7) referred to as a "sacrifice" (θυσία) and mention made of it in one's own sacrifice before the sacrifice (cf. Matt., v, 23), but the whole passage is crowned with an actual quotation of the prophecy of Malachi, which referred, as is well known, to the effective act of sacrifice (c. a. d. 96), not only is the "breaking of bread" (cf. Acts, xx, 7) referred to as a "sacrifice" (θυσία) and mention made of it in one's own sacrifice before the sacrifice (cf. Matt., v, 23), but the whole passage is crowned with an actual quotation of the prophecy of Malachi, which referred, as is well known, to the effective act of sacrifice.

The early Christians gave the name of "sacrifice" not only to the Eucharistic "thanksgiving," but also to the entire ritual celebration including the liturgical "breaking of bread", without at first distinguishing clearly between the prayer and the gift (bread and wineBody and Blood). When Ignatius of Antioch (d. 107), a disciple of the Apostles, says of the Eucharist: "There is only one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, only one chalice containing His one Blood, one altar (τὸ θουαστήριον), as also only one bishop with the priesthood and the deacons" (Eph., ad. Philad., iv), he gives here to the liturgical Eucharistic celebration, on which alone he speaks, by his reference to the "altar" (τὸ θουαστήριον) and the "chalice" (θυσιαστήριον), a clear indication of its sacrificial character, as he may use the word "altar" in other contexts in a metaphorical sense.

A heated controversy had raged round the conception of Justin Martyr (d. 166) from the fact that in his "Dialogue with Tryphon" (c. 117) he characterizes the prayer and thanksgiving (εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι) as the "one perfect sacrifice acceptable to God" (ἐνθριασμὸς καὶ εὐχαρίστησις). Was it the "perfect sacrifice" acceptable to God (μιᾶς εὐχαριστίας)? Did he intend by this emphasis on the interior spiritual sacrifice to exclude the exterior real sacrifice of the Eucharist? Clearly he did not, for in the same "Dialogue" (c. xii: P.G., VI, 584) he says the "food offering" of the lepers, assured of a real gift (cf. Mark vii, 39), is a figure (τίμιον) of the breaking of the Eucharist which God has commanded to be offered (θυσία) in commemoration of His sufferings. He goes on: "Of the sacrifices which you (the Jews) formerly offered, God through Malachi has said: 'I have no pleasure, etc.' By the sacrifices (θυσία), however, which we Gentiles present to Him in every place, that is (τούτους) of the bread of the Eucharist and likewise of the chalice of the Eucharist, He then said that we glorify His name, while you dishonour him." Here "bread and chalice" are the use of τούτων clearly included as objective gift offerings in the idea of the Christian sacrifice. If the other apologists (Aristides, Athenagoras, Minucius Felix) in this respect present to Him in every place, that is (τούτων) of the bread of the Eucharist and likewise of the chalice of the Eucharist, He then said that we glorify His name, while you dishonour him."

For Augustine nothing is more certain than that every religion, whether true or false, must have an exterior form of worship and was for our Lord Jesus Christ and Chrysostom (d. 407) who have been charged with exaggerating "realism", and whose plain discourses on the sacrifice rival those of Basil (d. 379), Gregory of Nyssa (d. c. 394) and Ambrose (d. 397). Only about Augustine (d. 430) must a word be said, since, in regard to the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, he is cited as favouring the "symbolical" theory. Now it is precisely his teaching on sacrifice that best serves to clear away the suspicion that he inclined to a merely spiritual interpretation.

For Augustine nothing is more certain than that every religion, whether true or false, must have an exterior form of worship and was for our Lord Jesus Christ and Chrysostom (d. 407) who have been charged with exaggerating "realism", and whose plain discourses on the sacrifice rival those of Basil (d. 379), Gregory of Nyssa (d. c. 394) and Ambrose (d. 397). Only about Augustine (d. 430) must a word be said, since, in regard to the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, he is cited as favoring the "symbolical" theory. Now it is precisely his teaching on sacrifice that best serves to clear away the suspicion that he inclined to a merely spiritual interpretation.

For Augustine nothing is more certain than that every religion, whether true or false, must have an exterior form of worship and was for our Lord Jesus Christ and Chrysostom (d. 407) who have been charged with exaggerating "realism", and whose plain discourses on the sacrifice rival those of Basil (d. 379), Gregory of Nyssa (d. c. 394) and Ambrose (d. 397). Only about Augustine (d. 430) must a word be said, since, in regard to the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, he is cited as favoring the "symbolical" theory. Now it is precisely his teaching on sacrifice that best serves to clear away the suspicion that he inclined to a merely spiritual interpretation.
smoothly along in a well-ordered channel, without check or disturbance, through the Middle Ages to our own time. Even the powerful attempt made to stem it by the Reformation had no effect. A brief demonstration of the existence of the Mass is the so-called proof from prescription, which is thus formulated: A sacrificial rite in the Church which is older than the oldest attack made on it by heretics cannot be deemed as "idolatry", but must be referred back to the Church of Christianity as a rightful heritage of which He was the heir. Now the Church's legitimate possession as regards the Mass can be traced back to the beginnings of Christianity; it follows that the Mass was Divinely instituted by Christ. Regarding the minor proposition, the proof of which alone concerns us here, we may begin at once with the Reformation, the only movement that utterly did away with the Mass. Psychologically, it is quite intelligible that men like Zwingli, Karlstadt and Zéclampadius should tear down the altars, for they denied Christ's real presence in the Sacrament. Calvinism also reviled the "papistical mass" which the Heidelberg catechism characterised as "cursed idolatry", and merely as a custom, since it still had only a "stamped" presence. It is rather strange on the other hand that, in spite of his belief in the literal meaning of the words of consecration, Luther, after a violent "nocturnal disputation with the devil" in 1521, should have repudiated the Mass. But it is exactly these measures of violence that best show what the Church had been doing to the Mass ever since the root by that time in Church and people. How long had it been taking root? The answer, to begin with, is: all through the Middle Ages back to Photius, the originator of the Eastern Schism (869). Though Wycliffe protested against the teaching of the Council of Constance (1414-18), which maintained that the Mass was the Church's "sacrament", and that the Albigenses and Waldenses claimed for the laity also the power to offer sacrifice (cf. Denzinger, "Enchiridion", 585 and 430), it is none the less true that even the schismatic Greeks held fast to the Eucharistic sacrifice as a precious heritage from their Catholic past. In the negotiations for reunion at Lyons (1274) and Florence (1439) they showed moreover that they had kept it intact; and they have faithfully safeguarded it to this day. From all which it is clear that the Mass existed in both Churches long before Photius, a conclusion borne out by the monuments of Christian antiquity.

Taking a long step backwards from the ninth to the fourth century, we come upon the Nestorians and Monophysites who were driven out of the Church during the fifth century at Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451). From that day to this they have celebrated in their solemn liturgy the sacrifice of the New Law, and since they could only have taken it with them from the old Christian Church, it follows that the Mass goes back in the Church beyond the time of Nestorianism and Monophysitism. Indeed, the first Nicene Council (325) in its celebrated eighteenth canon forbade priests to receive the Eucharist from the hands of deacons for the very obvious reason that "neither the canon nor custom have handed down to us, that those, who have not the power to offer sacrifice (σφορόφιον) may give Christ's body to those who offer (σφορόφιον)". Hence it is plain that for the celebration of the Mass there was required the dignity of a special priesthood, from which the deacons as such were excluded. Since, however, the Nicene Council speaks of a "custom", that takes us at once into the third century, we are already in the age of the Catacomb (q.v.), which has been, as it were, the key to the underground strata of pagan religions. Here, however, a rich variety of hypotheses is placed at their disposal. In this age of Pan-Babylonism it is not at all surprising that the germinal ideas of the Christian communion should be located in Babylon, where in the Adapa myth (on the tablet of Tell Amarna) men were called to a "good of life" (Zimmern). Others (e. g. Brandt) fancy they have found a still more striking analogy in the "bread and water" (Pathâ and Mambûhâ) of the Mundran religion. The view most widely held to-day among
upholders of the historic-religious theory is that the Eucharist and the Mass originated in the practices of the Persian Mithraism (Dieterich, H. T. Holtzmann, Pfeiderer, Robertson, etc.), "In the Mandan mass", writes Cumont ("Mysterien des Mithra", Leipzig, 1893, p. 118) "to celebrate these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to inpenetrable night, as long as men refuse to operate the well Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.

(a) The Physical Character of the Mass.—In regard to the physical character there arises not only the question as to the concrete portions of the liturgy, in which the real offering lies hidden, but also the question regarding the relation of the Mass to the bloody sacrifice on the Cross. To be celebrated in detail these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to inpenetrable night, as long as men refuse to believe in the true Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.

(b) The Physical Character of the Mass.—In regard to the physical character there arises not only the question as to the concrete portions of the liturgy, in which the real offering lies hidden, but also the question regarding the relation of the Mass to the bloody sacrifice on the Cross. To be celebrated in detail these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to inpenetrable night, as long as men refuse to believe in the true Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.

(c) The Physical Character of the Mass.—In regard to the physical character there arises not only the question as to the concrete portions of the liturgy, in which the real offering lies hidden, but also the question regarding the relation of the Mass to the bloody sacrifice on the Cross. To be celebrated in detail these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to inpenetrable night, as long as men refuse to believe in the true Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.

(d) The Physical Character of the Mass.—In regard to the physical character there arises not only the question as to the concrete portions of the liturgy, in which the real offering lies hidden, but also the question regarding the relation of the Mass to the bloody sacrifice on the Cross. To be celebrated in detail these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to inpenetrable night, as long as men refuse to believe in the true Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.

(e) The Physical Character of the Mass.—In regard to the physical character there arises not only the question as to the concrete portions of the liturgy, in which the real offering lies hidden, but also the question regarding the relation of the Mass to the bloody sacrifice on the Cross. To be celebrated in detail these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to inpenetrable night, as long as men refuse to believe in the true Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.

(f) The Physical Character of the Mass.—In regard to the physical character there arises not only the question as to the concrete portions of the liturgy, in which the real offering lies hidden, but also the question regarding the relation of the Mass to the bloody sacrifice on the Cross. To be celebrated in detail these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to inpenetrable night, as long as men refuse to believe in the true Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.

(g) The Physical Character of the Mass.—In regard to the physical character there arises not only the question as to the concrete portions of the liturgy, in which the real offering lies hidden, but also the question regarding the relation of the Mass to the bloody sacrifice on the Cross. To be celebrated in detail these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to inpenetrable night, as long as men refuse to believe in the true Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.

(h) The Physical Character of the Mass.—In regard to the physical character there arises not only the question as to the concrete portions of the liturgy, in which the real offering lies hidden, but also the question regarding the relation of the Mass to the bloody sacrifice on the Cross. To be celebrated in detail these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to inpenetrable night, as long as men refuse to believe in the true Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.

(i) The Physical Character of the Mass.—In regard to the physical character there arises not only the question as to the concrete portions of the liturgy, in which the real offering lies hidden, but also the question regarding the relation of the Mass to the bloody sacrifice on the Cross. To be celebrated in detail these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to inpenetrable night, as long as men refuse to believe in the true Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.

(j) The Physical Character of the Mass.—In regard to the physical character there arises not only the question as to the concrete portions of the liturgy, in which the real offering lies hidden, but also the question regarding the relation of the Mass to the bloody sacrifice on the Cross. To be celebrated in detail these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to inpenetrable night, as long as men refuse to believe in the true Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.

(k) The Physical Character of the Mass.—In regard to the physical character there arises not only the question as to the concrete portions of the liturgy, in which the real offering lies hidden, but also the question regarding the relation of the Mass to the bloody sacrifice on the Cross. To be celebrated in detail these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to inpenetrable night, as long as men refuse to believe in the true Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.
of the Church (cf. Trent, Sess. XXII, i) that the Mass is in its very nature a "representation" (repräsentation), a "commemoration" (memoria) and an "application" (applikatio) of the Sacrifice of the Cross. When indeed the Roman Catechism (II, c. iv, Q. 70), as a fourth relation, adopts the daily repetition (instauratim), it means that such a repetition is to be taken not in the sense of a multiplication, but simply of an application of the merits of the passion. Just as the Church repudiates nothing so much as the suggestion that by the Mass the sacrifice on the Cross is as it were set aside, so she goes a step farther and maintains the essential identity of both sacrifices, holding that the main difference between them is in the different manner of sacrificing, the one bloody, the other unbloody (Trent, Sess. XXII, can. 3). "Haec nunqua sacerdotum ministerio, qui sequitur tune in cruce obtulit, sola offrendi ratione diversa." Inasmuch as the sacrificing priest (offerens) and the sacrificial victim (hostia) in both sacrifices are Christ Himself, their sameness amounts even to a numerical identity. In regard to the manner of the sacrifice (offerendi ratio) on the other hand, it is naturally a question only of a specific identity or unity that includes the possibility of ten, a hundred, or a thousand masses.

(b) Turning now to the other question as to the constituent parts of the liturgy of the Mass in which the real sacrifice is to be looked for, we need only take into consideration its three chief parts; the Offertory, the Mass, and the Communion. The view of Johann Eck, according to which the act of sacrifice was comprised in the prayer "Unde et memores . . . offerimus", is thus excluded from our discussion, as is also the opinion of Melchior Canus, who held that the sacrifice is accomplished in the symbolic ceremony of the breaking of the Host and its concommittal with the other elements of Mass. The question now is: Is the sacrifice comprised in the Offertory? From the wording of the prayer this much at least is clear, that bread and wine constitute the secondary sacrificial elements of the Mass, since the priest, in the true language of sacrifice, offers to God bread as an "unspotted host" (immaculatum hostiam) and wine as the "chalice of salvation" (calicem salutaria). But the very significance of this language proves that attention is mainly directed to the prospective transsubstantiation of the Eucharistic elements. Since the Mass is not a mere offering of bread and wine, like the figurative food offering of Melchisedech, it is clear that only the Body and Blood of Christ can be the primary material in the sacrifice. Consequently, the sacrifice is not in the Offertory. Does it consist then in the priest's Communio? There were and are theologians who favour that view. They can be ranged in two classes, according as they see in the Communion the essential or the eventual.

Those who belong to the first category (Dominicus Soto, Renz, Bellard) had to beware of the heretical doctrine proscribed by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, can. 1), viz., that Mass and Communion were identical. In American and English circles the so-called "banquet-theory" of the late Bishop Bellard once created some stir (cf. The Ecclesiastical Review, XXXIII, 1905, 258 sq.). According to that view, the essence of the sacrifice was not to be looked for in the offering of a gift to God, but solely in the Communion. Without communion there was no sacrifice. Regarding pagan sacrifices Döllinger ('Heidentum und Judentum', Ratisbon, 1857) had already demonstrated the falsity of the theory. With the complete shedding of blood pagan sacrifices ended, so that the supper which sometimes followed it was expressive merely of the satisfaction felt at the reconciliation with the gods. Even the horrible human sacrifices had as their object the death of the victim only and not a sannibal feast (cf. Mader, "Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer und der benachbarten Völker", Freiburg, 1909). As to the Jews, only a few Levitical sacrifices, such as the peace offering, had feeding connected with them; most, and especially the burnt offerings (holocausta), were accomplished without feeding (cf. Levit., vi, 9 sq.). Bishop Bellard, having cast in his lot with the "banquet-theory", could naturally find in the sacrifice of the Mass in the priest's communion only. He was indeed logically bound to allow that the Crucifixion itself had the character of a sacrifice only in conjunction with the Last Supper, at which alone food was taken; for the Crucifixion excluded any ritual food offering. These disquieting consequences are all the more serious in that they are devoid of any scientific content (cf. Pesch, "Præf. dogmat.", VI, 379 sq., Freiburg, 1908).

Harmless, even though improbable, is that other view (Bellarmine, De Lugo, Tournely, etc.) which includes the Communion as at least a co-essential factor in the constitution of the Mass; for the consumption of the Host and of the contents of the Chalice, being a kind of destruction, would appear to accord with the conception of the sacrifice developed above. But only in appearance; for the sacrificial transformation of the victim must take place on the altar, and not in the body of the celebrant, while the partaking of the two elements can at most represent the burial and not the sacrificial death of Christ. The Last Supper also would never have been the Communion of Christ had given the Communion not only to His apostles but also to Himself. There is however no evidence that such a Communion ever took place, probable as it may appear. For the rest, the Communion of the priest is not the sacrifice, but only the completion of, and participation in, the sacrifice; it belongs therefore not to the essence, but to the form of the sacrifice. And this integrity is also preserved absolutely even in the so-called "private Mass" at which the priest alone communicates; private Masses are allowed for that reason (cf. Trent, Sess. XXII, can. 8). When the Jansenist Synod of Pistoia (1786), proclaiming the false principle that "participation in the sacrifice is essential to the sacrifice", demanded at least the making of a "spiritual communion" on the part of the faithful as a condition of allowing private Masses, it was denied by Pius VI in his Bull "Auctorem fidei" (1796) (see Denzinger, n. 1528).

After the elimination of the Offertory and Communion, there remains only the Consecration as the part in which the true sacrifice, in reality, that part alone is to be regarded as the proper sacrificial act which is such by Christ's own institution. Now the Lord's words are: "This is my Body; this is my Blood." The Oriental Epiclesis (q. v.) cannot be considered as the moment of consecration for the reason that it is absent in the Mass in the West and is known to have first occurred in Apostolic times (see Eucharist). The sacrifice must also be at the point where Christ personally appears as High Priest and the human celebrant acts only as his representative. The priest does not however assume the personal part of Christ either at the Offertory or Communion. He only does so when he speaks the words: "This is My Body; this is My Blood", in which there is no possible reference to the body and blood of the celebrant. While the Consecration as such can be shown with certainty to be the act of Sacrifice, the necessity of the twofold consecration can be demonstrated only as highly probable. Not only elder theologians such as Frasen, Gottzi, and Bonacina, but also later theologians, like Schmid, have supported the untenable theory that when one of the consecrated elements is invalid, such as barley bread or cider, the consecration of the valid element not only produces the Sacrament, but also the (mutated) sacrifice. Their chief argument is that the
sacrament in the Eucharist is inseparable in idea from the sacrifice. But they entirely overlooked the fact that the Eucharistic representation of the sacrifice for the sacrifice of the Mass (not for the sacrament), and especially the fact that in the consecration of one element only the intrinsically essential relation of the Mass to the sacrifice of the Cross is not symbolically represented. Since it was no mere death from suffocation that Christ suffered, but a bloody death, in which His veins were emptied of their blood, this condition of separation must receive visible representation on the altar, as in a sublime drama. This condition is fulfilled only by the double consecration, which brings before our eyes the Body and the Blood in the state of separation, and thus represents the mystical shedding of blood. Consequently, the double consecration is the equally essential element of the Mass as a relative sacrifice.

(b) The Metaphysical Character of the Sacrifice of the Mass.—The physical essence of the Mass having been established in the consecration of the two species, the metaphysical question arises as to whether and in what degree the scientific concept of sacrifice is realized in this double consecration. Since the three ideas, sacrificing priest, sacrificial gift, and sacrificial object, present no difficulty to the understanding, the problem is finally seen to lie entirely in the determination of the real sacrificial act (actio sacrificii), and indeed not so much in the form of this act as in the matter, since the glorified Victim, in consequence of its immateriality, has no existence apart from the fact that it may not constitute a hypothetical theolologem on the basis of a theory, one can no longer from such a standpoint successfully defend the indispensability of the double consecration. Equally difficult is it to find in the Eucharistic Christ's voluntary surrender of his sensitive functions the relative moment of sacrifice, i.e., the representation of the crucifixion of the Cross. The standpoint of Suarez, adopted by Scheeben, is both exalting and imposing; the real transformation of the sacrificial gifts he refers to the destruction of the Eucharistic elements (in virtue of the transubstantiation) at their conversion into the Precious Body and Blood of Christ (in statu perfectio), just as, in the process of incense in the Old Testament, the incense were transformed by fire into the higher and more precious form of the sweetest odor and fragrance. But, since the antecedent destruction of the substance of bread and wine can by no means be regarded as the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, Suarez is finally compelled to identify the substantive production of the Eucharistic Victim with the sacrificing of the same. Herein is straightforwardly revealed a serious weakness, already clearly perceived by De Lugo. For the production of a thing can never be identical with its sacrifice; otherwise one might declare the gardener's production of plants or the shepherd's raising of sheep to be the sacrifice, for the latter is at most the object of the sacrifice, not the sacrifice itself; (4) since this postulated kenosis, however, can be no real, but only a mystical or sacramental one, we must appraise intelligently those moments which approximate in any degree the "mystical slaying" to a real exanishment, instead of rejecting them. With the aid of these four criteria it is comparatively easy to arrive at a decision concerning the probability or otherwise of the different theories concerning the sacrifice of the Mass.

(i) The Jesuit Gabriel Vasquez, whose theory was supported by Perrone in the last century, requires for the essence of an absolute sacrifice only—and thus, in the present case, for the Sacrifice of the Cross—a true destruction or the real slaying of Christ, whereas for the idea of the relative sacrifice of the Mass it suffices that the former slaying on the Cross be visibly represented in the separation of Body and Blood on the altar. This view soon found a keen critic in Cardinal de Lugo, who, appealing to the Tridentine definition of the Mass, claimed that the scriptural proofs for Vasquez for reducing the Mass to a purely relative sacrifice. Were Jephta to arise again to-day with his daughter from the grave, he argues (De Euchar., disp. xix, sect. 4, n. 58), and present before our eyes a living dramatic reproduction of the slaying of his daughter after the fashion of a tragedy, we would undoubtedly see before us not a true sacrifice, but a historic or symbolical representation of the sacrifice. Such may indeed satisfy the notion of a relative sacrifice, but certainly not the notion of the Sacrifice of the Mass, which includes in itself both the relative and the absolute (in opposition to the merely relative) sacrificial moment. If the Mass is to be something more than an Ober-Ammergau Passion Play, then not only must Christ appear in the Immanence on the altar, but He must also be in some manner really sacrificed on that very altar. The theory of Vasques thus fails to fulfill the first condition which we have named above.

To a certain extent the opposite of Vasquez's theory is that of Cardinal Cienfuegos, who, while exaggerating the absolute moment of the Mass, failed to recognize the equally essential relative moment of the sacrifice. The sacrificial destruction of the Eucharistic Christ he would find in the voluntary suspension of the powers of sense (especially of sight and hearing), which the sacramental mode of existence implies, and which lasts from the consecration to the muing of the two Species. But, apart from the fact that one may not constitute a hypothetical theolologem on the basis of a theory, one can no longer from such a standpoint successfully defend the indispensability of the double consecration. Equally difficult is it to find in the Eucharistic Christ's voluntary surrender of his sensitive functions the relative moment of sacrifice, i.e., the representation of the crucifixion of the Cross. The standpoint of Suarez, adopted by Scheeben, is both exalting and imposing; the real transformation of the sacrificial gifts he refers to the destruction of the Eucharistic elements (in virtue of the transubstantiation) at their conversion into the Precious Body and Blood of Christ (in statu perfectio), just as, in the process of incense in the Old Testament, the incense were transformed by fire into the higher and more precious form of the sweetest odor and fragrance. But, since the antecedent destruction of the substance of bread and wine can by no means be regarded as the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, Suarez is finally compelled to identify the substantive production of the Eucharistic Victim with the sacrificing of the same. Herein is straightforwardly revealed a serious weakness, already clearly perceived by De Lugo. For the production of a thing can never be identical with its sacrifice; otherwise one might declare the gardener's production of plants or the shepherd's raising of sheep to be the sacrifice, for the latter is at most the object of the sacrifice, not the sacrifice itself; (4) since this postulated kenosis, however, can be no real, but only a mystical or sacramental one, we must appraise intelligently those moments which approximate in any degree the "mystical slaying" to a real exanishment, instead of rejecting them. With the aid of these four criteria it is comparatively easy to arrive at a decision concerning the probability or otherwise of the different theories concerning the sacrifice of the Mass.

(ii) Disavowing the above-mentioned theories concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass, theologians of to-day are again seeking a closer approximation to the pre-Tridentine conception, having realized that post-Tridentine theology had perhaps for polemical reasons needlessly exaggerated the idea of destruction in the sacrifice. The old conception, which our catechisms still teach to the people as the most natural and intelligible, may be fearlessly declared...
patristic and traditional view; its restoration to a position of general esteem is the service of Father Billot (De sacram., I, 4th ed., Rome, 1907, pp. 507 sqq.). Since this theory refers the absolute moment of sacrifice to the (active) "sacramental mystical mas- saging", and the relative to the (passive) "separation of Body and Blood", it has indeed made the "two-edged sword" of the double consecration the cause from which the double character of the Mass as an absolute (real in itself) and relative sacrifice proceeds. We have an absolute sacrifice, for the Victim is—not indeed in specie propria, but in specie altera—sacramen-
tally slain; we have also a relative sacrifice, since the sacramental separation of Body and Blood represents perceptibly the former shedding of Blood on the Cross.

While this view meets every requirement of the metaphysical nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass, we do not think it right to reject offhand the somewhat more elaborate theory of Lessius instead of utilizing it in the spirit of the traditional view for the extension of the idea of a "mystical slaying". Lessius (De perfect. moribusque div., XII, xiiii) goes beyond the old ex-
planation by adding the not untrue observation that the intrinsic force of the double consecration would have been equal to both, the shedding of Blood on the altar, if this were not per accidens impossible in conse-
quently of the impassibility of the transfigured Body of Christ. Since ex vi verborum the consecration of the bread makes really present only the Body, and the consecration of the Chalice only the Blood, the tendency of the double consecration is towards a form-
al of sacrifice to the Body and Blood of Christ. Mystical slaying thus approaches nearer to a real destruct-
ion and the absolute sacrificial moment of the Mass receives an important confirmation. In the light of this view, the celebrated statement of St. Gregory of Nazianus becomes of special importance (Ep. cixxi, ad Amphil. in P. G., XXXVII, 282): "Hesitate not to approach the Body with boils [θηματος ταμα] thou separatest [ςπαστη] the Body and Blood of the Lord, having speech as a sword [πους ὕψω το λείψε]". As an old pupil of Cardinal Franselín (De Euchar., p. II, thes. xvi, Rome, 1887), the present writer may perhaps speak a good word for the once popular, but recently combated theory of Christ's actual presence in the Eucharist, if it lived a long period of neglect; not however that he intends to proclaim the theory in its present form as entirely satisfactory, since, with much to recommend it, it has also serious defects. We believe, however, that this theory, like that of Lessius, might be most profitably utilized to develop, supplement, and deepen the tradi-
tional view. Starting from the principle that the Eucharistic destruction can be, not a physical, but only a moral one, De Lugo finds this exainment in the voluntary reduction of Christ to the condition of food (reductio ad statum cibi et potus), in virtue of which the Saviour, after the fashion of lifeless food, leaves him-
self at the mercy of mankind. That this is really the essence of the Mass in one false place, the ne-
cessity of the double consecration is not made properly apparent, since a single consecration would suffice to
produce the condition of food, and would therefore achieve the sacrifice; secondly, the reduction to the state of articles of food reveals not the faintest analogy to the blood-shedding on the Cross, and thus the real sacrifice must be regarded as one in which the Mass is not properly dealt with. De Lugo's theory, there-
fore, of no service in this connexion. It renders, how-
ever, the most useful service in extending the tra-
ditional idea of a "mystical slaying", since indeed the reduction of Christ to food is and purports to be nothing else than the preparation of the mystically slain Victim for the feast in the Communion of the priest and the faithful.

Concerning research in history of religions see ANHIL, Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum nebst einem kurzen Abriss des Abendmahlvorstellens im ersten Jahrh. n. Chr. (2nd ed., Giessen, 1906); BABBEMANN, Das Abendmahl vor der ersten Jahrh. des Christentums (Leipzig, 1907); BABBEMANN, Das Abendmahl im Urchristentum in Zeitschr. für neueste missionswiss. (1904), 204 sqq.; DEHMANN, Licht von Osten (Tienna, 1908); GEFFKEN, Aus der Werke des Christentums (Leipzig, 1904); CLEMMEN, Die religionsgesch. Methode in der Theol. (Berlin, 1904); IDEM, Religionsgesch. (Berlin, 1906), p. 24; IBE, Histoire des religions (Paris, 1906). For an answer to Radicalism see RAHNER, Die Einsetzung der Taufe u. des Abendmahls u. die moderne Kirche (Munich, 1907); BAKAS, Die Messer der altchrist. Liturgie (Trier, 1910); GOTT. Die heutige Abendmahlsfrage in ihrer Erforschung. Dieliturgischen Einführungen (Köln, 1910). Concerning the meaning of "the Mass of Labeos", see F. von LABEOS, Das Mysterium der Heiligen Gräber u. der Verh. von Labeos (Würzburg, 1841); BREUTENBERG, Das Sakramental des Hl. Sakraments (Breitenbrunn, 1869); TANNER, Currment Chrsisti sacrificii, incurrentium Mass sacrificialium explicat. (Fragus, 1869); CENEFURGO, Vites abscnsionis sub specie ciborum (Ratisbon, 1723); WESTERL, Die Mass in ihrem Wesen oder das verbale Kreuzopfer (Ratis-
bon, 1883); THABERGER, Das Opfer des A. u. N. Bades (Rat-
sbon, 1870); EISENHOLD, Das Wesen des Heiligen Opfers u. der wortlichen heil. Theologen der drei letzten Jahrh. (Ratis-
bon, 1890); DE WEVER, Die Massen (Köln, 1888); HUMPHREY, The One Mediator or Sacrifice and Sacri-
fice (London, 1900); VACANT, Histoire de la Conception du Sacri-
cement (2 vols., Paris, 1885); SCHWEIZ, Die Massen, erstes T. (Freiburg, 1888); HÖTTREMANN, Das eucharist. Opfer nach der Lehre der älteren Scholastik (Freiburg, 1901); HENRICH-OTTO,
BERLET, Dogmat. Theol. IX (Mainz, 1901); HESS, Die Grasch, des Massopferbegriffs oder der alte Glaube u. die neuen Theorien über die Massen des unendlichen Opfers (3 vols., Freiburg, 1901–3); ROBERT, The Eucharistic Sacrifice, a Historical and Logical Investigation of the Sacri

(3) The Causality of the Mass.—In this section we shall treat: (a) the effects (effectus) of the Sacrifice of the Mass, which practically coincide with the various ends for which the Sacrifice is offered, namely ador-
tion, thanksgiving, impetration, and expiation; (b) the manner of its efficacy (modus efficacitatis), whether in part objectively in the Sacrifice of the Mass itself (ex opere operato), and partly dependently on the personal devotion and piety of man (ex opere operantis).

(a) The Effects of the Sacrifice of the Mass. The Reformers found themselves compelled to reject en-
tirely the Sacrament of the Mass since they regarded the Eucharist merely as a sacrament. Both their views were founded on the reflection, properly appraised above, that the Bloody Sacrifice of the Cross was the sole Sacrifice of Christ and of Chri									tendom, and thus does not admit of the Sacrifice of the Mass. As a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving in the sym-
pathy of the Church for its forefathers, and of the Mystical Body of the Mass, and Melanchthon resented the charge that Protestants had entirely abolished it. What they most bitterly opposed was the Catholic doctrine that the Mass is a sacrifice not only of praise and thank-
giving, but also of impetration and atonement, whose fruits may benefit others, while it is evident that a sacramentist's st\n\nHere the Council of Trent interposed with a definition of faith (Sess. XXII, can. iii): "If any one say, that
the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving... but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or, that it profits only the recipient, and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be anathema!” (De senect., ix, 90). In this, Tertullian gives a summary of all the sacrificial effects in order, the synod emphasizes the propitiatory and imperative nature of the sacrifice. Propitiatio (propitiation) and petition (impetatio) are distinguishable from each other, inasmuch as the latter appeals to the goodness and the former to the mercy of God. Naturally, therefore, they differ also as regards their objects, since, while petition is directed towards our spiritual and temporal concerns and needs of every kind, propitiation refers to our sins (peccata) and to the temporal punishments (poenas), which must be expiated by works of penance or satisfaction (satisfactiones) in this life, or otherwise by a corresponding suffering in purgatory. In all these respects the imperative and expiatory Sacrifice of the Mass is of the greatest utility, both for the living and the dead.

Should a Biblical foundation for the Tridentine doctrine be asked for, we might first of all argue in general as follows: Just as there were in the Old Testament, in addition to sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, propitiatory sacrifices, the pagans (Ego: 23, sqq.; II Kings, xxiv, 21 sqq., etc.), the New Testament, as its antitype, must also have a sacrifice which serves and suffices for all these objects. But, according to the prophecy of Malachias, this is the Mass, which is to be celebrated by the Church in all places and at all times. Consequently, the Mass is the imperative and expiatory sacrifice. As such, it is also a sacrifice to Tertullian (Ad scapul, ii), the Christians sacrificed “for the welfare of the emperor” (pro salute imperatoris); according to Chrysostom (Hom. xxi in Act. Apost. n. 4), “for the fruits of the earth and other needs”. St. Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 389) describes the liturgy of the Mass of his day as follows: “(Catech. nuncius, p. C. X. XXXIII, 1115): “As for the spiritual sacrifice [σωματική θυσία], the unbloody service [διανύστος λατρεία], we pray to God over this sacrifice of propitiation [αὐτή του θυσίας εικόνα του Νασαυα] for the universal peace of the churches, for the proper guidance of the world, for the emperor, soldiers and companions, for the infirm and the sick, for those stricken with trouble, and in general for all in need of help we pray and offer up this sacrifice [τοῦ ἀπολύτου τής θυσίας]. We then commemorate the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God may, at their prayers and intercession, graciously accept our supplication. We afterwards pray for the dead... since we believe that it will be of the greatest advantage to the outside world of the faithful and most awesome Victim [τῆς θυσίας καὶ φιλικοσυναρτησίας τῆς θυσίας].”

The chief source of our doctrine, however, is tradition, which from the earliest times declares the imperative and expiatory nature of the Mass. According to Tertullian (Ad scapul, ii), the Christians sacrificed “for the welfare of the emperor” (pro salute imperatoris); according to Chrysostom (Hom. xxi in Act. Apost. n. 4), “for the fruits of the earth and other needs”. St. Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 389) describes the liturgy of the Mass of his day as follows: “(Catech. nuncius, p. C. X. XXXIII, 1115): “As for the spiritual sacrifice [σωματική θυσία], the unbloody service [διανύστος λατρεία], we pray to God over this sacrifice of propitiation [αὐτή του θυσίας εικόνα του Νασαυα] for the universal peace of the churches, for the proper guidance of the world, for the emperor, soldiers and companions, for the infirm and the sick, for those stricken with trouble, and in general for all in need of help we pray and offer up this sacrifice [τοῦ ἀπολύτου τής θυσίας].”

We then commemorate the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God may, at their prayers and intercession, graciously accept our supplication. We afterwards pray for the dead... since we believe that it will be of the greatest advantage to the outside world of the faithful and most awesome Victim [τῆς θυσίας καὶ φιλικοσυναρτησίας τῆς θυσίας].”

Discharge our prayers for them. The Christ, who was slain for our sins, we sacrifice [Χριστὸς λειψαμένος ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ διανύστηκε τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν] to propitiate the merciful God for those who are gone before and for ourselves. This beautiful passage, which leads the minds of the faithful into the most holy and most awesome Victim [τῆς θυσίας καὶ φιλικοσυναρτησίας τῆς θυσίας]... it seems inconceivable that the Heavenly Father could accept with other than infinite satisfaction the sacrifice of His only begotten Son. Consequently God, as Malachias had already prophesied, is in a truly infinite degree honoured, glorified, and praised in the Mass; through Our Lord Jesus Christ he is thanked by men in an infinite manner, in a manner worthy of God.

But when we turn to the Mass as a sacrifice of impetration and expiation, the case is different. We must always regard its intrinsic value as infinite, since it is the sacrifice of the God-Man Himself, its extrinsic value must necessarily be finite in consequence of the limitations of man. The scope of the so-called “fruits of the Mass” is limited. Just as a tiny chip of...
wood cannot collect within it the whole energy of the sun, so also, and in a still greater degree, is man incapable of converting the boundless value of the imputatory and expiatory sacrifice into an infinite effect for his soul. Wherefore, in practice, the imputatory value of the sacrifice is always as limited as is its propitiatory and satisfactory value. The greater or less measure of the fruits derived will naturally depend very much on the personal efforts and worthiness, the devotion and fervour of those who celebrate or are present at Mass. This limitation of the fruits of the Mass must, however, not be construed to mean that the presence of a large congregation causes a diminution of the benefits derived from the Sacrifice by the individual, as if such benefits were after some fashion divided into so many aliquot parts. Neither the Church nor the Christian people has any tolerance for the false principle: 'The less the number of the faithful in the church, the richer the fruits'. On the contrary, the Bride of Christ desires for every Mass a crowded church, being rightly convinced that from the unlimited treasures of the Mass much more grace will result to the individual from a service participated in by a full congregation, than from one attended merely by a few of the faithful. This relative infinite value refers in a general (fructus generalis), and not to the special (fructus specialis)—two terms whose distinction will be more clearly characterized below. Here, however, we may remark that by the special fruit of the Mass is meant that for the application of which according to a special intention a priest may accept a stipend.

Masae, whether in this connexion the applicable value of the Mass is to be regarded as finite or infinite (or, more accurately, unlimited). This question is of importance in view of the practical consequences it involves. For, if we decide in favour of the unlimited value, a single Mass celebrated for a hundred persons or intentions is as efficacious as a hundred individual Masses is first of all a stipend.

On the other hand, it is clear that, if we incline towards a finite value, the special fruit is divided pro rata among the hundred persons. In their quest for a solution of this question, two classes of theologians are distinguished according to their tendencies: the minority (Gotth, Billuart, Antonio Bellarini, etc.) are inclined to the special fruit, the majority to the infinite. The majority, arguing that the infinite dignity of the High Priest Christ cannot be limited by the finite sacrificial activity of his human representative. But, since the Church has entirely forbidden as a breach of strict justice that a priest should seek to fulfil, by reading a single Mass, the obligations imposed by several stipends (see Denzinger, p. 1110), these theologians hasten to admit that their theory is not to be translated into practice, unless the priest applies as many individual Masses for all the intentions of the stipend-givers as he has received stipends. But inasmuch as the Church has spoken of strict justice (justitia commutativa), the overwhelming majority of theologians, in theory, admit the satisfactory—and, according to many, also the propitiatory and impetulatory—value of a Mass for which a stipend has been taken, is so strictly circumscribed and limited from the outset, that it accurses pro rata (according to the greater or lesser number of the living or the dead for whom the Mass is offered) to each of the individuals. Only on such a hypothesis is the custom prevailing among the faithful of having several Masses celebrated for the deceased or for their intentions intelligible. Only on such a hypothesis can one explain the widely established 'Mass Association', a pious union whose members voluntarily bind themselves to read or get read at least one Mass annually for the souls of the deceased. In the eighth century we find in Germany a so-called 'Totenbund' (see Pertz, 'Monum. Germaniae hist. Leg.', II, i, 221). But probably the greatest of such societies is the Massbund of Ingolstadt, founded in 1724; it was raised to a confraternity (Confraternitity of the Immaculate Conception) on 3 Feb., 1874, and at present contains 80,000 members (Abklasse, ihr Wesen u. ihr Gebrauch', 13th ed., Paderborn, 1906, pp. 610 sqq.). Tourneul (De Euch. q. viii, a. 6) has also sought in favour of this view important internal grounds of probability, for example by advertizing to the visible course of Divine Providence: all natural and supernatural effects in general are seen to be slow and gradual, not sudden or decisive, wherefore it is also the most holy intention of God that man should, by his personal exertions, strive through the medium of the greatest possible number of Masses to participate in the fruits of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

(b) The Manner of Efficacy of the Mass.—In theological phrase an effect 'from the work of the action' (ex opere operato) signifies a grace conditioned exclusively by the objective bringing into activity of a cause of the supernatural order, in connexion with which the proper disposition of the subject comes subsequently into account only as an indispensable antecedent condition (conditio sine qua non), but not as a real joint cause (concursus). Thus, for example, baptism is effectually obtained only by the suit of the interior grace in each recipient of the sacrament who in his heart opposes no obstacle (obex) to the reception of the graces of baptism. On the other hand, all supernatural effects, which, presupposing the state of grace, are accomplished by the personal actions and exertions of the subject (e. g., everything obtained by prayer), are called effects 'from the work of the agent' (ex opere operantis). We are now confronted with the difficult question: In what manner does the Eucharistic Sacrifice accomplish its effects and fruits? As the early scholastics gave scarcely any attention to this problem, we are indebted for almost all the light thrown upon it to the later scholastics.

Masae, whether in every sacrifice of the Mass four distinct categories of persons really participate. At the head of all stands of course the High Priest, Christ Himself; to make the Sacrifice of the Cross fruitful for us and to secure its application, He offers Himself as a sacrifice, which is quite independent of the merits or demerits of the celebrant. The Church, whilst she contains the sacrifice, and is for these an opus operatum. Next after Christ and in the second place comes the Church as a juridical person, who, according to the express teaching of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, cap. i), has received from the hands of her Divine Founder the institution of the Mass and also the commission to ordain constantly priests and to have celebrated for these the most vulnerable Sacrifice. This intermediate stage between Christ and the celebrant may be neither passed over nor eliminated, since a bad and immoral priest, as an ecclesiastical official, does not offer up his own sacrifice—which indeed could only be impure—but the immaculate Sacrifice of Christ and his spotless merits, which can be consecrated by the celebrant. But to this special sacrificial activity of the Church, offering up the sacrifice together with Christ, must also correspond a special ecclesiastical-human merit as a fruit, which, although in itself an opus operantis of the Church, is yet entirely independent of the worthiness of the celebrant and the faithful, and therefore constitutes for these an opus operatum. When, however, as De Lugo rightly points out, an excommunicated or suspended priest celebrates in defiance of the prohibition of the Church, this ecclesiastical merit is always lost, since such a priest no longer acts in the name and with the commission of the Church. His sacrifice is nevertheless valid, since, by the very nature of the Church, it is always a sacrifice in the name of Christ, even though in opposition to His wishes, and, as the self-sacrifice of Christ, even such a
Mass remains essentially a spotless and untarnished sacrifice before God.

We are thus compelled to concur in another view of De Lugo, namely that the greatness and extent of this ecclesiastical service is dependent on the greater or less holiness of the body-church, the clergy throughout the world, and that for this reason in times of ecclesiastical decay and laxity of morals (especially at the papal court and among the episcopate) the fruits of the Mass, resulting from the sacrificial activity of the Church, might under certain circumstances easily be very small. With Christ and His Church is associated in the third place the celebrating priest, since he is the representative through whom the real and the mystical Christ offer up the sacrifice. If, therefore, the celebrant be a man of great personal devotion, holiness, and purity, there will accrue an additional fruit which will benefit not himself alone, but also those in whose favour he applies the Mass. The faithful are thus guided by sound instinct when they prefer to have Mass celebrated for their intentions by an upright and holy priest rather than by an unworthy one, since, in addition to the chief fruit of the Mass, they secures this special fruit which springs ex opere operantis, from the piety of the celebrant.

And in the fourth place, must be mentioned those who participate actively in the Sacrifice of the Mass, e.g. the servers, sacristan, organist, singers, and the whole congregation joining in the sacrifice. The priest, therefore, prays also in their name: Offerimus (i.e. We offer). That the effect resulting from this (metaphorical) sacrificial activity is entirely dependent on the worthiness of the person mediating therein and results exclusively ex opere operantis, is evident without further demonstration. The more fervent the prayer, the richer the fruit. Most intimate is the active participation in the Sacrifice of those who receive Holy Communion during the Mass, since in their case the special fruits of the Communion are added to those of the Mass. Should sacramental Communion be impossible, the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, cap. vi) advises the faithful to make at least a "spiritual communion" (spirituales effectus communi- care), which consists in the ardent desire to receive the Eucharist. However, as we have already emphasized, the omission of real or spiritual Communion on the part of the faithful who receive Holy Communion at the Sacrifice of the Mass either invalid or unlawful, wherefore the Church even permits "private Masses", which may on reasonable grounds be celebrated in a chapel with closed doors.

(ii) In addition to the active, there are also passive participators in the Sacrifice of the Mass. These are the persons in whose favour it may be even without their knowledge and in opposition to their wishes—the Holy Sacrifice is offered. They fall into three categories: the community, the celebrant, and the person (or persons) for whom the Mass is specially applied. To each of these three classes corresponds ex opere operato a separate and distinct fruit of the Mass, whether the same be an imper- titory effect of the Sacrifice of Petition or a propitiatory and satisfactory effect of the Sacrifice of Expiation. Although the development of the teaching concerning the threefold fruit of the Mass begins only with Scotus (Quest. quodlibet, xx), it is nevertheless based on the very essence of the Sacrifice itself. Since, according to the wording of the Canon of the Mass (q.v.), prayer and sacrifice is offered for all those present, the whole Church, the pope, the diocesan bishop, the faithful living and dead, and even "for the salvation of the whole world", there must first of all result a "general fruit" (fructus generalis) for all mankind, the bestowal of which lies immediately in the will of Christ and His Church, and secondly is frustrated by no contrary intention of the celebrant. In this fruit of the excommunicated, heretics, and infidels partici- pate, mainly that their conversion may thus be ef- fected. The second kind of fruit (fructus personalis, specialis, or ministerialis) falls to the personal share of the cele- brant, since it was unjust that he—apart from his worthiness and piety (opus operantis)—should come away empty-handed from the altar. Between these two fruits lies the third, the so-called "special fruit of the Mass" (fructus specialis, medius, or ministerialis), which is usually applied to particular living or de- ceased persons according to the intention of the cele- brant or the donor of a stipend. This "application" rests so exclusively in the hands of the priest that even the prohibition of the Church cannot render it inefficacious, although the celebrant would in such a case sin through disobedience. For the existence of the special fruit of the Mass, rightly defended by Pius VI against the Jansenistic Synod of Pistoia (1786), we have the testimony also of Christian antiquity, which offered the Sacrifice for special persons and intentions. To secure in all cases the certain effect of this fructus specialis, Suarez (De Euch., disp. lxxix, sect. 10) gives priests the wise advice that they should always add to the first a "second intention" (intention secunda), which, should the first be inefficacious, will take its place.

(iii) A last and an entirely separate problem is afforded by the special mode of efficacy of the Sacrifice of Reconciliation. As an effect of the sacrifice, the double function of obliterating actual sins, especially mortal sins (effectus stricte propitiatorius), and also of taking away, in the case of those already in the state of grace, such temporal punishments as may still remain to be endured (effectus satisfactorius). The main question is: Is this double effect ex opere operato or ex opere operantis? Since the actual forgiveness of sin, it must, in opposition to earlier theologians (Aragon, Casalis, Gregory of Valencia), be maintained as undoubtedly a certain principle, that the expiatory sacrifice of the Mass can never accomplish the forgiveness of mortal sins otherwise than by way of contrition and penance, and therefore only mediately through procuring the grace of conversion (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, cap. ii: "donum penitentiae concedens"). With this limitation, how- ever, the Mass is able to remit even the most grievous sins (Council of Trent, l. c., "Crimina et peccata etiam ingentia dimitit"). Since, according to the present economy of salvation, no sin whatsoever, grievous or trifling, can be forgiven without contrition and an act of faith, we must confine the efficacy of the Mass, even in the case of venial sins, to obtaining for Christians the grace of contrition for less serious sins (Sess. XXIII, cap. i). It is indeed this purely mediate activity which constitutes the essential distinction between the sacrifice and the sacrament. Could the Mass remit sins immedi- ately ex opere operato, like Baptism or Penance, it would be a sacrament of the dead and cease to be a sacrifice (see SACRAMENT). Concerning the remission of the temporal punishment due to sin, however, which appears to be effected in an immediate manner, our judgment must be different. The reason lies in the intrinsic distinction between sin and temporal punishment. Without the personal co-operation and sorrow of the sinner, all forgiveness of sin by God is impossible; this cannot however be said of a mere remission of punish- ment. One person may validly discharge the debts or fines of another, even without apprising the debtor of his intention. The same rule may be applied to a just person, who, after his justification, is still burdened with temporal punishment consequent on his sins. It is certain that, only in this immediate way, can assistance be given to the poor souls in purgatory through the Sacrifice of the Mass, since they are henceforth powerless to perform personal works of satisfaction (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXV, de purgat.). From this consideration we derive by analogy our legitimate conclusion that the case is exactly the same as regards the living.
See Bellarmin, De Euchar., vi, 2 sqq.; Suarez, De Euchar.,
disc. xii., c. v.; W. de Sacy, De Euchar., dissert. viii.; especially Sanchez, Spiritualis Theaurus Massae (Ingolstadt, 1620); Gottesmann, Das euchar. Opfer nach der Lehre der älteren Scholastik (Freiburg, 1801); Koepe, Liturgische Erklärung der hl. Messe (3rd ed., Ratibon, 1860); Olivier, Solutions théol. et liturg. touchant le sacre de la Messe, etc. (Paris, 1873); Schmidt, Die Wurzeln des euchar. Opfers (Augsburg, 1878); Müller, Die Heilige Messe, die Sacramenten, die Liturgie (3rd ed., Bâves, 1900); Baerkoven, Der divine Sacrifice et le prêtre qui le célèbre (Paris, 1888); Liturgische Erklärung des hl. Messopfer (Danzig, 1892); Rostaing de Flers, De Masse sacreuse (Paris, 1895-99); Zahn, Die hl. Messe, der grösste Schatz der Welt (6th ed., Brixen, 1901); Gihr, Das hl. Messopfer dogmatisch, liturgisch u. aesthetisch erklärt (10th ed., Freiburg, 1907); 6th ed. tr. (St. Louis, 1908).

B. Practical Questions Concerning the Mass.—From the exceedingly high valuation, which the Church places on the Mass as the unbloody Sacrifice of the God-Man, issues, and with it were spontaneously, all those practical precepts of a positive or a negative nature, which are given in the Rubrics of the Mass, in Canon Law, and in Moral Theology. They may be conveniently divided into two categories, according as they are intended to secure in the highest degree possible the objective dignity of the Sacrifice or the subjective worth of the celebrant. 

(1) Precepts for the Promotion of the Dignity of the Sacrifice.—(a) One of the most important requisites for the worthy celebration of the Mass is that the place in which the all-holy Mystery is to be celebrated, should be a suitable one. Since, in the days of the Apostolic Church, there were no churches or chapels, priests celebrated Mass, when suitably appointed, for the solemnization of “the breaking of bread” (cf. Acts, ii, 46; xx, 7 sqq.; Col., iv, 15; Philem., 2). During the era of the persecutions the Eucharistic services in Rome were transferred to the catacombs, where the Christians believed themselves secure from government agents. The first “houses of God” (in Greek, hagia) in general did not exceed the first century, as we learn from Tertullian (Ad Valent., iii) and Clement of Alexandria (Strom., i, 1). In the second half of the fourth century (a. d. 370), Optatus of Mileve (De Schism. Donat., ii, iv) could already reckon more than forty basilicas which adorned the city of Rome. From this period dates the prohibition of the celebration of Mass in private houses. Thenceforward the public churches were to be the sole places of worship. In the Middle Ages the synods granted to bishops the right of allowing house-chapels within their dioceses. According to the law of to-day (Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, de reform.), the Mass may be celebrated only in chapels and churches (semi-public). The consecrated or at least blessed. At present, private chapels may be erected only in virtue of a special papal indulg. (S. C. C, 23 Jan., 1847; 6 Sept., 1870). In the latter case, the real place of sacrifice is the consecrated altar (or altar-stone), which must be placed in a suitable room (cf. Missale Romanum, Rubr. gen., lit. xx). In such a room it is usually stipulated that the sea be calm during the celebration, and that a second priest (or deacon) be at hand to prevent the spilling of the chalice in case of the rocking of the ship.

(b) For the worthy celebration of Mass the circumstance of time is of great importance. In the Apostolic age the first Christians assembled regularly on Sundays for “the breaking of bread” (Acts, xx, 7: “the first day of the week”), which day the “Didache” (c. xiv), and later Justin Martyr (i Apol., lxvi), already name “the Lord’s day.” Justin himself seems to be aware only of the Sunday celebration, but Tertullian adds the fast-days on Wednesday and Friday and the anniversary of the apparition of the Lord (c. xxxi; “De orat.,” xix). As Tertullian calls the whole paschal season (until Pentecost) “one long feast,” we may conclude with some justice that during this period the faithful not only communicated daily, but were also present at the Eucharistic Liturgy. As regards the time of the day, there existed in the Apostolic age fixed and specified precepts regarding the order in which the Eucharistic celebration should take place. The Apostle Paul appears to have on occasion “broken bread” about midnight (Acts, xx, 7). But Pliny the Younger, Governor of Bithynia (died a. d. 114), already states in his official report to Emperor Trajan that the Christians assembled in the early hours of the morning and stood themselves up in a Thurible (c. xxxi), by which we can understand to-day only the celebration of the mysteries. Tertullian gives as the hour of the assembly the time before dawn (De cor. mil., iii: antelucanis cælis). When the fact was adverted to that the Saviour’s Resurrection occurred in the morning before sunrise, a change of the hour set in, the celebration of the Mass being postponed until the second hour (Acts, xiii, 2). The writings of the Sunday celebration (Ep., ixii): “We celebrate the Resurrection of the Lord in the morning.” Since the fifth century the “third hour” (i. e. 9 a. m.) was regarded as “canonical” for the Solemn Mass on Sundays and festivals. When the Little Hours (Prime, Terce, Sext, None) began in the Middle Ages, the Mass was fixed for the third hour of the day, which was ante meridiem, and hence the precepts governing the hour for the conventional Mass received a new meaning. Thus, for example, the precept that the conventual Mass should be held after None on fast days does not signify that it be held between midday and evening, but only that “the reception of None in choir is followed by the Mass” (Council of Sardica). It is evident that the priest could celebrate at any hour between dawn and midday (ab aurora usque ad meridiem). It is proper that he should read beforehand Matins and Lauds from his breviary.

The sublimity of the Sacrifice of the Mass demands that the priest should approach the altar wearing the sacred vestments (amice, stola, cincture, maniple, etc.). Whether the priest is vested in the vestments, the historical developments from Judaism or paganism, is a question still discussed by archaeologists. In any case the “Canones Hippolyti” require that at Pontifical Mass the deacons and priests appear in “white vestments”, and that the lectors also wear festive garments. No priest may celebrate the Mass without the necessary vestments, except in case of urgent necessity (e. g. to consecrate a Host as the Viaticum for a person seriously ill). The altar-cross is also necessary as an indication that the Sacrifice of the Mass is nothing else than the unbloody reproduction of the Sacrifice of the Cross. Usually, also, the priest must be at the altar by a server of the male sex. The celebration of Mass without a server is allowed only in case of need (e. g. to procure the Viaticum for a sick person, or to enable the faithful to satisfy their obligation of hearing Mass). A person of the female sex may not serve at the altar itself, e. g. transfer the missal, present the cruets, etc. (S. R. C., 27 August, 1836). Women (especially nuns) may, however, answer the celebration from their places, if no male server be at hand. During the celebration of Mass a simple priest may not wear any head-covering—whether biretta, pileolus, or full wig (comas Jactitas)—but the bishop may allow him to wear a plain perruque as protection for his hairless scalp.

To preserve unimpaired the honour of the most venerable sacrifice, the Church has surrounded with a strong rampart of special defensive regulations the institution of “mass-stipends”; her intention is on the one hand to keep remote from the altar all base ava-
rice, and on the other to ensure and safeguard the right of the faithful to the conscientious celebration of the Masses bespoken. By a mass-stipend is meant a certain monetary offering which anyone makes to the priest for the Masses to be said for him. There must be given to the Mass in accordance with the intentions of the donor (ad intentionem dantis). The obligation incurred consists, concretely speaking, in the application of the "special fruit of the Mass" (fructus specialis), the nature of which we have already described in detail (A, 3). The idea of the stipend emanates from the earliest ages, and its justification lies incontestably in the axiom of St. Paul (1 Cor., ix, 13): "They that serve the altar, partake with the altar." Originally consisting of the necessaries of life, the stipend was at first considered as "alms for a Mass" (elemosyna missarum), the object being to contribute to the proper support of the clergy. The character of a pure alms has been since lost by the stipend, since such may be accepted by even a wealthy priest. But the Pauline principle applies to the wealthy priest just as it does to the poor. The now customary money-offering, which was introduced about the eighth century and was tacitly approved by the Church, is to be regarded merely as the substitute or commutation of the earlier presentation of necessaries. In one institution (fundacja) the change from the ancient practice has been introduced, since at present the individual priest receives the stipend personally, whereas formerly all the clergy of the particular church shared among them the total obligations and gifts. In their present form, the whole matter of stipends has been officially taken by the Church end in the ecclesiastical Constitution of Trent (Sess. XXII, de ref.) and by the dogmatic Bull "Auctorem fidei" (1796) of Pius VI (Denzinger, n. 1554). Since the stipend, in its origin and nature, claims to be and can be nothing else than a lawful contribution towards the proper support of the clergy, the false and foolish views of the ignorant are shown to be without foundation. In this respect the stipend may be simoniacally purchased with money? (cf. St. Thomas, II-II, Q. c, art. 2). To obviate all abuses concerning the amount of the stipend, there exists in each diocese a fixed "mass-tax" (settled either by ancient custom or by an episcopal regulation), which no priest may exceed, unless extraordinary inconvenience is shown. In addition, the Money Act of 1521 forbids the collection of funds or real property, the interest or income from which is to procure for ever the celebration of Mass for the founder or according to his intentions. Apart from anniversaries, foundations of Masses are divided, according to the testamentary arrangement of the testator, into monthly, weekly, and daily foundations. Annual annuities and other sums are subject to the administration of the ecclesiastical authorities, especially of the diocesan bishop, who must grant his permission for the acceptance of such and must appoint for them the lowest rate. Only when episcopal approval has been secured can the foundation be regarded as completed; thenceforth it is unlawful for anyone to assume the ecclesiastical property is subject to the approval of the State (e.g. in Austria). The establishment of a foundation must also be submitted to the secular authorities. The declared wishes of the founder are sacred and decisive as to the manner of fulfillment. Should no special intention be mentioned in the deed of foundation, the Masses may be said according to the will of the founder himself (S.C.C., 18 March, 1668). To secure punctuality in the execution of the foundation, Innocent XII ordered in 1697 that a list of the mass-foundations, arranged according to the months, be kept in each church possessing such endowments. The administrators of pious foundations are bound under pain of mortal sin to forward to the bishop at the end of each year a list of all founded Masses left uncélébrated together with the money therefor (S. C. C., 25 May, 1893).

The celebrant of a founded Mass is entitled to the full amount of the foundation, unless it is evident from the circumstances of the foundation or from the wording of the deed of foundation that this is not the case when the foundation serves also as the endowment of a benefice, and consequently in such a case the beneficiary is bound to pay his substitute only the regular tax (S. C. C., 25 July, 1874). Without urgent reason, founded Masses may not be celebrated in churches (or on altars) other than those stipulated by the foundation. Permanent transference of such founded Masses is reserved to the pope, but in isolated instances the dispensation of the bishop suffices (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXI de ref.; Sess. XXV de ref.). The unavoidable loss of the income of a foundation puts an end to all obligations connected with it. A serious diminution of the foundation capital, owing to the depreciation of property, is made provisionally for by the necessary increase of the mass-tax, scarcity of priests, poverty of a church or of the clergy may con-
This connotates not alone freedom from all ecclesiastical censures (excommunication, suspension, interdict), but also a becoming preparation of the soul and body of the priest before he approaches the altar. To celebrate in the state of mortal sin has always been regarded by the Church as an infamous sacrilege (cf. 1 Cor. xi, 27 sqq.). For the worthy (not for the valid) celebration of the Mass it is, therefore, especially required that the celebrant be in the state of grace. To place him in this condition, the awakening of perfect sorrow is no longer sufficient since the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, cap. vii in Denzinger, n. 880), for there is a still ecclesiastical precept that the reception of the Sacrament of Penance must precede the celebration of Mass. This rule applies to all priests, even when they are bound by their office (ex officio) to read Mass, e.g. on Sundays for their parishioners. Only in instances, when no confessor can be procured, may they content themselves with reciting an act of perfect sorrow (contrito), and they then incur the obligation of going to confession "as early as possible" (quem primum), which, in canon law, signifies within three days at furthest. In addition to the pious preparation for Mass (accessus), there is prescribed a correspondingly long thanksgiving after Mass (recessus), whose length is fixed by moral theologians between fifteen minutes and half an hour, although in particular official engagements of the priest must be considered. As regards the length of the Mass itself, the duration is naturally variable, according as a Solemn High Mass is sung or a Low Mass celebrated. To perform worthily all the ceremonies and pronounce clearly all the prayers in Low Mass requires an average of about half an hour. Moreover, Canonists justly declare that the scandalous haste necessary to finish Mass in less than a quarter of an hour is impossible without grievous sin.

With regard to the more immediate preparation of the body, custom has declared from time immemorial, and positive canon law since the Council of Constance (1414), that the priest, as a sign of the sacrament of the altar, and priests, when celebrating the Holy Sacrifice, must be fasting (jejumina naturale), which means that they must have partaken of no food or drink whatsoever from midnight. Midnight begins with the first stroke of the hour. In calculating the hour, the so-called "mean time" (or local time) must be used. The day begins with midnight (12 July, 1893), Central-European time may be also employed, and, in North America, "one time". The movement recently begun among the German clergy, favouring a mitigation of the strict regulation for weak or overworked priests with the obligation of duplicating, has serious objections, since a general relaxation of the ancient strictness might easily result in lesser respect for the Blessed Sacrament and in a harmful reaction among thoughtless members of the laity. The granting of mitigations in general or in exceptional cases belongs to the Holy See alone. To keep away from the altar irreverent adventurers and unworthy priests, the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, de ref.) declares that, in the absence of the priests, the sacred vessels and the vestments of the Church, in places in which, that an unknown priest without the Celebrant (q. v.) may not be allowed to say Mass in any church.

(b) A second question may be asked: "Who must say Mass?" In the first place, if this question be considered identical with the enquiry as to whether a general obligation of Divine Law binds every priest by the very name of his priestly dignity, the answer must be in the negative. St. Thomas, Durandus, Paludanus, and Anthony of Bologna certainly maintained the existence of such an obligation; on the other hand, Richard of St. Victor, Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure, Gabriel Biel, and Cardinal Cajetan declared for the opposite view. Canon law teaches nothing on the subject. In the absence of a decision, Suarez (De Eucharist., clasp. ixxx, sect. 1, n. 4) believes that one who conforms to
the negative view, may be declared free from grievous sin. Of the ancient hermits we know that they did not celebrate the Holy Sacrifice in the desert, and St. Ignatius Loyola, guided by high motives, abstained for a whole year from celebrating. Cardinal De Lugo (De Euchar., disp. xx, sect. 1, n. 13) takes a middle course, by interpet; Christmas the bishops should while declaring that, in practice, omission through lukewarmness and neglect may, on account of the scandal caused, easily amount to mortal sin. This consideration explains the teaching of the moral theologians that every priest is bound under pain of mortal sin to celebrate at least a few times each year (e.g. at Easter, Christmas, the Epiphany). The obligation of hearing Mass on all Sundays and holy days of obligation is of course not abrogated for such priests. The spirit of the Church demands—and it is to-day the practically universal custom—that a priest should celebrate daily, unless he prefers to omit his Mass occasionally through motives of reverence.

Until far into the Middle Ages it was left to the discretion of the priest, to his personal devotion and his zeal for souls, whether he should read more than one Mass on the same day. But since the twelfth century canon law declares that he must in general content himself with one daily Mass, and the synods of the thirteenth century allow, even in case of necessity, at most three Masses on one day. The feast of the Holy Sacrifice twice on the same day was more and more curtailed. According to the existing law, duplication is allowed, under special conditions, only on Sundays and holy days, and then only in the interests of the faithful, that they may be enabled to fulfill their obligation of hearing Mass. But in the case of the state of the Mass, the priests have a privilege universally allowed to retain the privilege of three Masses; in Spain and Portugal this privilege was extended to All Souls’ Day (2 Nov.) by special Indult of Benedict XIV (1746). Such customs are unknown in the East.

This general obligation of a priest to celebrate Mass must not be confused with the special obligation which results from the acceptance of a Mass stipend (obligatio ex stipendio) or from the cure of souls (obligatio ex cura animarum). Concerning the former sufficient has been already said. As regards the cure of souls, the obligation of Divine Law that parish priests and administrators of a parish should frequently celebrate Mass, and the obligation of the benefactors, arises from the relations of pastor and flock. The Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, de ref.) has specified this duty of application more closely, by directing that the parish priest should especially apply the Mass, for which no stipend may be taken, for his flock on all Sundays and holy days (cf. Benedict XIV, "Cum semper oblatas", 19 Aug. 1744). The obligation to apply the Mass pro populo extends also to the holy days abrogated by the Bull of Urban VIII, "Universa per orbem", of 13 Sept., 1642; for even to-day these remain "canonically fixed feast days", although the faithful are dispensed from the obligation of hearing Mass and may engage in servile works. The same obligation of the Mass also likewise holds on bishops, as pastors of their dioceses, and on those abbots who exercise over clergy and people a quasi-episcopal jurisdiction. Titular bishops alone are excepted, although even in their case the application is to be desired (cf. Leo XIII, "In suprema", 10 June, 1882). As the obligation of Mass is not only personal, but also real, the application must be made in union of one Mass, either be made soon afterwards, or be effected through a substitute, who has a right to a mass stipend as regulated by the law. Concerning this whole question, see Heuser, "Die Verpflichtung der Pfarrer, die hl. Messe für die Gemeinde zu applizieren" (Düsseldorf, 1850).

(c) For the sake of completeness a third and last question must be touched on in this section: For whom may Mass be celebrated? In general the answer may be given: For all those and for those only, who are fitted to participate in the fruits of the Mass as an impecunious, propitiatory, and satisfactory sacrifice. From this is immediately derived the rule that Mass may not be celebrated for the blessed in Heaven, since they are incapable of receiving the fruits of the Mass; for the same reason children who die unbaptized are excluded from the benefits of the Mass. Thus, there remain as the possible participants only the living on earth and the poor souls in purgatory (cf. Trent, Sess. XXII, can. iii; Sess. XXV, de purg.). The offering of the Mass is a participation in the Sacrifice, however, and partly to avoid scandal, the Church has surrounded with certain conditions, which priests are bound in obedience to observe, the application of Mass for certain classes of the living and dead. The first class are non-tolerated excommunicated persons, who are to be avoided by the faithful (excommunication stans). Although, according to various authors, the priest is not forbidden to offer up Mass for such unhappy persons in private and with a merely mental intention, still to announce publicly such a Mass or to insert the name of the excommunicated person in the prayers, even though he may be in the state of grace owing to perfect sorrow or may have been absolved from the sin of "excommunication divina", and is strictly forbidden under penalty of excommunication (cf. C. 28, de sent. excomm., V, t. 39). It is likewise forbidden to offer the Mass publicly and solemnly for deceased non-Catholics, even though they were princes (Innoc. III, C. 12, X, 1, 3, tit. 28). On the other hand it is allowed, in consideration of the Supreme Pontiff, to offer Mass for living rulers even a public Solemn Mass. For living heretics and schismatics, also for the Jews, Turks, and heathens, Mass may be privately applied (and even a stipend taken) with the object of procuring for them the grace of conversion to the true Faith. For a deceased heretic the private and hypothetical application of the Mass is allowed only when the priest has good grounds for believing that the deceased held his error in good faith (bona fide). Cf. S. C. Officii, 7 April, 1875. To celebrate Mass privately for deceased catechumens is permissible, since we may assume that they are already justified by their desire of Baptism and are in purgatory. In like manner Mass may be privately applied for living heathens, who have led an upright life, since the sacrifice is intended to benefit all who are in purgatory. For further details see Göpfert, "Moralthologiae", III (5th ed., Paderborn, 1906).

In addition to the special bibliography given under each section, see for the word Mass: HOLLER, Missae, Uepragung u. Bedeu- tung der Bemennung (Aschaffenburg, 1873); LOWET, Die mystischen Bezeichnungen Jesu als Siloe, Schloß u. Pecie (insbesondere die Bezeichnung der christl. Opferer als Missae (Paderborn, 1888); KLIESNER, Heterologie (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1874 pp. 88 sqq.; tr. (London, 1875, 1876 sqq.; von FURK, Abhandlungen u. Untersuchungen, III (Pader- born, 1907); RATHOLIK, II (1907), 259 sqq.; I (1906), 114 sqq. CONRAD, Die Agape (v. v.), von der Agape im Inneren des Agape und Eucharistie (Solothurn, 1909). On the whole sub- ject: Summa Thol., III, 1 sqq.; INFANT, III, DE sacra Liturgiae mysterio in Joh. iii. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 sqq.; BELLARMINE, De Eucharistica, VI, ed. LEQUITTE; BELLARMINE, De Eucharistica, VII, ed. FRYXEL; De Sacra Liturgiae sacrisficio, Inol- stria, 1580; JURF, De Sacra Liturgiae sacrisficio, (Paris, 1861); DE LUGO, De sa Eucharistie, IV, ed. FOURNIER; FRYXEL, De Sacra Liturgiae sacrisficio, inacto, sicut etiam (Rome, 1883); DE LUGO, De sacra Liturgiae sacrisficio, (Paris, 1903); GAVIN, The Sacrifice of the Mass (London, 1903); HEDLEY, The Holy Eucharist (London, 1907), pp. 147-252; HEDLEY, The Eucharistie (London, 1911); camping; KRAUT, Die hl. Messe (Mainz, 1744); CAPPALLASI, L’Eucharistie come sacrimento e come sacrificio (Turin, 1907); HEUVER, Die Eucharistie als Opfer (Ratisbon, 1866); HOLLE- WARTH, Briefe über das hl. Messeopfer (Mainz, 1873); MENE, Das hl. Sakrament des Alters als Opfer (Paderborn, 1878); EM-
**Massa Candida.**—Under the date 24 August, the "MartYROLOGIUM ROMANUM" records this commemoration: "At Carthage, of three hundred holy martyrs in the time of Valerian and Gallienus. Among other torments, the governor, ordering a limetkin to be lighted and live coals with incense to be set near by, said to these confessors of the Faith: 'Choose whether you will offer incense to Jupiter or be thrown down into the lime.' And they, armed with faith, confessing Christ, the Son of God, with one swift impulse hurled themselves into the fire, where, in the fumes of the burning lime, they were reduced to a powder. Hence this band of blessed ones in white raiment have been held worthy of the name, White Mass." The date of this event may be placed between A. D. 253, when Galienus was associated with his father in the imperial office, and A. D. 260, when Valerian was entrapped and made prisoner by Sapor, King of Persia. As to the exact place, St. Augustine [Ser. ccxi (al. cxii)] calls these martyrs the "White Mass of Utica," indicating that there they were specially commemorated. Utica was only 25 miles from the city of Carthage, which was the seat of the see in Africa; and it is likely the three hundred may have been brought from Utica to be judged by the procurator (Galerius Maximus). The fame of the Massa Candida has been perpetuated chiefly through two early references to them: that of St. Augustine, and that of the poet Frudentius (q. v.). The latter, in the thirteenth hymn of his episcopal collection, describes the deaths of the "pit dug in the midst of the plain, filled nearly to the lime that emitted chocking vapours," how the "stones vomit fire, and the snowy dust burns." After telling how this ordeal ceased, he concludes: "Whiteness (candor) possesses their bodies; purity (candor) bears their minds [or, souls] to heaven. Hence it [the "head-long swarm" to which the poet has referred in a preceding line] has merited to be forever called the Massa Candida." Both St. Augustine and Frudentius were at the height of their activity before the end of the fourth century. Moreover, St. Augustine was a native and a resident of this same Province of Africa, and Frudentius was a Spaniard. It is natural to suppose that the glorious tale of the three hundred of Carthage had become familiar to both writers through a fresh and vivid tradition—no older than the traditions of the Revolutionary War now are in, say, New England. It is not even probable that either of them originated the metaphor under which the martyrs of the limetkin have been known to later generations: the name Massa Candida had, most likely, been long in use among the faithful of Africa and Spain. As Christians, they would have been reminded of Apoc., vii, 13 and 14, by every commemoration of a martyrdom; as Romans—at least in language and habit of thought—they were aware that candidates (candidati) for office were said to have been so called in Republican Rome from the custom of whitening the toga with chalk or lime (calx) when canvassing for votes. Given the Apocalyptic image and the Latin etymology (candor—candidus—candidatus; cf. in the "Te Deum"); "Candidatus martyrum exercitus"); it was almost in-evitable that this united body of witnesses for Christ, together with their hearth of incandescent lime, which reduced their bodies to a homogenous mass, should, by the peculiar form of their agony, have suggested this name to the African and Spanish Christians.

(For the casuistry of the self-destruction of the Massa Candida, see Suicide.)

**Massachusetts.** one of the thirteen original United States of America. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts covers part of the territory originally granted to the Plymouth Company of England. It grew out of the consolidation (in 1692) of the two original colonies, Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay. The settlement at Plymouth began with the landing of the Pilgrims, 22 December, 1620; the Colony of Massachusetts Bay was established under John Endicott at Salem in 1628. The royal province created by this consolidation included also the District of Maine and so remained until the present State of Maine was set off from Massachusetts by Congress, 3 March, 1820. No authentic and complete survey of the State of Massachusetts exists, but it is generally believed to include an area of about 8040 square miles, with a population of rather more than three millions. Of this number 1,373,752 are Catholics, distributed among the three Dioceses of Boston (the Archdiocese), Fall River, and Springfield, which are the actual ecclesiastical divisions of the state. Classified by nationality, the Catholic population comprises more than 7000 Germans, 50,000 Portuguese, 100,000 Italians, 150,000 French Canadians, 10,000 Lithuanians, 3000 Syrians, 25,000 Poles, 1000 Negroes, 81 Chinese, 3000 Bravas, the remainder—more than 1,000,000—being principally Irish or of Irish parentage.
I. Colonial History.—A Settlement.—The explorations and settlements of the Northmen upon the shores of Massachusetts, the voyaging fur-traders, the temporary settlement (1602) of the Gosnold party on one of the Elizabeth Islands of Buzzard's Bay, and the explorations and the mapping of the New England coast by Captain John Smith are usually passed over as more or less conjectural. The undisputed history of Massachusetts begins with the arrival of the “Mayflower” in December, 1620. The discovery of the gardening being made by the fishery in the search of the fisheries set forth by Cabot, or by the daring Drakes, Frobishers, and Hawkinses of Elizabeth's reign, does not seem clear. It is an accepted fact that, when Gosnold set out in 1602, there was not a single English settlement on the Continent. France did not acknowledge the claim of England over the whole protected region, and the French colony had been established where now is northern Virginia, under the name of “New France.” This was after Verazzano’s expedition made by order of the French king himself, the first of the English explorers, too, the Huguenot Sieur de Monts, had been to Canada, and knew much about the resources of that country, especially the fur trade of the Indian tribes. Hence, the French granted to Béobec a patent to all the country now included in New England, also a monopoly of the fur trade.

All this is important, because it entered into the conditions of the early permanent settlement here.

For a quarter of a century prior to the coming of the Pilgrims, the French and the Dutch resented the encroachments of the English. “The Great Patent for New England”, of 1620, granted to Gorges and his forty associates, has been called a “despotism as well as a gigantic commercial monopoly.” This grant included the New Netherlands of the Dutch, the French Acadia and Beobec, and the purpose of it seemed to be to establish British possessions in North America, besides all New England, the State of New York, half of New Jersey, nearly all of Pennsylvania, and the country to the west—in short, all the territory from the fortieth degree of north latitude to the forty-eighth, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. The English had increased the enemy of the French by destroying the Catholic settlements at Ste-Croix and at Port-Royal, and had aroused the suspicion and hostility of the Indians by the treachery of Hunt, an act described by Mather as “one which constrained the English to suspend their trade and abandon their prospects of a settlement in New England.”

The religious conditions were no less ominous for the Pilgrims. At the opening of the sixteenth century, all Christian Europe, with slight exceptions, was Catholic and loyal to the papacy; at the close of that century England herself was the mother of three anti-papacy sects: the State Church and its two divisions; the Nonconformists, or Puritans; and the Separatists, or Pilgrims. At the time of the “Mayflower”, the Puritans had become as fully disenfranchised by the Anglican Church as the Pilgrims had estranged themselves from both; each distrusted the others; all three hated the Church of Rome. Gorges and his associates had found the French and their Jesuit missionaries a stumbling-block in the way of converting the Indians; the conceit of the cherub hopes of the Pilgrims to find a home away from their English persecutors, and, after much chicanery on the part of the promoters, the company agreed to found a home for the Pilgrims in the new world. The articles of agreement were wholly commercial, and the “Mayflower” sailed for Virginia. This story differs in its interpretation of the company's knowledge of the new voyage, but all agree that the Pilgrims, in landing at Plymouth, 22 December, 1620, were outside any jurisdiction of their patrons, the Virginia Company. The Pilgrims themselves recognized their difficulty, and the famous “Compact” was adopted, before landing, as a basis of government by mutual agreement. This Compact was taken directly from James I the new charter of 1620 which controlled, on a commercial basis, all religious colonization in America. The struggle of race against race, tribe against tribe, neighbour against neighbour were all encouraged so long as the warfare brought gain to the mercenary adventurers at home. The Pilgrims, by reason of their religious disabilities, ill-feeling, were forced by the law of self-preservation to continue religious intolerance and the extermination of the Indians. Thus it is that we find the laws, the customs, and the manners of these first English settlers so interwoven with the religio-commercial principle. The coming of the Puritans, in 1629–30, with the factor of given and an extinguishing in America the very thing against which these “Purists” had fought at home, namely, the union of Church and State. Here, again, at Puritan Salem, Gorges and Mason cloaked their commercialism under religion, as the accounts of La Tour and Winslow attest, and so effective were their machinations that, as early as 1635, Endicot's seal had not left a set of the king's colours intact with the red cross thereon—that “relief of popery insufferable in a Puritan community.”

B. Colonial Legislation.—The legality of the early acts of the colonists depends, to a great degree, on whether the charters granted to the two colonies were corporate charters, for public purposes, or whether they are regarded as constitutions and foundations of a government. This much-controverted point has never been settled satisfactorily. The repeated demands from the king, often with threat of prosecution, for the return of the charters were ignored, so that, until 1694, the colony was practically a free state, independent of England, professing little, if any, loyalty. Judging from the correspondence, it is more than probable that the intention of the Crown in granting the charter was that the corporation should have a local habitation in England, and it is equally evident that the colony did not possess the right to make its own laws. It is plainly stated in the patent granted to the Puritans who the governor and other officials of the colony should be showing thereby that the Crown retained the right of governing. A new charter was granted in 1692, covering Massachusetts, Plymouth, Maine, Nova Scotia, and the intervening territory, entitled “The Province of Massachusetts Bay in New England”, nevertheless the proceedings on the part of the home Government, to assert the Crown's rights, abated notably. During the half-century in which the Puritans ignored the terms of their charter, and made laws in accordance
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with their own selfish interests, many of those acts occurred which history has since condemned. At the first meeting of the General Court held 30 August, 1630, it was agreed ‘‘to build a harbor for the purpose of trade and maintain it at the state’s expense—an act described by Benedict, in his ‘History of the Baptists,’’ as ‘‘the first dangerous act performed by the rulers of this inexpient government which led to innumerable evils, hardships, and privations to all who had the misfortune to dissent from the ruling power in after-times.’’

The Puritans in England had been in revolt against church and State. After the execution of King Charles I, however, the forced emigration of the Irish brought many to that race to these shores; their number is hard to estimate, first, because the law made it obligatory that all sailings must take place from English ports. By 1640 there were 40,000 Irish in Massachusetts. The next order of events came from Ireland with English sailing registry; secondly, because the law, under heavy penalties, obliged all Irishmen in certain towns of Ireland to take English surnames—the name of some small town, of a colour, of a particular trade or office, or of a certain art or craft. Children in Ireland were separated forcibly from their parents under penalties sent into the colonies. Men and women, from Cork and its vicinity, were openly sold into slavery for America. Connacht, which was nine-tenths Catholic, was depopulated. The frequently published statement in justification of Cromwell’s persecution, that the white men were exterminated, is contradicted by finds in the existence of the single penitentiary colony in this country. In 1634 the General Court of Massachusetts Bay also granted land for an Irish settlement on the banks of the Merrimac River. (See Boston, Archdiocese of; Irish in Countries Other Than Ireland.)

II. Modern Massachusetts.

A. Statistics of Population.

In 1630 the population of Plymouth and Massachusetts Colonies was estimated at 8000 white people; in 1650, at 16,000; in 1700, at 70,000; while in 1790 it was placed at 220,000. In 1790 the population of the State of Massachusetts was 378,787; in 1800 it was 1,000,650. The density of population increased from 47 to the square mile, in 1790, to 373, in 1805. In 1790 over nine-tenths of the population lived in rural communities, while in 1905 less than one-fourth (22.28 per cent) of the total population lived in communities of 8000 or less. The great tide of Irish immigration began in 1847. This has since conspicuously modified the population of Massachusetts, the ratio of Irish and foreign-born of the population was 6.48 per cent and 8.47 per cent respectively; the number of native-born in the total population being 2,085,636, and that of the foreign-born being 918,044, an increase of the latter of 459.7 per cent since 1880. This foreign-born population is mostly (83.91 per cent) in cities and towns with populations of more than 5000. Ireland furnishes 25.75 per cent of the total foreign-born population. Canada (exclusive of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island) is second, with a population of 12.88 per cent of the total foreign-born population. At present Russia supplies the largest increase in foreign-born, having risen from one-half of one per cent, in 1896, to 8.43 per cent, in 1905. Italy’s contribution in the period rose from 76 per cent to 5.51 per cent. Almost sixty per cent of the entire population of Massachusetts is now of foreign parentage. In the cities of Fall River and Lawrence it runs as high as four-fifths of the entire population, while in Holyoke, Lowell, and Chicopee it is more than three-fourths. In Boston the population of foreign parentage forms 69.03 per cent, while at New Bedford it rises to 72.34 per cent, at Worcester to 65.64 per cent, at Cambridge to 65.16 per cent, at Woburn to 63.63 per cent, and at Salem to 61.10 per cent. The Greeks have increased in Massachusetts 1242.7 per cent since 1895, a greater rapidity of increase than all peoples of foreign parentage in the population. A new influx of Jews began in 1904. In 1860, the Irish population of Boston, Irish parentage gives 174,770 out of a total census of 410,860 persons of foreign parentage, and this nationality predominates in every ward except the eighth, where Russian parentage stands first. The transformation in the racial and national population in Massachusetts has likewise changed the religious denominations of the people. The present order of denominations in this state is: Catholic, 69.2 per cent; Congregationalists, 7.6 per cent; Baptists, 5.2 per cent; Methodists, 4.2 per cent; Protestant Episcopalians, 3.3 per cent.

B. Economic Conditions.

Massachusetts was not favored by nature for an agricultural centre. The soil is sandy in the level country and light in the low sections. The valleys of the streams are rich in soil favourable to vegetable and fruit-production. The early industries were cod and mackerel fisheries. At the outbreak of the Revolution, commerce was the most profitable occupation, and after the declaration of peace, Massachusetts sent its ships to all parts of the world. The European and American commerce greatly until the War of 1812, with its embargo and non-intercourse laws, which forced the American vessels to stay at home. It had its recompenses, however, in the birth of manufactures, an industry attempted as early as 1631 and 1644, but subsequent efforts were almost in vain. The first cotton mill was established at Beverly in 1787. It was not until 1840, however, that the cotton and leather industries attained permanent leadership. According to the published statistics of 1908, Massachusetts had 6044 manufacturing establishments, with a yearly product valued at $1,172,808,782. The boot and shoe industry was the leading industry of the State, with a yearly production of $213,506,562. This industry produced 18.2 per cent of the product value of the State, and one-half of all the product in this line in the United States. The cotton manufacturers were 13.51 per cent of the State’s total product. The total capital devoted to production in the State was $717,787,935. More than 480,000 wage-earners were employed (323,308 males, 156,826 females) in the various manufacturing industries of the State, the two leading industries employing 35.22 per cent of the aggregate average number of all employees. The average yearly earning for each operative is $501.71. The Massachusetts laws prohibit more than fifty-nine hours’ weekly employment in meat-packing establishments. The working hours in the slaughtering industries are ten hours. No woman or minor can be employed for purposes of manufacturing between the hours of ten o’clock p.m. and six o’clock a.m.; no minor under
eighteen years and no woman can be employed in any textile factory between six o'clock p.m. and six o'clock a.m.; no child under fourteen years of age can be employed during the hours when the public schools are in session, nor between seven o'clock p.m. and six o'clock a.m. Children under fourteen years, and children over fourteen years and under sixteen years, who cannot read at sight and write legibly simple sentences in the English language, shall be permitted to work on Saturdays between six o'clock a.m. and seven o'clock p.m. only. Transportation facilities have been set up, or are to be set up, in all branches of the industries. Two main railroad systems connect with the West, and, by means of the interstate branches, these connect with all the leading industrial cities. One general railroad system with its sub-divisions connects with the South, via New York. The means of transportation by water are not less complete, and other supplies of the world into connection with the various railroad terminals for distribution.

C. Education.—All education in Massachusetts was at first religious. We read of the establishment in 1636 of Harvard College, "lest an illiterate ministry might be left to instruct the congregation in the duties of the people in piety, morality, and learning." The union of Church and State was accepted, and the General Court agreed to give 400 pounds towards the establishment of the college. Six years later it was resolved, "taking into consideration the great neglect of many parents and guardians in training up their children in learning and other useful knowledge which may be profitable to the Commonwealth... that those men in every town are to redress this evil, are to have power to take account of parents, masters, and of their children, especially of their ability to read and understand the principles of religion and the capital laws of the country." This was at one time education in Massachusetts. In 1647 every town was ordered, under penalty of a fine, to build and support a school for the double purpose of religious instruction and of citizenship; every large town of one hundred families to build a grammar school to fit the youths for the university. Thus was established the common free school. The work of the common school of the rural districts was of secondary education as in civic affairs. When the grants from the legislature—colonial, provincial, and state—failed to meet the expenses of salaries and maintenance, lotteries were employed. The last grant to Harvard College from the public treasury was in 1814. Congregationalism had controlled education and legislation during the first three quarters of the century, and the work of the new Congregational colleges, which were limited to state officials and a specified number of Congregational clergyman. It was not until 1843 that other than Congregationalists were eligible for election as overseers of the college.

The original system of state education, as outlined above, was uninterrupted until the close of the Revo
tu. The normal Colleges of the North, act substituting six taxation, reduced the "grammar school" to a very low standard. Men of ability found a more lucrative occupation than teaching. Private schools sprang into existence about this time, and the legacies of Dummer, Phillips, Williston, and others made their foundations the preparatory schools for Harvard. In 1769 the legislature passed an act substituting six months for the constant instruction provided for of towns of fifty families; and the law required a gram
teacher of determined qualifications for towns of 200 families, instead of the similar requirements for all towns of half that population. In 1797 the Legis
lature formally adopted all the incorporated academies and required the law of 1769. More and more the the law adoption almost entirely replaced the grammar schools founded in 1647. The act of 1789 was repealed in 1824. This aided greatly the private denominational schools and gave to them a false and fictitious social, intellectual, and moral standing. The American Institute of Instruction was formed in 1830 at Boston as a protest against the low standard of teaching in the public schools. Three years prior to this (1827) the Legislature had established the State Board of Education, which remained unchanged in form until 1900. That same year was made historic by the Legislature voting to make it unlawful to use the common schools, or to teach anything in the schools, in order to turn the children to a belief in any particular sect. This was the first show of what was manifest in Massachusetts, and it has retained its control of the educational policy of the state since that date. In 1835 the civil authorities at Lowell authorized the establishment of separate Catholic schools with Catholic teachers and with all text-books subject to the pastor's approval. The municipality paid all the expenses except the rent of rooms. This experiment was a great success. The general wave of religious fanaticism, which swept the country a few years later, was responsible for the acceptance of the referendum vote of 21 May, 1855, which adopted the constitutional amendment that "all moneys thus raised and put to the use of schools in any part of the state, shall never be appropriated to any religious purposes or for the maintenance exclusively of its own schools". The Civil War resulted in a saner view of many questions which had been blurred by passion and prejudice, and in 1862 (and again in 1880) the statute law was modified so that "Bible reading is required, but without writing, oral or written." The pupil is not made to take part in any such exercise if his parent or guardian so wishes; any version is allowed, and no committee may purchase or order to be used in any public school books calculated to favor the tenets of any particular sect of Christians."—This, in brief, is the process by which the secularization of the public schools can be about, a complete repudiation of the law of 1842.

Massachusetts has ten state normal schools with over 2000 pupils and a corps of 130 teachers. In the 17,566 public schools there are 524,319 pupils with an average attendance of 92 per cent. The proportion of teachers is 1251 male and 13,497 female. The total valuation of the state is $14,697,774. There are forty-two academies with an enrolment of over 6000 pupils, and 344 private schools with a registration of 91,772. The local annual tax for school support per child between the ages of five to fifteen years is $26. The total valuation of all schools in Massachusetts is $3,512,557,604. There are within the state eighteen colleges and universities, six of which are devoted to the education of women only. Massachusetts has also eight schools of theology, three law schools, four medical schools, two dental schools, one school of pharmacy, and three textile schools. The only colleges in Massachusetts (except textile schools) receiving state or federal subsidies are the State Agricul
tural College, and the World's College of Technology, the latter receiving both. The number of public libraries in Massachusetts exceeds that of any other state. The list includes 2586 libraries with 10,810,974 volumes valued at $12,657,757. There are 623 reading rooms, of which 301 are free. There are thirty schools for the dependent and the afflicted. The growth of the Catholic schools has been most notable. Besides Holy Cross College at Worcester, and Boston College at Boston, there are in the diocese of Boston many grammar schools and twenty-six high schools with a teaching staff of 1075 persons and an enrolment of 52,142. This represents an investment of more than $2,700,000, a yearly interest of $174,000. More than one third of the population of the diocese now maintain parochial schools. In the Diocese of Fall River there are over 12,000 pupils in 28 parochial schools, besides a commercial school with
363 pupils. In the Diocese of Springfield there are 24,542 pupils in 56 parochial schools.

D. Laws affecting Religion and Morals.—Elsewhere in this article we have traced colonial laws and legislation. The Constitution of the United States gave religious liberty. The State Constitution of 1780 imposed a religious test as a qualification for office and it authorized the legislature to tax the towns, if necessary, “for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality.” The former law was repealed in 1821, and the latter in 1833. Complete religious liberty has existed since the latter date. The observance of the Lord’s Day is amply safeguarded, but entertainments for charitable purposes given by charitable or religious societies are permitted. The keeping of open shop or engaging in work or business for charitable purposes is forbidden. Many of the rigid laws of colonial days are yet unrepealed. There is no law authorizing the use of prayer in the Legislature; custom, however, has made it a rule to open each session with prayer. This same custom has become the rule in opening the several sittings of the higher courts. Catholic priests have officiated at times at the former. The present Archbishop of Boston offered prayer at the opening of his first session in the State House Court, but later it was the custom of the Catholic to perform this office. The courts and the judiciary have full power to administer oaths.

The legal holidays in Massachusetts are 22 Feb., 19 April (Patriots’ Day), 30 May, 4 July, the first Monday in September (Labor Day), 12 Oct. (Columbus Day), Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day. The Society of Jesus is not allowed to celebrate Mass on the Feast of the Holy Innocents. The observance of the Lord’s Day has been known as a custom, if not a law, since the earliest years of the state. The protest of the clergy of both Protestant and Catholic faith has been in favor of the observance. Since 1831 the law has been repealed.

The seal of confession is not recognized by law, although in practice sacramental confession is generally treated as a privileged conversation. Incorporation of churches and of charitable institutions is authorized by statute. Such organizations may make their own laws and elect their own officers. Even religious societies so organized shall constitute a body corporate with the powers given to corporations. Section 44, chapter 36, of the Public Statutes provide that the Roman Catholic archbishop or bishop, the vicar-general of the diocese, and the pastor of the church for the time being, or a majority of these, may associate with these twain, or, by letter, communicants of the church, may form a body corporate, to issue and execute a certificate of incorporation becoming the trustees. Such corporations may receive, hold, and manage all real and personal property belonging to the church, sell, transfer, hold trusts, bequests, etc., but all property belonging to any church or parish, or held by such a corporation, shall be held in trust for all time.

All church property and houses of religious worship (except that part of such houses appropriated for purposes other than religious worship or instruction) are exempt from taxation. This exemption extends to the property of literary, benevolent, charitable, and scientific institutions and to the monuments, libraries, cemeteries, and tombs. Clergymen are exempt from service as constables, from jury service, and service in the militia. Clergymen are permitted by law to have access to prisoners after death sentence, and are among those designated as “officials” who may be present at executions. The statutes prohibit marriage between relatives, and recognize marriage by civil authorities and by church. The statutory grounds for divorce recognized are adultery, impotency, desertion continued for three consecutive years, confirmed habits of intoxication by liquor, opium, or drugs, cruel and abusive treatment; also if either party is sentenced for life to hard labour, or five or more years term in jail, or house of correction. The Superior Court hears all divorce cases. After a decree of divorce has become absolute, either party may marry again as if the others were dead; except that the party from whom the decree was granted shall not marry within two years. The sale of intoxicating liquors is regulated by law. Each community, city, or town votes annually upon the question, whether or not licence to sell liquor shall be issued in that municipality. Special boards are appointed to regulate the conditions of such licences. The number of licences that may be granted in each town or city is limited to one to each thousand persons, though Boston has a limitation of one licence to each five hundred of the population. The hours of opening and closing of licensed places are regulated by law. Any person owning property can object to the granting of a licence to sell intoxicating liquors within twenty-five feet of his property. A licence cannot be granted to sell intoxicating liquors on the same street as, or within four hundred feet of, a public school.

E. Religious Liberty.—In the beginning Massachussetts was Puritan against the Catholic first, against all non-conformists to their version of established religion next. The Puritan was narrow in mind and for the most part limited in education, a type of man swayed easily to extremes. England was at that period intensely anti-papal. In Massachusetts, however, the antipathy early became racial; first against the French Huguenots, then the Quakers, and finally against the Roman Catholic, but so great was the determination to maintain the racial religious bigotry that it has not disappeared wholly in Massachusetts. Within the pale of the Church racial schisms have been instigated from time to time in order that the defeat of Catholicism might be accomplished when open antagonism from without failed to accomplish the end sought. In politics it is often effective to bleat for the extermination of Catholics or to have them excluded from office. The first measure was the banishment of all foreigners in 1631 except Puritans were excluded by law from the freedom of the body politic. In 1647 the law became more specific and excluded priests from the colony. This act was reaffirmed in 1770. Bowdoin College preserves the cross and Harvard College the Indian. In the time of King Charles, the priest excluded under the provision of the law. In 1746 a resolution and meeting at Faneuil Hall bear testimony that Catholics must prove, as well as affirm, their loyalty to the colony. Washington himself was called upon to suppress the insult of Pope Day at the siege of Boston. Each of these events was preceded by a period of French and Irish immigration. The circumstances which were repeated in the religious fanaticism of the middle of the nineteenth century. Cause and effect seem well established and too constant to be incidental. In all the various anti-Catholic uprisings, from colonial times to the present, there is not one instance where the Catholics were the aggressors; they were ever rulers, and the men of peace and forbearance have always been in marked contrast to the conduct of their non-Catholic contemporaries. In every one of the North Atlantic group of states, the Catholics now constitute the most numerous religious denomination. In Massachusetts the number of the leading denominations is as follows: Catholics, 75,000; Jews, 2,575; Unitarians, 1,350; Methodists, 1,725; Baptists, 1,530; Presbyterians, 855.
the Otis, the Lees, the Perkins, Everett, and Loring—all non-Catholics—whose voices and pens were enlisted heartily in the cause of justice, toleration, and unity.

In 1846, Rhode Island and Connecticut were set off from the Diocesan Diocese of Boston. Maine and New Hampshire, also under the jurisdiction of Boston, were made a new diocese ten years later, with the episcopal Irish immigration, and Boston received a large quota. This new influx was, as in the previous century, looked upon as an "intrusion" and the usual result followed. New England had now become what Lowell was pleased to call "New Ireland". This religious and racial transformation, made the necessity for churches, academies, schools, asylums, priests, and teachers an imperative one. The work of expansion, both material and spiritual, went forward apace. The great influx of Canadian Catholics added much to the Catholic population, which had now reached more than a million souls—over sixty-nine per cent of the total religious population of the state. The era was not without its religious strife, this time within public and charitable institutions, state and municipal. This chapter reads like those efforts of proselytizing in the colonial days when names of Catholic children were changed, and that of his brother, all in the hope of destroying the true religious inheritance of the state's wards. The influence of Catholics in the governing of institutions, libraries, and schools has since then increased somewhat. The spiritual necessities of the vast Catholic communities are provided for abundantly; orphans are well housed; unfortunately charity is not provided; there is great need for more schools, and the sick have the sacraments at their very door. Schools, academies, colleges, and convets, wherein Catholic education is given, are now within the reach of all. The whole period of Archbishop Williams's administration (1866-1907) has been appropriately called "the brick and mortar age of the Catholic Church in New England". (See Boston, Archdiocese of.)

Upon the death of Archbishop Williams, in the summer of 1907, his coadjutor, the Most Reverend William H. O'Connell, D.D. (the present archbishop), was promoted to the metropolitan see. This archbishop is the founder of the devotion of Catholic Societies to meet in Boston with restoring interest, activity, and strength to that society, in which, indeed, he has shown a special interest. To develop the solidarity of priests and people, of races and nations, of the cultured and the unlettered—a unity of all the interests of the Church, the archbishop needed a free press: he purchased "The Pilot", secured able and fearless writers and placed it at a nominal cost within the reach of all. The dangers to the immigrant in a new and fascinating environment are all anticipated, and safeguards are being strengthened daily. At the same time, the inherited misunderstandings of Puritan Massachusetts, and the ever growing work: he had the wisdom to give the Church, to its priests, and to their spiritual leader. In every diocese and in each county well-organized branches of the Federation exist, temperance and church societies flourish, educational and charitable associations are alive and active. The Church's oldest laymen are enlisted, and all are helping mightily to reconstruct the Church of Boston, to make Massachusetts the leading Catholic state in the country. (See also Cheverus, Jean Louis de; Boston, Archdiocese of; Fall River, Diocese of; Springfield, Diocese of.)
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THOMAS F. HARRINGTON.

Massaia, Guglielmo, Cardinal, b. 9 June, 1809, at Piova in Piedmont, Italy; d. at Cremona, 6 August, 1889. His baptismal name was Lorenzo; that of Guglielmo was given him when he became a religious. He was first educated at the Collegio Reale at Asti under the care of his elder brother Guglielmo, a canon and preceptor of the cathedral of that city. On the death of his brother he was sent to the Jesuit observance in the Turin church, and thence to the Jesuit seminary; but at the age of sixteen entered the Capuchin Franciscan Order, receiving the habit on 25 September, 1825. Immediately after his ordination to the priesthood, he was appointed lector of theology; but even whilst teaching he acquired some fame as a preacher and was chosen confessor to Prince Victor Emmanuel, afterwards King of Italy, and Ferdinand, Duke of Genoa. The royal family of Piedmont would have nominated him on several occasions to an episcopal see, but he strenuously opposed their project, being desirous of joining the foreign missions of his order. He obtained his wish in 1846. That year the Congregation of Propaganda, at the instance of the traveler Antoine d'Abbadie, determined to establish a Vicariate-Apostolic for the Gallias in Abyssinia. The mission was confined to the Capuchins, and Massaia was appointed first vicar-apostolic, and was consecrated on Rome in 24 May of that year. On his arrival in Abyssinia he found the country in a state of religious agitation. The heretics of the ancient men had there been a movement amongst the Copts towards union with Rome. Massaia, who had received plenary faculties from the pope, ordained a number of native priests for the Coptic Rite; he also obtained the appointment by the Holy See of a vicar-apostolic for the Copts, and himself consecrated the missionary Giustino de Jacobs to this office. But this act aroused the enmity of the Coptic Patriarch of Egypt, who sent a bishop of his own, Abba Salama, to Abyssinia. As a result of the ensuing political agitation, Massaia was banished from the country and had to flee under an assumed name. In 1850 he visited Europe to gain a fresh band of missionaries and means to develop the Church there. He was received with the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Paris, and with Lord Palmerston in London. On his return to the Gallas he founded a large number of missions; he also established a school at Marseilles for the education of Gallas boys whom he had freed from slavery; besides this he composed a grammar of the Gallas language which was published at Marseilles in 1867. During his thirty-five years as a missionary he was exiled seven times, but he always returned to his labours with renewed vigour. However, in 1880 he was compelled by ill-health to resign his mission. In recognition of his merit, Leo XIII raised him to the titular Archibishopric of Statoorpis, and on 10 November, 1894, to the dignity of cardinal. In the title of S. Vitale, in which he was placed in 1894, he wrote an account of his missionary labours, under the title, "I miei trentacinque anni di missione nell'
Massa Marittima, Diocese of (Massana), in the Province of Grosseto, in Tuscany, first mentioned in the eighth century. It grew at the expense of Populonia, an ancient city of the Etruscans, the principal product of which was iron, and especially copper works. Populonia was besieged by Sulla, and later by the forces of the Lombard kings, and in 817 by a Byzantine fleet. After this, the bishops of Populonia abandoned the town, and in the eleventh century, established their residence at Massa. In 1226 Massa became a commune under the protection of Pisa. In 1307 it made an alliance with Siena, which was the cause of many wars between the two republics that brought about the decadence of Massa. The town has a fine cathedral. The first known Bishop of Populonia was Attelius (about 450); another was Saint Certonius (546), protector of the city, to whom Saint Gregory refers in his Dialogues. Among the bishoprics of Massa were the friar Antonio (1430), a former general of the Franciscans, and legate of Boniface IX; Leonardo Dati (1467), author of poetic writing; Alessandro Petrucci (1601), who embellished the cathedral and the episcopal palace; the Camaldolese Eusebio da Ciani (1719), who governed the diocese for fifty-one years. This see was at first suffragan of Pisa, but since 1458 of Siena. It has 29 parishes, 68,200 inhabitants, one religious house of men and four of women.

Masses, Bequests for (Canada).—The law governing bequests being concerned with "property and civil rights", falls within the legislative competency of the provincial legislatures, not of the Dominion Parliament. The basic law in all the provinces is, however, not the same. Any question concerning bequests is, therefore, one of provincial, not Dominion law. There is no statute enacted by any of the legislatures specially affecting bequests for Masses.

Quebec.—In this province there is no question of the validity of such bequests. The basic law is the French law as in force in the province at the time of the cession (1759–63). Whether such bequests were or are valid under English statute or Common Law, is immaterial. Under article 869 of the Civil Code a testator may make bequests for charitable or other lawful purposes. The freedom of the practice of the Catholic religion being not only recognized but guaranteed, as well under the Treaty of Cession (1763) as under the terms of the Quebec Act (1774), and subsequent Provincial Legislation (14 & 15 Vic. Cap. 175) having confirmed that freedom, a bequest for the saying of Masses is clearly for a lawful purpose.

Ontario.—In this province the law of England, as in force on 15 October, 1792, introduced "so far as it was not from local circumstances inapplicable", under powers conferred by the statute of 1791 which divided the old Province of Quebec into Lower and Upper Canada, is the basic law. That Act preserved to Roman Catholics in Upper Canada the rights as regards their religion secured to them under the Act of 1774. The provincial legislation cited as regards Quebec being enacted after the reunion of Upper and Lower Canada, was also law in this province. The validity of bequests for the saying of Masses was upheld in the case of Elmesley and Madden (18 Grant Chan. R. 386). The court held that the English law, as far as under it such dispositions may have been invalid, was inapplicable under the circumstances of the province, wherein the Catholic religion was tolerated. This case has been accepted as settling the law.

British Columbia, Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan.—In British Columbia the civil law of England, as it existed on 19 November, 1858, and in the three other of these provinces, that law as it existed on 15 July, 1870, "so far as from local circumstances inapplicable", is the basic law. The Ontario judgment above cited is in practice accepted as settling the question under consideration.

In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, though there is no statutory enactment making the English law applicable, it has, since the acquisition of Acadia by Great Britain, been recognized as being in force. In these provinces, however, that law in so far as it may treat as void dispositions for the
MASSES, BEQUESTS FOR (ENGLAND).—Before the Reformation, dispositional provisions, whether real or personal, of the bequestors, were valid. Where, in the case of real property, they might happen to conflict with the Mortmain laws by being made to religious congregations. There was a tenure of land known as tenure by divine service, an incident of which was the saying of Masses and of prayers for the dead. The Statute of Westminster, 31 Edward III, c. 11, contained a provision that the administration of intestate Masses should be able to recover by action debts due to the intestate and that they should administer and dispense for the soul of the dead. The wills of various great people who lived in those ages contain bequests for Masses. Henry VII left £250 for 10,000 Masses to be said for his and other souls. The will of Henry VIII, made on 28 December, 1546, commanded his corpse to be placed on an altar over his tomb in St. George's Chapel in Windsor, where daily Mass shall be said "as long as the world shall endure," and it sets out a grant to the dean and canons of the chapel of lands to the value of £600 a year for ever to find two priests to say Mass and to keep four obits yearly and to give alms for the King's soul; and contains other provisions for requiem Masses and prayers for his soul. But in A.D. 1531, by the statute 23, Henry VIII, c. 10, all subsequent assurances or dispositions of land to the use of a perpetual obit (i.e. a service for the dead to be celebrated at certain fixed periods) or the continual service of a priest to be void if the use was to extend over more than a year, but if the use was for a less period the dispositions were to be valid. That even private Masses were at that time approved by the state is shown by the six articles passed in A.D. 1539 (32 Henry VIII, c. 14), which constituted the denial of their expediency a felony. Henry VIII died 28 January A.D. 1547. The change of religion became much more marked in the following reign, and the government fostered the establishment in England of the Protestant doctrines which had begun to spread on the continent. In the same year the Six Articles were repealed and the Statute of Chauntreys (1 Edward VI, c. 14) was passed from which the invalidity of bequests for requiem Masses has been made subject to the statute of 1692, "a great part of the superstitious and errors in the Christian religion hath been brought into the minds and estimation of men by reason of the ignorance of their very true and perfect salvation through the death of Jesus Christ and by devising and phantasying vain opinions of purgatory and masses satisfactory to be done for them which be departed, that the said doctrine and vain opinion by nothing more is maintained and upheld than by the abuse of tren- tals, chauntreys and other provisions made for the continuance of the said blindness and ignorance." The statute, after further reciting that the property given to such uses ought to be devoted to the founding of schools and other good purposes, enacted that proprietary given to such uses, which had been so used within the succeeding five years, should be given to the king. The statute only applied to past dispositional property and it did not declare the general illegality of bequests for requiem Masses, nor has any other statute ever so declared (Cary v. Abbot, 1802, 7 Ves. 495). Nevertheless, the effect of the statute has been to bring it. (West v. Shuttleworth, 1835, 2 M. & K. 679; Heath v. Chapman, 1854, 2 Drew 423.)

The statute was not repealed under Mary, and by 1 Ellis, c. 24, all property devoted to such uses in Mary's reign was given to the crown. There is a series of cases on the question decided under Elizabeth, notably that of Adama v. Lambert, decided in 1602, in the course of which the other and the following cases these decisions are slightly conflicting, but the main points to be drawn from the series are, first, that uses for Masses or prayers for the dead were held to be superstitious and unlawful, but, second, that the question of their unlawfulness was considered according as they came within the provisions of the Statute of 1 Edward VI, c. 14. In the case of the Catholic Church, the Catholic religion was proscribed and any devise or bequest for the promotion of it was illegal and, as regarded the purpose thereof, void (Re Lady Portington 1692, 1 Salk. 162). In the report of that case, as also in other later cases, the terms "superstitious" and "unlawful" appear to be applied indifferently to purposes for the maintenance of any religious belief. But dispositions for Catholic poor or Catholic schools or other Catholic purposes which might come under the general construction of "charity," passed to the crown to be devoted to other lawful charitable purposes (Cary v. Abbot above). In 1829 the Roman Catholic Relief Act was passed, which contained, however, in some of its clauses and penal provisions against members of religious orders of men by reason of which the status of these orders in the United Kingdom is illegal. In 1832 the Roman Catholic Charities Act (2 and 3 William IV, c. 115) was passed. By it Catholics were, as regards their charitable purposes, put in the same position as that of Protestant dissenters. The law as to bequests for a bequest for the celebration of Masses with no intention for souls departed would be valid, and, moreover, it would constitute a good charitable bequest, and so, it would be valid though made in perpetuity (Re Michel's Trusts, 1860, 28 Beav. 42). But it has been held that the act has not validated bequests for requiem Masses, that the term of the so-called "superstitious" (West v. Shuttleworth above), that they do not constitute charitable bequests and that, accordingly, the property given under them passes to the person otherwise entitled (Heath v. Chapman above). This is the position of the law to-day with the exception made by the Roman Catholic Charities Act, 1850, which provides that any lawful devotional service given to any Catholic or Catholic Charity is to be invalidated because the estate devised or bequeathed is, also, subject to any trust deemed to be superstitious or prohibited through being to religious orders of men, but such latter trust may be apportioned by the Court or the Charity Commissioners to some other lawful charitable trust. Thus the true position of such Masses is as such invalid, and where no question of apportionment can arise, for instance, where there is a specific legacy of money for the purpose only of such Masses, the estate which is subject to the trust does not pass to any charity but to the person otherwise entitled to it (Re Fleetwood, Siddgoves, 1850, 18 Ch. D. 609). Also, a legacy for requiem Masses is invalid even though the legacy be payable in a country where it would be legally valid (Re Elliott, 1891, 39 W.R. 297). The grounds on which this position of the law is based appear rather unsatisfactory. Admittedly, there is no direct statutory illegality. In the case of Heath v. Chapman (above) Viner V. C. stated that the Statute 1 Edward VI, c. 14, assumed that trusts for Masses were already illegal—that they were in fact so—and that the statute has stamped on all such trusts, whether made before or since it, the character of illegality on the ground of being superstitious. Seeing that the statute was passed in the year of the death of Henry VIII, it is not possible to derive the validity of the Six Articles, and that during that time there had been no statutory abolition of the Mass or condemnation of the doctrine of purgatory, it is not easy to discern how the legal invalidity of such bequests had al-
ready become established. In West v. Shuttleworth (above), which is the leading case on the subject, Pepys M. R. stated that it was by analogy to the statute that the illegality of these bequests had become established. This would seem to mean that their illegality was based upon the general policy of the law and upon principles resulting from such a change in the national system as must have arisen in that case from the complete change in the national church. In that case, since the policy applied to the whole realm including Ireland, where Protestantism became the established church and an even more vigorous anti-Catholic policy was pursued by the legislature, one would expect to find the illegality of bequests for Masses as well as for Requiem Masses established in Ireland through the very fact itself did not apply to Ireland. Thus, in the case of the Attorney-General v. Power, 1809 (1 B. & Ben. 150) Lord Manners, Irish Lord Chancellor, in giving judgment with regard to a bequest to a school by a Catholic testator, stated that he would not act upon the presumption that it was for the endowment of a Catholic school, and that such a bequest would by the law of England be deemed void either as being contrary to the provisions of the statute of Edward VI or as being against public policy. Yet the same Lord Chancellor, in the case of the Commissioners of Charitable Donations v. Walsh, 1823, 7 Ir. Eq. 32, after a prolonged argument before him, held a bequest for requiem Masses to be valid.

The ground of public policy in respect of this question seems no longer to hold good. There is no longer any public policy against Catholicism as such. As mentioned above, seemingly, a bequest for the mere celebration of Masses with no intention for souls departed would be valid. Moreover, seemingly, a bequest for the celebration of the Mass at the funeral of the testator himself would be a good charitable bequest (Thorton v. Howe, 1862, 31 Beav. 19). Thus, since the Roman Catholic Charities Act 1832, putting Catholics as regards "their...charitable purposes" in the same position as other persons, the holding a bequest for Masses for the dead to be invalid appears necessarily to imply that the bequest is not to a charitable purpose and thereby to involve the inconsistency that it is not a "charity" to practise by the exercise of a "charity" the doctrine which it is a "charity" to propagate. Yet this is so even though, by the bequest being for Masses to be said for the departed generally, there is evidence of an intention on the part of the testator of promoting mortality. In view of this evidence, the real basis of the legal view of these bequests is that the law may not recognize the purpose of a spiritual benefit to one's fellow-creatures in an after existence intended by a person believing in the possibility of such a benefit. But such an attitude, apart from the inconsistency mentioned, seems to be opposed to the present policy of the law with regard to religious opinions, especially when the act of worship directed by the bequest, when viewed apart from the particular believed effect, is approved by the law as a charity. Doubt as to the soundness of the present law on the subject was expressed by Romilly M. R. in the case Re Michels Truste (above), where he upheld a bequest for a Jewish prayer to be recited on the testator's anniversary in perpetuity, there being no evidence that the prayer was to be recited for the benefit of the testator's soul, and in the case Re Blundell's Trusts, 1861 (30 Beav. 362), where he considered himself compelled, in compliance with the judgment in West v. Shuttleworth (above), to disallow a bequest by a Catholic for requiem Masses, stating that the law declaring such bequests to be invalid had now become so established that only a judgment of the House of Lords could alter it. It would be desirable that the decision of that tribunal should be obtained on this question.

In Ireland bequests for requiem Masses have long been regarded as valid, and, by a recent decision given upon exhaustive consideration of the question by the Irish Court of Appeal, the law is settled that such bequests, even when the Masses are to be said in private, constitute good charitable gifts and so may be made in perpetuity (O'Halton v. Logue, 1906, 1 Ir. 247). But in Ireland, also, religious orders of men are illegal and any bequest to such an order which is to go to the benefit of the order is invalid (Burke v. Power, 1905, 1 Ir. 123). But such a bequest was allowed in one recent case, and in cases where the bequest for Masses contains no indication that the money is to go to the order itself the Court will allow the bequest (Bradshaw v. Jackson, 1857 21 L. R. Ir. 15). The decisions show a strong general tendency to seek any means of escaping the provisions of the Catholic Relief Act, 1829, which, though never actively enforced, still remain on the statute book. This statutory illegality of any bequest to a religious order of men to go to the benefit of the order applies, of course, equally to England and to Scotland, where these provisions against religious orders are also law, but there does not appear to be any report of any decision on the point in either of these countries.

In Scotland the position seems, otherwise, to be as follows: though, in the centuries succeeding the Reformation the public policy was distinctly anti-Catholic and there was legislation (such as the Mass and Recusants Act passed in 1700, which, amongst other provisions, penalised the hearing of Mass) directed against the Catholic religion, yet there seems to have been no Statute which has given rise to the question of "superstition" on the special point of gifts for prayers for the dead. By an Act passed in 1793 Catholics in Scotland, and by an Act of 1801, no longer required, were put upon the same footing as other persons. The Catholic Charities Act, 1832, applied also to Scotland. The term "charity" is even rather more widely interpreted in Scottish law than in English law. Thus, in Scotland through the repeal of the legislation against Catholics and the legalisation of bequests to their charitable purposes, legacies for requiem Masses seem to pass unquestioned. There is little doubt that, if they were to be challenged, the Courts would uphold them. In a recent case where there was a bequest for the celebration of Mass in perpetuity (there was no mention of any intention for the dead) the validity of the bequest was not in any way called in question (In Re Macneil's Estates, 1904, 7 F. 42). The law as to superstitious uses prevailing in England is not taken to be imported into the laws of British colonies or possessions (Yase v. Ong, 1875, L. R. 6 C. P. 396). In Australia, though by an Act of the British Parliament passed in 1828, all the laws and statutes in force in England at that date were carried over (7 & 8 Geo. IV. c. 22), the validity of the bequest was not in any way called in question in the case of the insertion of a bequest for requiem Masses in favour of the administration of justice in the Courts of the new Australasian Colonies, the law as to superstitious uses has been held by the Supreme Court of Victoria not to apply there (In the Will of Purcell, 1895, 21, V. L. R. 249). This decision was followed in the Supreme Court of New South Wales in 1907 (Re Hartnett, 7 S. R. 465). There is little doubt that the law which these cases declare would be followed in all other Australasian Colonies and in New Zealand. In India bequests for requiem Masses are valid (Das Mercers v. Coates, 1864, 2 Hyde 65; Judah v. Judah, 1870, 2 B. L. R. 433).

Given on Littleton 96 (b); Nicholls, Will of the Kings and Queens of England and of members of the Blood Royal from Willam the Conqueror to Henry VII (London, 1778); Will of King Henry the VIII, stating that Mass should be said for King Henry (London, 1763); Duke on the Law of Charitable Uses, edited by Bristow (London, 1805).

R. S. NOLAN.

Masses, Devises and Bequests for (United States).—Prior to the period of the Reformation in England in 1532, Masses for the repose of the souls of
the donors of property given for that purpose were upheld in England, but during that year a statute was passed declaring the holding of land, except leaseholds of twenty years, to the intent to have perpetual or the continued service of a priest, or other like uses, should be void. In the reign of Edward VI (1547), another statute was passed declaring the king entitled to all real and certain specified personal property theretofore disposed of for the perpetual supply of clerks, and personal tenance of any anniversary or obit, or other like thing, or any light or lamp at any church or chapel. These statutes did not make disposition of personal property to such uses void, and the statute of Henry VIII was prospective and applied only to assurances of land to churches and chapels, and that of Edward VI was limited to the provision of perpetual clergy and personal tenance of any anniversary or obit, or other like thing, or any light or lamp at any church or chapel. The English chancellors and the English judges, in the absence of any express statute, determined all dispositions of property, whether real or personal, given or devised for uses specified in the two statutes, to be absolutely void as contrary to public policy, being for superstitious uses. The decision in such cases was not as to the validity of the bequest or the soul of the donor or for the bringing up of poor children in the Roman Catholic faith.

It has been expressly decided that these statutes and the doctrine of superstitious uses as enunciated by the English judges do not apply in the United States, although the first colonies from which the States grew were British colonies, must not be considered as a reason for the adoption of the statutes referred to, and this, notwithstanding the fact that in some of the states statutes were passed adopting the common law and statutes of England so far as the same might be applicable to the altered condition of the settlers in the colonies. The doctrine is that it is a maxim of law in the United States that a man shall dispose of his property as he will with his own, so long as he does not violate the law by so doing or devote his property to an immoral purpose; consequently, since there is a legal equality of sects and all are thus in the eyes of the law equally orthodox, to discriminate between what is a pious and what a superstitious use would be to infringe upon the constitutional guarantee of perfect freedom and equality of all religions (see opinion of Tuley, J., in the case of Kehoe v. Kehoe, reported as a note to Gilman v. McArdle, 12 Abb. N. C., 427 New York). In none of the states of the Union, therefore, are bequests or devises for property for Masses for the dead invalid on the ground that they are of a superstitious or religious character. The decisions as to the circumstances under which such bequests or devises will be sustained.

In New York the law of England on the subject of charitable and religious trusts has been completely abrogated by statute, it being intended that there should be no system of public charities in that state except through the medium of corporate bodies. The policy has been to enact from time to time general and special laws specifying and sanctioning the particular object to be promoted, restricting the amount of property to be enjoyed, carefully keeping the subject under legislative control, and always providing a competent and ascertained donee to take and use the charitable gifts (Levy v. Levy, 33 N. Y. 97; Holland v. Alcock, 108 N. Y., 312). In accordance with this policy a general act was passed regulating the incorporation of religious bodies, and empowering the trustees to take into their possession property, whether the same has been given, granted or devised directly to a church, congregation or society, or to any other corporation duly authorized by law to hold charitable property. (Gen. Laws and other Statutes of N. Y., p. 3401). By the provisions of other statutes Roman Catholic churches come under this act (Laws of 1882, c. 45; Cummings and Gilbert, loc. cit., p. 3425). Therefore a bequest of real property for Masses will be upheld if it comply with the statutory requirements, which are: (1) that the gift be to a corporation duly authorized by law to hold charitable property; (2) that the statute to take gifts for such purpose and not to a private person; (2) that the will by which the gift is made shall have been properly executed at least two months before the testator's death (Cummings and Gilbert, loc. cit., p. 4470; Laws of 1848, c. 319; Laws of 1860, c. 360; Lefevre v. Lefevre, 59 N. Y., 434), and (3) that if the testator have a wife, child, or parent, the bequest shall not exceed one-half of his property after his debts are paid (ibid., see Hagenmeyer's Will, 12 Abb. N. C., 432). Every trust of personal property, which is not contrary to public policy and is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and protecting the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character, is valid when the trustee is competent to take and a trust is for a lawful purpose well defined so as to be capable of being specifically executed by the court (Holmes v. Mead, 52 N. Y., 332). "If then a Catholic desire to make provision by will for saying of Masses for his soul, there is not the shadow of a doubt but that every court of this State (New York) would hold he bequeath the bequest if the mode of making it were agreeable to the law" (see careful article written in 1886 by F. A. McCloskey in "Albany Law Journal", XXXII, 136).

For similar reasons in Wisconsin, where all trusts are abolished by statute except certain specified trusts with a definite beneficiary, a gift for Masses, to be valid as such, must take the form of a trust. Thus a bequest in the following language: "I give and bequeath unto the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Green Bay, Wisconsin, the sum of $4150, the said sum to be used and applied as follows: For Masses for the repose of my soul, two thousand dollars, for Masses for the repose of the souls of my deceased wife, etc., etc." The bequest is a trust as created by this language, and says: "It is evident that such a trust is not capable of execution, and no court would take cognizance of any question in respect to it for want of a competent party to raise and litigate any question of abuse or perversion of the trust." But it adds: "We know of no legal reason why any person of the Catholic faith, believing in the efficacy of Masses, may not make a direct gift or bequest to any bishop or priest of any sum out of his property or estate for Masses for the repose of his soul or the souls of others, as he may choose. Such gifts or bequests, when made in clear, direct, and legal form, should be upheld; and they differ no more from a sale or purchase reached invalid under the rule that prevailed in England by which they were held void as gifts to superstitious uses" (72 N. W. Rep., 631).

The same view was taken by the Supreme Court of Alabama, where a bequest to a church to be used in solemn Masses for the repose of the soul of the testator was held invalid inasmuch as it did not respond to any one of the following tests: (1) that it was a direct bequest to the church for its general uses; (2) that it created a charitable use; or (3) that it created a valid private trust. It was not a charity inasmuch as it was "for the benefit alone of his own soul, and cannot be upheld as a public charity without offending every principle of law by which such charities are supported," and it was not valid as a private trust for want of a living beneficiary to support it (Festorassi v. St. Joseph's R. C. Church of Mobile, 25 Law. Rep. Ann., 360).

In Illinois an opposite conclusion is reached, it being held distinctly that a devise for Masses for the repose of the soul of the testator, the Masses to be said for the soul of the testator, and the Masses of other named persons, is valid as a charitable use, and the devise for such purpose will not be allowed to fail for want of a competent trustee, but the court will appoint a trustee to take the gift and apply it to the purposes of the trust. Such a bequest is distinctly
held to be within the definition of charities which are
to be sustained irrespective of the indefiniteness of the
beneficiaries, or of the lack of trustees, or the fact that
the trustees appointed are not competent to take; and
it is not derived from the Statute of Charitable Uses
(43 Elizabeth, c. 4), but existed prior to and independ-
dent of that statute. The courts quote with approval
the definition of a charity as given by Mr. Justice Gray
of Massachusetts: "A charity in a legal sense may be
more fully defined as a gift, to be applied consistently
with existing laws, for the benefit of an indefinite num-
er of persons, either by bringing their hearts under
the influence of education or religion, by relieving
their sufferings, or by assisting them to establish themselves for life, or by
erecting and maintaining public buildings or works,
or otherwise lessening the burthen of government. It
is immaterial whether the purpose is called charitable
in the gift itself, if it be so described as to show that it
is charitable in its nature" (Jackson v. Phillips, 14
Allen, 539). The court proceeds to show that the
Mass is intended to be a repetition of the sacrifice of
the Cross, and is the chief and central act of worship
in the Catholic Church; that it is public. It points out
the Catholic belief on the subject of Purgatory, and
holds that the adding of a particular remembrance in
the Mass does not change the character of the religious
service and render it a mere private devotion; and fur-
ther, that the bequest is an aid to the support of the

In Pennsylvania bequests and devisees for Masses
are distinctly held to be gifts for religious uses, the
Supreme Court of that state having expressed the
same view of the law subsequently adopted in Illinois.
The courts use the following language: According to
the Roman Catholic system of faith there exists an
intermediate state of the soul, after death and before
final judgment, during which guilt incurred during life
and unatoned for must be expiated; and the temporary
punishments to which the souls of the penitent
are thus subjected may be mitigated or arrested
through the efficacy of the Mass as a propitiatory sac-
rifice. Hence the practice of offering Masses for the
departed. It cannot be doubted that, in obeying
the injunction of the testator, intercession would be
especially invoked in behalf of the testator alone. The
service is just the same in kind whether it be designed to
promote the spiritual welfare of one or many. Prayer
for the departed is no less efficacious than prayer for
a religious act as a petition for the salvation of thou-
sands. The services intended to be performed in
carrying out the trust created by the testator's will,
as well as the objects designed to be attained, are all
essentially religious in their character" (Rhymers' Ap-
peal, 65 Pa., 142). In Pennsylvania care must be
taken to observe the provisions of the Act of 26 April,
1855, P. L., 342, which prohibits devisees or legacies for
charitable or religious uses, unless by will executed at
least one month before the death of the testator. A
gift to be expanded for Masses, being a religious use,
would come within this statute. The provisions of the
late relations involving witnesses, requiring the credi-
tible and interested witnesses when any gift is made
by will for religious or charitable uses, should also be
noted.

In Massachusetts the courts take the same view as
those of Pennsylvania, that gifts for Masses are to be
sustained as for religious uses (Re Schouler, 134 Mass.,
126).

In Iowa the Supreme Court has sustained a bequest
"to the Catholic priest who may be pastor of the R.
Catholic Church when this will shall be executed, three
dollars that Masses may be said for me," as valid, al-
though it contains no element of a charitable use.
The court says: "We have said that this bequest, if the
priest should receive it, is a private trust; and we think it
essential elements of such a trust, as much as it would if the
object were the erection of a monument or the doing
of any other act intended alone to perpetuate the
memory or name of the testator. But even if there is a
technical departure because of no living beneficiary,
still the bequest is valid. We have also said that it is
not a charitable trust, but a trust in good conscience,
or a trust under the Act of 1855. We hold that it is a
charity in its nature, and that the object is one of a
charity in it. It seems to be a matter entirely personal
to the testator. In one or more cases the courts have
felt the necessity in order to sustain such a bequest, to
denominate it a charity because charitable bequests
have had the sanction of the law. We know of no such
limitation on testamentary acts as that bequests or
calls to charities must be made by persons who are the
holders of a charity in the legal sense, if others are to
be deemed to be charitable, if an otherwise lawful"

It follows then that there is no legal prohibition on
bequests for Masses in any of the United States either
on the ground of public policy or because they offend
against any inherent principle of right. But care must
be taken in drafting the will to observe the statutes,
where any exist, in relation to devises or bequests in
trust for any purpose as well as the current of decisions
where cases have arisen. The language should be clear
and drawn in accordance with legal rules. It should
not be left to the chances of interpretation.

See the authorities quoted above.

WALTER GEORGE SMITH.

Massillon. See Semipelagians.

Massillon, Jean-Baptiste, celebrated French
preacher and bishop; b. 24 June, 1663; d. 28 Sep-
tember, 1742. The son of François Massillon, a notary
of Hyères in Provence, he began his studies in the
college of that town and completed them in the college
of Marseilles, both under the Oratorians. He entered
the Congregation of the Oratory at the age of eighteen.
After his novitiate and theological studies, he was sent
as professor to the colleges of the congregation at
Pézenas, Marseilles, Montbrison, and, lastly, Vienne,
where he taught philosophy and theology for six years
(1689-95).

Ordained priest in 1691, he commenced preaching
in the chapel of the Oratory at Vienne and in the vicin-
ity of that city. Upon the death of Villeroi, Arch-
bishop of Lyons (1693), he was called upon to deliver
the funeral oration, and six months later that of M.
de Villars, Archbishop of Vienne. Joining the Lyons
Oratory in 1695, and summoned to Paris in the follow-
ing year, to be director of the Seminary of Saint-
Mauguir, he was thenceforward able to devote himself
exclusively to preaching. As director of this seminary
he delivered those lectures (conférences) to young
clerics which are still highly esteemed. But a year
later he was removed from his position at Saint-
Mauguir for having occupied himself too exclusively
with preaching. Having preached the Lent at Montpellier
in 1698, he preached it the next year at the Oratory of
Paris. His eloquence in this series of discourses was
very much approved, and, although he aimed at pre-
aching in a style unlike that of his predecessors, public
opinion already hailed him as the successor of Bossuet,
and Bourdaloue. At the age of 60, his eloquence was
reduced to silence by age. At the end of this year he
preached the Advent at the court of Louis XIV—an
honour which was in those days highly coveted as the
consecration of a preacher's fame. He justified every
hope, and the king wittily declared that, where he had
formerly been well pleased with the preachers, he was
now very ill pleased with himself. Massillon, by com-
mand, once more appeared in the chapel of Versailles
for the Lent of 1701. Bossuet, who, according to his
secretary, had thought Massillon very far from the
sublime in 1699, this time declared himself very well
satisfied, as was the king. Massillon was summoned
again for the Lent of 1704. This was the apogee of his
success and his success. The king assiduously
attended his sermons, and in the royal presence Mas-
Massorah delivered that discourse "On the Fowlness of the Elect", which is considered his masterpiece. Nevertheless, whether because the compromising relations of the orator with certain great families had produced a bad impression on the king, or because of hisesy in Paris. Only believing him inclined—as some of his brethren of the Oratory were thought to be—to Jansenism, Massillon was never again summoned to preach at the Court during the life of Louis XIV, nor was he even put forward for a bishopric. Nevertheless he continued, from 1704 to 1718, to preach Lent and Advent discourses with great success in various churches of Paris. Only in the Advent of 1715 did he leave those churches to preach before the Court of Stanislas, King of Lorraine.

In the interval he preached, with only moderate success, sermons at ceremonies of taking the habit, panegyrics, and funeral orations. Of his funeral orations that on Louis XIV is still famous, above all for its opening: "God alone is great"—uttered at the grave of a prince to whom his contemporaries had yielded the title of "The Great".

After the death of this king Massillon, aged 1710, was given to favour at Court. In 1717 the regent nominated him to the Bishopric of Clermont (Auvergne); and in 1718 he was made a cardinal of the Oratory, of Jansenism, and again he is so lax as to be accused of complaisance for the sensibilities and the philosophy of his time. His chief merit was to have excelled in depicting the passions, to have spoken to the heart in a language it always understood, to have,mined the great, and, princes, understand the loftiest teachings of the Gospel, and to live as a bishop conform to those teachings. During Massillon's lifetime only the funeral oration on the Prince de Conti was published (1709); he even disavowed a collection of sermons which appeared under his name at Toulouse (1705, 1706, 1714). The first complete edition of his orations was published by his nephew, Father Joseph Massillon, of the Oratory; it has been frequently reprinted. But the best edition was that of Blampon, Bar-le-Duc, 1855-68, and Paris, 1868, in four vols. It comprises ten sermons for Advent, forty-one for Lent, eight on the mysteries, four on virtues, six on panegyrics, six on sermons, six on ordinations, six on SYNODAL discourses, twenty-six sermons, paraphrases on thirty psalms, some penes chrestes, and some fifty miscellaneous lections or notes.

Massorah, the textual tradition of the Hebrew Bible, an official registration of its words, consonants, vowels and accents. It is doubtful whether the word should be pointed הָנָּשָׁה (from הָנָּשָׁה, "to bind") or הָנָּשָׁה (from the New Hebrew verb, הָנָּשָׁה, "to hand down"). The former pointing is seen in Ezek. xx, 37; the latter is due to the fact that, in the Mishna, the word's primary meaning is "tradition". Our chief witness to Massorah is the actual text of MSS. of the Hebrew Bible. Other witnesses are several collections of Massorah, and the numerous marginal notes scattered over Hebrew MSS. The upper and lower margins and the end of the MS. contain the Greater Massorah, such as lists of words; the side margins contain the Lesser Massorah, such as variants. The best collection of Massorah is that of Ginsburg, "The Massorah compiled from MSS. alphabetically and lexically arranged" (3 vols. his works). Massorah will treat (I) the history and (II) the critical value of Massorah. For the number and worth of Massoretic MSS., see MSS. of the Bible.
I. HISTORY OF MASSORAH.—Their sacred books were to the Jews an inspired code and record, a God-intended means to conserve the political and religious unity of the community. For this purpose they employed a method of interpunction, the Massorah, by means of which it was arranged that certain letters and other elements of the Hebrew text should have characteristic marks upon them to keep those books intact. So far back as the first century B.C., copyists and revisers were trained and employed to fix the Hebrew text. All had one purpose,—to copy הִגְמָטִיס יִשְׂרָאֵל, i.e., according to the face-value of the Massorah. To reproduce their exemplar perfectly, to hand down the Massorah, to make this and nothing more was purposed by the official copyists of the Hebrew Bible. Everything new was shunned. There is evidence that false pronunciations were fixed by Massorah centuries before the invention of points such as are seen in our present Massorethic text. At times such early translations as those of Aquila, Theodotion, the LXX and the Peshitto give evidence of precisely the same erroneous pronunciation as is found in the pointed Hebrew text of to-day.

(1) The Consonantal Text.—Hebrew had no vowels in its alphabet. Vowel sounds were for the most part handed down by tradition. Certain consonants, כ, ב, ה, and sometimes ר, were used to express some long vowel sounds after certain letters. The Rabbis, therefore, because they determined the pronunciation. The efforts of copyists would seem to have become more and more minute and detailed in the perpetuation of the consonantal text. These copyists (פרמיטרי) were at first called Sopherim (from ספירה, “to count”), because, as the Talmud says, “they counted all the letters in the Torah” (Kiddushin, 34a). It was not until later on that the name Massoretes was given to the preservers of Massorah. In the Talmudic period (c. A.D. 300–500), the rules for perpetuating Massorah were extremely detailed. Only skins of clean animals must be used for parchment rolls and fastenings thereof. Each column must be of equal length, not more than sixty letters or less than twenty. The line must contain thirty letters, written with black ink of a prescribed make-up and in the square letters which were the ancestors of our present Hebrew text-letters. The copyist must have before him an authentic copy of the text; and must not write from memory a single letter, not even a god,—every letter must be copied on the exemplar, letter for letter. The interval between consonants should be the breadth of a hair; between words, the breadth of a narrow consonant; between sections, the breadth of nine consonants; between books, the breadth of three lines. Such numerous and minute rules, though scrupulously observed, were not enough to perpetuate the consonantal text fixed and unchanged. Letters were omitted which had surreptitiously crept in; variants and conjectural readings were indicated in side-margins,—words, “read but not written” (Qere), “written but not read” (Kethibh), “read one way but written another.” These marginal critical notes went on increasing with time. Still more was done to fix the consonantal text. The words and letters of each verse and of every section of the twenty-four books of the Hebrew Bible were counted. The middle words and middle letters of books and sections were noted. The Talmud, we see how one rabbi was wont to take with him a copy of the Talmud, and this with such trivial textual questions as the interpretation of certain letters in this or that section of a scroll, and the number of times that certain words and phrases occurred in the several books of the whole Bible; and searched for mystic connotations in the consonantal text and in the interpunction. The rabbis counted the number of times certain words and phrases occurred in the several books of the whole Bible; and searched for mystic connotations in the consonantal text. They were wont to mark with distinctive signs certain letters in this or that section of a scroll, and the number of times that certain words and phrases occurred equally often,—for instance, of the word תּוֹם (Tomm, γέφύρ) among other words that occurred equally often. For instance, of the word נֶטֶן (Neten, тομές) among other words that occurred equally often. It was a part of the copyist’s work to keep a record of the number of times certain words and phrases occurred in the several books of the whole Bible; and searched for mystic connotations in the consonantal text. They were wont to mark with distinctive signs certain letters in this or that section of a scroll, and the number of times that certain words and phrases occurred equally often,—for instance, of the word תּוֹם (Tomm, γέφύρ) among other words that occurred equally often. For instance, of the word נֶטֶן (Neten, тομές) among other words that occurred equally often.
Massoulié, Antoine, theologian, b. at Toulouse, 28 Oct., 1632; d. at Rome, 23 Jan., 1706. At an early age he entered the Order of St. Dominic, in which he held many important offices; but above all these he prized study, teaching, and writing, for the love of which he refused a bishopric and asked to be relieved of distraction duties. It was said that he knew by heart the Summa of St. Thomas. He devoted himself with such earnestness to the study of Greek and Hebrew that he could converse fluently in both of these languages. His knowledge of Hebrew enabled him to overcome in public debate two Jewish Rabbins, one at Avignon in 1658, the other at Florence in 1665. The method of his argument is full of error and evasion being modestly ascribed by Massoulié to pray more than to successful disputations. His published works and some unpublished manuscripts (preserved in the Casanatense Library at Rome) may be divided into two classes: those written in defence of the Thomistic doctrine of physical premonition, relating to God's omniscience on the one hand, and the unfortunate Quietists, whom he strenuously opposed, both by attacking their false teachings and also by explaining the true doctrine according to the principles of St. Thomas. His principal works are: "Divus Thomas sui interpres de divina motione et libertate creata" (Rome, 1696). Orationes... "Summam theologiam de a. Thomas sur les trois vies, purgative, illuminative et unitive" (Toulouse, 1678); "Traité de la véritable oraison, où les erreurs des Quitistes sont réfutées" (Paris, 1699); "Traité de l'amour de Dieu" (Paris, 1703). See also E. Chambry, Script. Ord. Prad. II, 793; Toussaint, "Histoire des hommes ilus. V, 751-73; Hurter, Nomenclator. D. J. Kennedy.

Massuet, René, Benedictine patologist, of the Congregation of St. Maur; b. 13 Aug, 1666, at St. Ouen de Mancelles in the diocese of Evreux; d. 11 Jan., 1716, at St. Germain des Prés in Paris. He made his solemn profession in religion in 1682 at Notre Dame de Lire, and studied at Bonnouvelle in Orleans, where he showed more than ordinary ability. After teaching at the Academy of the Congregation, in 1690 he entered the University of Paris and studied the sciences. He entered the Benedictine Order at the Abbey of St. Stephen's, in Caen, he attended the lectures of the University and obtained the degrees of bachelor and licentiate in law. After this he taught at the University of Caen and three years at Fécamp. He spent the year 1702 in Rome in the study of Greek. The following year he was called to St. Germain des Prés and taught theology there to the end of his life. His principal work, which he undertook rather reluctantly, is the edition of the writings of St. Ireneus, Paris, 1710. An elegant edition of these writings had appeared at Oxford, 1702, but the editor, John Erasmus Graebe, was less intent on an accurate rendering of the text than on making Ireneus favour Anglican views. Massuet enriched his edition with valuable annotations on the heresies impugned by St. Ireneus and on the life, writings, and teaching of the saint. He also edited the fifth volume of the "Annales Ord. S. Ben." of Mabillon, with some additions and a preface inclusive of the biographies of Mabillon and Ruinart. We owe him, moreover, a letter to John B. Langlois, S.J., in defence of the Benedictine Order, with a number of annotations on the heresies impugned by St. Augustine, and five letters addressed to Bernard P. found in Schelhorn's "Amenonites Literarius". He left in manuscript a work entitled "Augustinus Graecus", in which he quotes all the passages of St. John Chrysostom on grace.

Theol. Quartalschrift, 1833, 452; Tassin, Congr. von St. Maur (Frankfurt, 1773), 375; Hurter, Nomencl. IV (Innsbruck, 1910), 827; Kirchenlexikon, s. v.; Buecherberger, Kirch. Handz., s. v.

Francis Mershmann.

Massys (Massys, Metzis). Quentin, painter, b. at Louvain in 1456; d. at Antwerp in 1530 (bet. 13 July and 16 September), and not in 1529, as his episcopal states (it dates from the seventeenth century). The life of this great artist is all adorned, or obscured, with legends. It is a fact that he was the son of a smith. There is nothing to prove, but it is not impossible that he first followed his father's trade. In any case he was a "bronzier" and "bronzier". On 29 March, 1526, Erasmus wrote to Bontzen that Massys had engraved a medallion of him (Effigiem meam ludite aere). This was perhaps the medal dated 1519, a copy of which is at the Museum of Basle. In 1575 Molanus in his history of Louvain states that Quentin is the author of the standard of the baptismal fonts at St.-Pierre, but his name is the same as that of a painter very well known over the well in the Marché-aux-Gantes at Antwerp, which popular tradition attributes to him, the attribution is purely fanciful. Tradition also states that the young smith, in love with a young woman of Antwerp, became a painter for her sake. Indeed this pretty fable explains the poetical character of Massys. All his works are like love songs. Factual is the only that the young man, an orphan since he was fifteen, was emancipated by his mother April 4, 1491, and that in the same year he was entered as a painter on the registers of the Guild of Antwerp. He kept a studio which four different pupils entered from 1495 to 1510.

He had six children by his first marriage with Alyt van Tuyl. She died in 1521. Another wife, in 1508 or 1509, he married Catherine Heyns, who bore him, according to some, ten children, according to

Walter Drum.
others, seven. He seems to have been a respected personage. As has been seen, he had relations with Erasmus, whose portrait he painted in 1517 (the original, or an ancient copy, is at Hampton Court), and with the latter's friend, Petrus Egidius (Peter Gillis), magistrate of Antwerp, whose portrait by Massys is preserved by Lord Radnor at Longford. Dürrer went to visit him immediately on his return from his famous journey to the Low Countries in 1519. On 29 July of that year Quentin had purchased a house, for which he had perhaps carved a wooden statue of his patron saint. In 1520 he worked together with 250 other artists on the triumphal arches for the entry of Emperor Charles V. In 1524 on the death of Joachim Patenier he was named guardian of the daughters of the deceased. This is all we learn from documentary sources concerning him. He led a quiet, well-ordered, middle-class, happy life, which scarcely tallies with the legendary figure of the little smith becoming a painter through love of art.

Nevertheless, in this instance also, the legend is right. For nothing explains better the appearance in the dull prosaic Flemish School of the charming genius of this lover-poet. It cannot be believed, as Molanus asserts, that he was the pupil of Rogier van der Weyden, since Rogier died in 1482, two years before Quentin's birth. But the masters whom he might have encountered at Louvain such as Gonts, or even Dirck, the best among them, distress by a lack of taste and imagination a dryness of ideas and style which is the very opposite of Massys's manner. Add to this that his two earliest known works, in fact the only two which count, the "Life of St. Anne" at Brussels and the Antwerp triptych, the "Deposition from the Cross", date respectively from 1498 and 1511, that is to say, a period when the master was nearly fifty years old. Up to that age we know nothing concerning him. The "Banker and His Wife" (Louvre) and the "Portrait of a Young Man" (Collection of Mme. André), his only dated works besides his masterpieces, belong to 1513 and 1514 (or 1519). We lack all the elements which would afford us a formation. He seems like an inexplicable, miraculous flower.

When it is remembered that his great paintings have been almost ruined by restorations, it will be understood that the question of Massys contains insoluble problems. In fact the triptych of St. Anne at Brussels is perhaps the most gracious, tender and sweet of all the painting of the North. And it will always be mysterious, unless the principal theme, which represents the family or the parents of Christ, affords some light. It is the theme, dear to Memling, of "spiritual conversations", of those sweet meetings of heavenly persons, in earthly costumes, in the serenity of a Paradise court. This subjectivity is wholly Teriër and mystic, Memling, as is known, had brought from Germany, where it had been tirelessly repeated by painters, especially by him who was called because of this, the Master of the Heiligen Sippe. Here the musical, immaterial harmony, resulting from a composition which might be called symphonic, was enhanced by a new harmony, which was the feeling of purity, has never been expressed in all the assembled persons. It was the poem arising from the quite Germanic intimacy of the love of family. One is reminded of Suss or of Tauler. The loving, tender genius of Massys would be stirred to grave joy in such a subject. The exquisite history of St. Anne, that poem of maternity, of the holiness of the desire to survive in posterity, has never been expressed in a more penetrating, chaste, disquieting art.

Besides, it was the beginning of the sixteenth century and Italian influences were making themselves felt everywhere. Massys translated them into his brilliant architecture, into the spaciousness of the refined which he imparted to the blue summits of the mountains, to the horizons of his landscapes. A charming luxury mingles with his ideas and disfigures them. It was a unique work, a unique period; that of an ephemeral agreement between the genius of the North and that of the Renaissance, between the world of sentiment and that of beauty of which was at the foundation of all the desires of the South, from Dürrer to Rembrandt and Goethe, was realised in the simple thought of the ancient smith. By force of candour, of melancholy, he loved and he found the secret which others sought in vain. With still greater passion, the same qualities are found in the Antwerp "Deposition". The subject is treated, not as the Florentine or Umbrìan "Pietà", but with the familiar and tragic sentiment which touches the Northern races. It is one of the "Tombs" compositions, of which the most famous are those of Saint Mihiel and Solesmes. The face of the most exhausted, the most "dead", the most moving that painting has ever created. All is full of tenderness and desolation.

Massys has the genius of tears. He loves to paint tears in large pearls on the eyes, on the red cheeks of his holy women, as in his wonderful "Magdalen" of Berlin or his "Pietà" of Munich, or even in that of the same time the keenest sense of grace. His Heroi diades, his Salomes (Antwerp triptych) are the most bewitching figures of all the art of his time. And this excitable nervousness made him particularly sensitive to the ridiculous side of things. He had a sense of the grotesque, of caricature, of the droll and the hideous, which is displayed in his figures of old men, of executioners. And this made him a wonderful genre painter. His "Banker" and his "Money Changers" inaugurated in the Flemish School the rich tradition of the painting of manners. He had a pupil in this style, Marinus, many of whose pictures still pass under his name.

Briefly, Massys was the last of the great Flemish artists prior to the Italian invasion. He was the most sensitive, the most nervous, the most poetical, the most comprehensive of all, and in him is discerned the
tumultuous strain which was to appear 100 years later in the innumerable works of Rubens.

**VAMANDER. Le Livre des Peintres, ed. HYMANS. (Paris, 1888).**

*Hyman, Quentin Matsys in Gazette des Beaux-Arts (1888); COHEN, Stadten zu Quentin Matsys (Bonn, 1894); DE BOSCHER, Quentin Matsys (Brussels, 1907);\* Niederländisches Künstlerlexicon (Leipz., 1906-10).

**LOUIS GILLET.**

**Master of Arts.** See **Arts, Master of.**

**Master of the Sacred Palace.**—This office (which has always been entrusted to a Friar Preacher) may briefly be described as being that of the pope's theologian. St. Dominic, appointed in 1218, was the first Master of the Sacred Palace (Magister Sacri Palatii). Among the eighty-four Dominicans who have succeeded him, eighteen were subsequently created cardinals, twenty-four were made archbishops or bishops (including some of the cardinals), and six were elected generals of the order. Several are famous for their works on theology, etc., but only Durandus, Torquemada, Prierias, Mamachi, and Orsi can be mentioned here. As regards nationality: the majority have been Italians; of the remainder ten have been Spaniards and ten Frenchmen; one has been a German and one an Englishman (i. e. William de Boderichia, or Bondenask, or 1270). It has sometimes been asserted that St. Thomas was a Master of the Sacred Palace. This is due to a misconception. He was Lector of the Sacred Palace. The offices were not identical. (See Bullarium O. P. III, 18.) Though he and two other contemporary Dominicans, namely his teacher Bl. Albert the Great and his fellow pupil Bl. Ambrose Sancesconio (about both of whom the same assertion has been made) held successively the office of Lector on Scripture or on Theology in the papal palace school, not one of them was Master of the Sacred Palace. Their names do not occur in the official lists. While all Masters of the Sacred Palace were Dominicans, several members of other orders were Lectors of the Sacred Palace (e. g. Peckham O. S. F., who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1279).

St. Dominic's work as Master of the Sacred Palace consisted partly at least in expounding the Epistles of St. Paul (Colonna, O. P. c. 1255, who says that the commentary was then extant; Flaminius; S. Antonius, a monk near 1253 who was given it; the Epistles used by the Saint as Master of the Sacred Palace was preserved in Toulouse; Echard; Renazzi; Mortier, etc.). These exegetical lectures were delivered to prelates and to the clerical attendants of cardinals who, as the saint observed, had been accustomed to gather in the antechamber and to spend the time in gossip while their masters were having audiences with the pope. According to Renazzi (I. 25), St. Dominic may be regarded as the founder of the papal palace school, since his Biblical lectures were the occasion of its being established. Catalanus, who, however, is not guilty of the confusion alluded to above, says he was the first Lector of the Sacred Palace and that the Epistles were given him in 1253 and that in the thirteenth century the chief duty of the Master of the Sacred Palace was to lecture on Scripture and to preside over the theological school in the Vatican: "in schola Romana et Pontificia regimine et in publica sacra scripture expositione" (Echard). The Lectores or Magistri scholastorum S. Palatii taught under him. It became customary for the Master of the Sacred Palace, according to Cardinal de Luca, to preach before the pope and his court in Advent and Lent. This had probably been sometimes done by St. Dominic. Up to the sixteenth century the Master of the Sacred Palace preached, but after it this work was permanently entrusted to his companion (a Dominican) by Benedict XIV (Decree, "Inculta Fratrum", 1743); present the companion preaches to the papal household, and a Capuchin preaches to the pope and to the cardinals.

But the work of the Master of the Sacred Palace as papal theologian continues to the present day. As it has assumed its actual form by centuries of development, we may give an account of the legislation respecting it and the various functions it comprises and also of the honours attaching to it. The Acta (or "Calenda") of the Palantine officials in 1409 (under Alexander V) show that on certain days the Master of the Sacred Palace was bound to deliver lectures and on other days was expected, if called upon, either to propose or to answer questions at the theological conference which was held in the pope's presence. On 30 October, 1439, Eugenius IV decreed that the Master of the Sacred Palace should rank next to the dean of the Rota, that no one should preach before the pope whose sermon had not been previously approved of by him, and that in accordance with ancient usage no one could be made a doctor of theology in Rome but by him (Bullarium O. P. III, 81). Callixtus III (13 November, 1455) confirmed and amplified the second part of this decree, but at the same time exempted cardinals from its operation (ibid., p. 356). At present it has fallen into disuse.

The Fifth Lateran Council (sext. x, 4 May, 1513) Leo X ordained that no theologian was to be ordained without consecration in Rome or in its district without leave from the cardinal vicar and the Master of the Sacred Palace (ibid., IV, 318). Paul V (11 June, 1620) and Urban VIII added to the obligations imposed by this decree. So did Alexander VII in 1663 (Bullarium, passim). All these later enactments regard the inhabitants of the Roman Province or of the Papal States. They were renewed by Benedict XIV (1 Sept., 1744). And the permission of the Master of the Sacred Palace must be got not only to print, but to publish, and before the second permission is granted, three printed copies must be deposited with him, one for himself, another for his companion, another for the Roman Vicariate. The Roman Vicariate never examines work intended for publication. For centuries the imprimatur of the Master of the Sacred Palace who always examines them followed the St. videbitur Reverendissimo Magistro Sacri Palatii of the cardinal vicar; now in virtue of custom but not of any ascertained law, since about 1855 the diocesan gave the name to the office and it follows that of the Master of the Sacred Palace. At present the obligation once incumbent on cardinals of presenting their work to the Master of the Sacred Palace for his imprimatur has fallen into disuse, but through courtesy many cardinals do present their works. In the Constitution "Officiorum ac munerum" (25 Jan., 1897) Leo XIII declared that all persons residing in Rome may get leave from the Master of the Sacred Palace to read forbidden books, and that if authors who live in Rome intend to get their works published elsewhere, the joint imprimatur of the cardinal vicar and the Master of the Sacred Palace renders it unnecessary to ask any other approbation. As is well known, if an author not resident in Rome desires to have his work published there, provided that an agreement with the author's Ordinary has been made and that the Master of the Sacred Palace judges favourably of the work, the imprimatur will be given. In this case the book is known by its having two title-pages: the one bearing the name of the domiciliary, the other of the Roman publisher.

Before the establishment of the Congregations of the Inquisition (in 1542) and Index (1567), the Master of the Sacred Palace condemned books and forbade reading them under censure. Instances of his so doing occur regularly till about the middle of the sixteenth century; one occurred as late as 1604, but he degrees this task to the above-mentioned congregations of which he is an ex officio member. The Master of the Sacred Palace was
made by Pius V (29 July, 1570; see "Bullarium", V, 245) canon theologian of St. Peter's, but this Bull was revoked by his successor Gregory XIII (11 March, 1575). From the time when Leo X recognised the Roman University or "Sapienza" (5 November, 1513; by the Decree "Dum suavisissimo") he transferred to it the old theological school of the papal palace. The Master of the Sacred Palace became the president of the new theological faculty. The other members were the pope's grand sacristan (an Augustinian), the commissary of the Holy Office (a Dominican), the procurators general of the five Mendicant Orders, I. e. Dominican, Franciscan (Conventual), Augustinian, Carmelite, and Servite, and the professors who succeeded to the ancient Lectors of the Sacred Palace. Sixtus V is by some regarded as the founder of this college or faculty, but he may have only given its definite form. It is said he had to confirm the prerogative enjoyed by the Master of the Sacred Palace of conferring all degrees of philosophy and theology. Instances of papal diplomas implying this power of the Master of the Sacred Palace occur in the "Bullarium" passim (e. g. of Innocent IV, 6 June, 1406). The presidential authority of the Master of the Sacred Palace over this, the greatest theological faculty in Rome, was confirmed by Leo XI in 1624. But under Clement XI in 1770 the Sapienza has been laicized and turned into a state university. It is said that on the special occasions when the Master of the Sacred Palace holds an examination, e. g. for the purpose of examining all that are to be appointed to sees in Italy, or again of conferring the title of S.T.D., he does so, with the assistance of the high dignitaries just mentioned, in his apartments in the Vatican. He is also examiner in the concursus for parishes in Rome which are held in the Roman Vicariate. Before Eugene IV issued the Bull referred to above, the Master of the Sacred Palace was in processions, etc., the dignitary immediately under the Apostolic subdeacons, but when this pope raised the auditors of the Rota to the rank of Apostolic subdeacons, he placed the Master of the Sacred Palace the place immediately next to the dean who was in charge of the papal mitre. In 1655, Alexander VII put the other auditors of the Rota above the Master of the Sacred Palace. This was done, according to Cardinal de Luca, solely because one white and black hat looking for several years amounted to a sinecure. The official duties of the Master of the Sacred Palace is performed in conjunction with the auditors of the Rota; namely to watch over the three apertures or "drums" through which during a conclave the cardinals receive all communications. In papal processions the Master of the Sacred Palace walks next to the auditors, immediately behind the bearer of the tiara.

Though he has, as we have seen, gradually lost some of his ancient authority and rank, nevertheless at the present day the Master of the Sacred Palace is a very high official. He is one of the three Palatine prelates (the others being the Maggiordomo and the Grand Almoner) to whom as to bishops, the papal guards presented with their addresses, even by foreigners, as "Most Reverend". In the Dominican Order he ranks next to the general, ex-general, and vicar-general. He is ex-officio consultor of the Holy Office, prelate-consultor of Rites, and perpetual assistant of the Index. He is consultant of the Biblical Commission, and is frequently consulted on various matters, as the theologians. As the Pope's chaplain, his presence occurs once a fortnight. The official apartment of the Master of the Sacred Palace was in the Quirinal, and until recently it contained the unbroken series of portraits of the Masters of the Sacred Palace, from St. Dominic down. These frescoes have been effaced by the present occupants of the Quirinal, but copies of them are to be seen in the temporary apartment of the Master of the Sacred Palace in the Vatican.

---

**Bullarium O.P., VIII (Rome, 1730-1740); MSS. in Vatican, Dominican Order, and Minerva Archives; Antonios, Chronicon, Antiquitatum Olympeens, vol. 1850; MALTEMPO, Bullari sopra la storia delle Sacre Rappresentazioni di Roma (Naples, 1627); FONTANA, Sylloge Magisterii Sacri Palatii Apostolici (Rome, 1695); DE LUCA, Romana Curia Relativa (Rome, 1683); CATANEI, Storia dell' Universita Romana, etc. (Rome, 1693-1700); QUETEUR, Éscriptres, Ordina Praticciarum (Paris, 1719); CARAFFA, De Gymnasio Romano (Rome, 1761), 125-145; RICAMBI, Storia dell' Universita Romana, etc. (Rome, 1803-1806); passim: MONIER, Histoire des Maitres Generaux de l'Ordre des Freres Precheurs (Paris, 1803; in progress); BATTANDIER, Annuaire Pont. Cath. (1801); RENAUDIN, REGINALD WALKER.

**Master of the Sentences.** See Peter Lombard.

**Mastrius, Bartholomew, Franciscan, philosopher and theologian, b. near Forli, at Meldola, Italy, in 1602; d. 3 Jan., 1673. He was one of the most prominent writers of his time on philosophy and theology. He received his early education at Cesena, and took degrees at the University of Bologna. He frequented the Universities of Padua and Rome before assuming the duties of lecturer. He acquired a profound knowledge of scholastic philosophy and theology, being deeply versed in the writings of Scotus. He was an open-minded and independent scholar. As a controversialist he was harsh and arrogant towards his opponents, mingling in his writings a mixture of audacity and modesty. His opinions on some philosophical questions were fiercely combated by many of his contemporaries and especially by Matthew Fesch and the Irish Franciscan, John Ponce. When presenting the second volume of his work on the "Sentences" to Alexander VII, to whom he had dedicated it, the pope asked him where he had learned to treat the questions in this book. His answer was: "in the manner of the sententiae". His statements on the interpretation of Holy Scripture were "hard and not without reason": the pope smilingly remarked, "From such masters other things could be learned". Ponce in his treatise on Logic holds that with qualifying explanations of God's words in the Scriptures in the Categories. Mastrius in combating this opinion characteristically says, "hic Pontius male tractat Deum sicut et alter". Mastrius had a well-ordered intellect which is seen in the clearness and precision with which he sets forth the subject-matter of discussion. His arguments for and against a proposition are of a real critical power, correct, and clear language. His numerous quotations from ancient and contemporary authors and various schools of thought are a proof of his extensive reading. His works shed light on some of the difficult questions in Scotistic philosophy and theology. His "Philosophy" in five volumes folio, his "Sentences" in four volumes, and his Moral Theology "ad mentem S. Bonaventurae" in one volume were all published at Venice.

**Wadding-Sharpe, Scriptores Ord. Min. (Rome, 1808); Ioannes A. Antonii, Bibliotheca universale Francorum (Madrid, 1732); THELEAUL, Triumphus Saprophicus (Velletri, 1656); FRANCESCI, Bibliotheca di scrittori francescani (Modena, 1863); HUNTER, Nomenclator.

**Gregory Cleary.**

**Mataco Indians (or Mataguayos).—A group of wild tribes of very low culture, ranging over a great part of the western Chaco region, about the head waters of the Vermejo and the Pilemomayo, in the Argentine province of Salta and the Bolivian province of Tarija, and noted for the efforts made by Jesuit and Franciscan missionaries in their behalf in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The group consists of or is derived from four tribes, distinguished by speaking the same language with slight dialectic differences, and together constituting a distinct linguistic stock, the Matacoan or Mataguayans, which, however, Quevedo suspects to be connected with the Guaycuran stock, to which belong the Toba, Mocobi and the famous Abipon tribes. Of the Matacoan group the principal tribes were the Mataco, Mataguayu, and Vejoe. At present the names in most use are..."
are Mataco in Argentina and Nocten (corrupted from their Chiriguano name) in Bolivia. From 60,000 (estimated) in the mission period they are now reduced to about 20,000 souls. In 1690 Father Ares, from the Jesuit college of Tarja, attempted the first missionary work. At a later period, 1755, the Jesuit mission of San Ignacio de Leodesa on the Rio Grande, a southern head stream of the Vermejo, was founded for Toba and Matagauyo, of whom 600 were enrolled there at the time of the expulsion of the order in 1767.

About the end of the eighteenth century the Franciscans of Tarja undertook to restore the mission work in the Chaco, founding a number of establishments, among which were Salinas, occupied by Matagauyo and Chiriguano, and Canta (now Olta, Salta province), occupied by Matagauyo and Vejos, the two missions in 1799 containing nearly 900 Indians, with 7300 cattle. With the decline of the Spanish power these missions also fell into decay and the Indians went over to the Caracas rivers. In 1854, when the Piedmont Ligurian missionaries, passing by the place where the old Cents mission, found a cattle corral where the church had been. An interesting account of the present condition of the wild Mataco is quoted by Quevedo from a letter by Father Alejandro Corrado, Franciscan, at Tarja. Their houses are light brush structures scattered through the forests, hardly high enough to allow of standing upright, and are abandoned for others set up in another place as often as insects or accumulation of filth make necessary. The only furniture is a wooden mortar with a few earthen pots, and some skins for sleeping. Men and women shave their hair and wear several girdles about the part of the body. The men also pluck out the beard and paint the face and body. They live chiefly upon fish and the fruit of the algarroba, a species of mesquite or honey-locust, but will eat anything that is not poisonous, even rats and grasshoppers. From the algarrobas they prepare an intoxicating liquor which robs them of their appearance, Mayaguan festival ceremony is in connexion with the ripening of the algarrobas, when the priests in fantastic dress go out about the trees, dancing and singing at the top of their voices to the sound of a wooden drum, keeping up the din day and night. A somewhat similar ceremony takes place when a young girl arrives at puberty. Everything is in common, and a woman divides her load of fruits or roots with her neighbours without even a word of thanks. They recognize no authority, even of parents over their children. The men occupy themselves with fishing or occasional hunting, their arms being the bow and club. The women do practically all the other work.

People and at the will of the young people, the wife usually going to live with her husband's relatives. Polygamy and adultery are infrequent, but divorce is easy. The woman receives little attention in pregnancy or childbirth, but on the other hand the father conforms to the couvade. Children are named when two or three years old. Abortion is very frequent; infanticide more rare, but the infant is often buried alive on the breast of the dead mother.

Disease is driven off by the medicine men with singing and shaking of rattles. They believe in a good spirit to whom they seem to pay no worship; and in a malevolent night spirit, whom they strive to propitiate. They believe that the soul, after death, descends into the bowels of the earth upon the language of the Mataco tribes is the grammar and dictionary of the Jesuit missionary.

Father Joseph Araoz, with Quevedo's studies of the Nocten and Vejos dialects, from various sources.

ARAOZ, Grammar and Dictionary: BURTON, American Race (New York, 1811); CARLETON, Grammar of the Matagauyo (1756), Eng. tr., 2 vols. (London, 1760); HERVA, Catálogo de las Lenguas, 1 (Madrid, 1800); LÓPEZ, Descripción Cronológica del Gran Chaco (Corriola, 1753); PAÉZ, La Plata, the Argentine Confederation and Paraguay (New York, 1859); PELLECHI, Otto Men nel Gran Chaco (Florence, 1881), tr., Eight Months in the Gran Chaco (London, 1882); ROCCHI, Diccionario de las Lenguas Nocten y Vejos (Dialecto Nocten, Dialecto Vejos) in Bol. del Instituto Geográfico Argentino, XVI-XVII (Buenos Aires, 1898).

JAMES MOONEY.

Matelica. See Fabrianz and Matelica, Diocese of.

Mater, a titular bishopsric in the province of Byzantium, mentioned as a free city by Pliny under the name of Matra (Hist. natur., V, iv, 5). Mgr. Toulotte ("Géographie de l’Afrique chrétienne", proconsulaire, 197) cites only two occupants of this see: Rusticius, who died shortly before 411, and Quintus, who succeeded him. Gams (Series episcoporum, 497) mentions four: Rusticius, Celsus for Quintus, Adeleus in 484, and Victor about the year 556. Mater is now known as Mater, a small town of 4000 inhabitants, in great part Christian, and is situated in Tunis. The modern town is encircled with a wall, with three gates; it is situated on the railway from Tunis to Bizerta, not far from the lake to which it has given its name.

S. VAILÀTE.

Matera. See Acerenza, Archidiocese of.

Materialism.—As the word itself signifies, Materialism is a philosophical system which regards matter as the only reality in the world, which undertakes to explain every event in the universe as resulting from the conditions and activity of matter, and which thus denies the existence of God and the soul. It is diametrically opposed to Spiritualism and Idealism, which, in so far as they are one-sided and exclusive, declare that everything in the world is either mental or mental. If the world and even matter itself are mere conceptions or ideas in the thinking subject. Materialism is older than Spiritualism, if we regard the development of philosophy as beginning in Greece. The ancient Indian philosophy, however, is idealistic; according to it there is only one real being, Brahma; everything else is mere appearance. Certain Indian schools of philosophy were more or less materialistic; they assumed the existence of a single primordial matter—water, earth, fire, air—or of the four elements from which the world was held to have developed. Materialism was methodically developed by the Atomists. The first and also the most important systematic Materialist was Democritus, the "laughing philosopher". He taught that out of nothing comes nothing; that everything is the result of combination and division of parts (atoms); that these atoms, separated by empty spaces, are infinitely numerous and varied. Even to man he extended his cosmological Materialism, and was thus the founder of Materialism in the modern sense, that is the sense in which materialism is a complex of very fine, smooth, round, and fiery atoms; these are highly mobile and penetrate the whole body, to which they impart life. Empedocles was not a thorough-going Materialist, although he regarded the four elements with love and hatred as the formative principles of the universe, and refused to recognize a spiritual Creator of the world. Aristotle re-approaches the Ionian philosophers in general with attempting to explain the evolution of the world without the Nous (intelligence); he regarded Protagoras, who first introduced a spiritual principle, as a sober man among the inebriated.

The Socraetic School introduced a reaction against Materialism. A little later, however, Materialism found a second Democritus in Epicurus, who treated the system in greater detail and gave it a deeper four-
soul cease to exist. However, the soul is no mere odour of a body, but a being with real activity; consequently, it must itself be real, and likewise distinct from the body, since thought and volition are incorporeal activities, and, as Lucretius at least, is the only function of the atoms.

Christianity reared a mighty dam against Materialism, and it was only with the return to antiquity in the so-called restoration of the sciences that the Humanists again made it a powerful factor. Giordano Bruno the Pantheist, was also a Materialist: "Matter is not without its forms, but without substance; and since it carries what is wrapped up in itself, it is in truth all nature and the mother of all the living." But the classical age of Materialism began with the eighteenth century, when de la Mettrie (1709-51) wrote his "Histoire naturelle de l'âme" and "L'homme machine". He holds that all that feels must be material: "The soul is formed, it grows and decreases with the organs of the body, wherefore it must also share in the latter's death"—a palpable fallacy, since even if the body is only the soul's instrument, the soul must be affected by the varying conditions of the body. In the case of this Materialist we find the moral consequences of the system revealed without disguise. In his two works, "L'Observation" and "L'Always of the Catastrophe of Man", the soul is a kind of vapour scattered throughout the world, especially in organic structures and mental activities. However, the soul and its origin present no puzzle, for to Lucretius, the soul is a kind of vapour scattered throughout the world, and mixed with a little heat. The bodies surrounding us give off continually certain minute particles which penetrate to our souls through our sense-organs and excite mental images. With the dissolution of the body, the corporeal soul is also dissipated. The same materialistic conception of the immaterial nature of psychical states as opposed to those of the body—to say nothing of the childish notion of sense-perception, which modern physiology can regard only with an indulgent smile.

Epicurean Materialism received poetic expression and further development in the didactic poem of the Roman Lucretius. This bitter opponent of the gods, like the modern representatives of Materialism, places it in outspoken opposition to religion. His cosmology is that of Epicurus; but Lucretius goes much further, inasmuch as he really seeks to give an explanation of the order in the world, which Epicurus referred unreservedly to chance. Lucretius claims that chance is just one of the infinitely numerous possibilities in the arrangement of the atoms; the present order was as possible as any other. He takes particular pains to disprove the immortality of the soul, seeking thus to dispel the fear of death, which is the cause of so much care and crime. The soul (anima) and the mind (animus) consist of the smallest, roundest, and most mobile atoms. That "feeling is an excitement of the atoms", he lays down as a firmly established principle. He says: "When the flavour of the wine vanishes, or the odour of the ointment passes away in the air, we notice no diminution of weight. Even so with the body when the soul has disappeared." He overlooks the fact that the flame is not necessarily lower even though we cannot measure them. That they do not perish is now certain, and, we must therefore conclude, still the spiritual

In Germany Materialism was vigorously assailed, especially by Leibniz (q. v.). As, however, this philosophy sought to repress the consciousness of the body, it was subjected to a spiritualistic system, he did not give a real refutation. On the other hand, Kant was supposed to have broken definitively the power of Materialism by the so-called idealistic argument, which runs: Matter is revealed to us only in consciousness; it cannot therefore be the cause or the principle of consciousness, which are shown to be independent of matter, against Materialism, unless we admit that our consciousness creates matter, i.e. that matter has no existence independent of consciousness. If consciousness or the soul creates matter, the latter cannot impart existence to the soul or to any psychical activity. Materialism would indeed be thus utterly annihilated: there would be no matter. But, if matter can create consciousness, it may possess all kinds of activities, even psychical, as the Materialists aver. As long as the impossibility of this is not demonstrated, Materialism is not refuted. Idealism or Phenomenalism, which entirely denies the existence of matter, is more absurd than Materialism. There is, however, some truth in Kantian rationalism. Consciousness is a psychical is far better known to us than the material; what matter really is, no science has yet made clear. The intellectual or the psychical, on the other hand, is presented immediately to our consciousness; we experience our thoughts, volitions, and feelings; in their full clearness they stand before the eye of the mind. From the Kantian standpoint a refutation of Materialism is out of the question. To overcome it we must show that the soul is an entity, independent of and essentially distinct from the body, an immaterial substance; only as such can it be immortal and survive the dissolution of the body. For Kant, however, substance is a purely subjective form and not a standing thing. From the Kantian standpoint we arrange our experiences. The independence of the soul would thus not be objective; it would be simply an idea conceived by us. Immortality would also be
merely a thought-product; this the Materialists gladly admit, but they call it, in plainer terms, a pure fabrication.

The German Idealists, Fichte, Hegel, and Schelling, seriously espoused the Phenomenalism of Kant, declaring that matter, and, in fact, the whole universe, is a subjective product. Thereby indeed Materialism is entirely overcome, but the Kantian method of refutation is reduced to absurdity. The objection that this extravagant Spiritualism was inevitable, and it resulted by a sort of necessary consequence in the opposite extreme of outspoken Materialism. Repelled by these fantastic views, so contrary to all reality, men turned their whole energy to the investigation of nature. The extraordinary success achieved in this direction led to the nutriment of new notions of the importance of matter, its forces, and its laws, with which they believed they could explain even the spiritual. The chief representatives of Materialism as a system during this period are Büchner (1824–99), the author of "Kraft und Stoff"; K. Vogt (1817–95), who held that thought is "secreted" by the brain, as gall by the liver and urine by the kidneys; C. G. E. Noldeke (1817–73); Molschott, to whom his Materialism brought political fame. Born on 9 August, 1822, at Herzogenbusch, North Brabant, he studied medicine, natural science, and the philosophy of Hegel at Heidelberg from 1842. After some years of medical practice in Utrecht, he qualified as instructor in physiology and anthropology at the University of Leiden, where he published his "Kreislauf des Lebens" (1852), created a great sensation. On account of the gross materialism, which he displayed both in his works and his lectures, he received a warning from the academic senate by command of the Government, whereupon he accepted in 1854 a call to the newly founded University of Zürich. In 1861 Causer, the Italian professor, gave him a chair at Turin, whence fifteen years later he was called to the Sapienza in Rome, which owed its foundation to the popes. Here death suddenly overtook him in 1893, and, just as he had burnt the bodies of his wife and daughter who had committed suicide, he also appointed in his will that his own body should be reduced to ashes. The most radical rejection of everything ideal is contained in the revised work "Der Einzige und sein Eigentum" (1845; 3rd ed., 1893) of Max Stirner, which rejects everything transcending the particular Ego and its self-will.

The brilliant success of the natural sciences gave Materialism a powerful support. The scientist, in divining nothing but the power of material forces, and consequently of denying it. Absorption in the study of natural matter is apt to blind one to the spiritual; but it is an evident fallacy to deny the soul, on the ground that one cannot experimentally prove its existence by physical means. Natural science overlooks its limits when it encroaches on the spiritual domain and claims to pronounce there an expert decision, and it is a palpable error to declare that science demonstrates the non-existence of the soul. Various proofs from natural science are of course brought forward by the Materialists. The "closed system of natural causation" is appealed to: experience everywhere finds each natural phenomenon based upon another as its cause, and the chain of natural causes would be broken were the same brought in. On the other hand, Sigwart (1830–1904) justly observes that the soul has its share in natural causation, and is therefore included in the system. At most it could be deduced from this system that a pure spirit, that God could not create, is marvellous; but this cannot be proved by either experience or reason. On the contrary it is clear that the Author of nature can interfere in its course, and history informs us of His many miraculous interventions. In any case it is beyond doubt that our bodily conditions are influenced by our ideas and volitions, and this influence is more clearly perceived by us than the causality of fire in the production of heat. We must therefore reject as false the theory of a closed system of natural causation, if this means the exclusion of spiritual causes.

But modern science claims to have given positive proof that in the human body there is no place for the soul. The great discovery by R. Mayer (1814–78), Joule (1818–89), and Helmholtz (1821–94) of the conservation of energy proves that energy cannot disappear in nature and cannot originate there. But the soul could of itself create energy, and there would also be energy lost, whenever an external stimulus influenced the soul and gave rise to sensation, which is not a form of energy. Now recent experiment has shown that the energy in the human body is exactly equivalent to the energy consumed in the body. Therefore, however, there is absolutely nothing against the existence of the soul. The law of the conservation of energy is an empirical law, not a fundamental principle of thought; it is deduced from the material world and is based on the activity of matter. A body cannot set itself in motion, can produce no force; it must be impelled by another, which in the impact loses its own power of movement. This is not lost, but is changed into the new movement. Thus, in the material world, motion, which is really kinetic energy, can neither originate nor altogether cease. This law does not hold good for the immaterial world, which is not subject to the law of inertia. That our higher intellectual activities are bound to some external influence is plainly seen in our freedom of will, by which we determine ourselves either to move or to remain at rest. But the intellectual activities take place with the cooperation of the sensory processes; and, since these latter are functions of the bodily organs, they are like them subject to the law of inertia. They do not enter into being by themselves, but only through the cooperation of their activity without some external influence. They are, therefore, subject to the law of the conservation of energy, whose applicability to the human body, as shown by biological experiment, proves nothing against the soul. Consequently, while even without experiment, one must admit the law in the case of sentient beings, it can in no wise affect a pure spirit or an angel. The "Achilles" of materialistic philosophers, therefore, proves nothing against the soul. It was accordingly highly opportune when the eminent physiologist, Du Bois Reymond (1818–96), called a vigorous halt to his colleague by his "Ignoramus et Ignorabimus". In his lectures,"Ueber die Gesetze der Naturerkenntniss" (Leipzig, 1872), he shows that feeling, consciousness, etc., cannot be explained from the atoms. He errs indeed in declaring permanently inexplicable everything for which natural science cannot account; the explanation must be furnished by philosophy.

Even theologians have defended Materialism. Thus, for example, F. D. Strauss in his work "Der alte und neue Glaube" (1872) declares openly for Materialism, and even adopts it as the basis of his religion; the material universe with its laws, although they occasionally crush us, must be the object of our veneration. The cultivation of music compensates him for the loss of all ideal goods. Among the materialistic philosophers of this time, Ueberweg (1826–71), author of the well-known "History of Philosophy", deserves mention; it is noteworthy that he at first supported the Aristotelian teleology, but later fell away into materialistic mechanism. There is indeed considerable difficulty in demonstrating mathematically the final object of nature; with those to whom the consideration of time display, the fact that a sum does not bring the conviction that it cannot owe its origin to blind physical forces, proofs will avail but little. To us, indeed, it is inconceivable how any one can overlook or deny the evidences of design and of the adaptation of means for the attainment of manifold ends.
The teleological question, so awkward for Materialism, was thought to be finally settled by Darwinism, in the mechanism of the Origin of Species, Charles Darwin showed the door. The blind operation of natural forces and laws, without spiritual agencies, was held to explain the origin of species and their purposiveness as well. Although Darwin himself was not a Materialist, his mechanical explanation of teleology brought water to the mill of Materialism, which recognizes only the mechanism of "tacitly assumed," but rather the evolution of the organism from the protosperm to man, announced from university chairs as the result of science, was eagerly taken up by the social democrats, and became the fundamental tenet of their conception of the world and of life. Although officially socialists disown their hatred of religion, the rejection of the higher destiny of man, the concept of "the most advantageous" among the most advantageous, is but another instance of what the oldest experience shows: the line of progress is not vertical but spiral. Overstraining in one direction starts a rebound in the other, which usually reaches the opposite extreme. The spiritual will not be reduced to the material, but it frequently commits the error of refusing to tolerate the material. Thus at present the reaction against Materialism leads in many instances to an extreme Spiritualism or Phenomenalism, which regards matter merely as a projection of the soul. Hence the widely-echoed cry: "Back to Kant!" Kant regarded matter as entirely the product of consciousness, and this view is outraged by the failure of L. Böckh and others, "Geist und Körper, Seele und Leib" (Leipzig, 1903) earnestly to discredit Materialism. He treats exhaustively the relations of the psychical to the physical, refutes the so-called psycho-physical parallelism, and decides in favour of the interaction of soul and body. His conclusion is the complete denial of matter. "Metaphysically the world-picture changes . . . . The corporeal world as such disappears—it is a mere appearance for the apprehending mind—and is succeeded by something spiritual. The idealistic spiritualistic metaphysics, whose validity we here tacitly assume without further justification, recognizes no corporeal but only spiritual being. 'All reality is spiritual.'" (p. 479).

How little Materialism has to fear from Kantian rivalry is plainly shown, among others, by the natural philosopher C. F. Wolff. In the "Neue Rundschau" of 1907 (Umriss einer neuen Weltanschauung), he most vigorously opposes Darwinism and Haeckelism, but finally rejects with Kant the substantiality of the soul, and falls back into the Materialism which he severely condemns. He says: "The disintegrating influence of Haeckelism on the spiritual life of the masses comes, not from the consequences which his conception of eternal things calls forth, but from the Darwinian thesis that there is no purpose in nature. Really, one might suppose that on the day, when the great discovery of the descent of man from the ape was made, the call went forth: 'Back to the Ape.'" "The walls, which confine Materialism, still stand in all their firmness: it is impossible to explain the purposive character of life from material forces. "We are so constituted that we are capable of recognizing certain purposes with our intellect, whereas the spiritual is mere beauty. One general plan binds all our spiritual and emotional forces into a unity. "This view of life Haeckel seeks to replace by his senseless talk about cell-souls, and thinks by his boyish trick to an "Kant. Chamberlain's words on Haeckelism will find an echo in the soul of every educated person: 'It is not poetry, not imagination, nor even three.' But what does the "Giant Kant" teach? That we ourselves place the purpose in the things, but that it is not in the things! This view is also held by Materialists. Uexküll finds the refutation of Materialism in the "empirical scheme of the objects," which is formed from our sense-perceptions. This is for him, indeed, identical with the "sum of motion," to which he reduces objects. Thus again there is no substance but only motion, which Materialism likewise teaches. We shall later find the Kantian Uexküll among the outspoken Materialists.

Philosophers of another tendency endeavour to refute Materialism by supposed every thing endowed with life and soul with to the "natural scientist" (R.W. Wundt, Paulsen, Haeckel, and the botanist Franck, who ascribes intelligence even to plants. One might well believe that this is a radical remedy for all materialistic cravings. The pity is that Materialists should be afforded an opportunity for ridicule by such a fiction. That brute matter, atoms, electrons should possess life and soul, however, is but a boast of modern science that it admits only what is revealed by exact observation; but the universal and unvarying verdict of observation is that, in the inorganic world, everything shows characteristics opposite to those which life exhibits. It is also a serious delusion to believe that one can explain the human soul in its unity and complexity by the cell-souls. A number of souls could never have one and the same consciousness. Consciousness and every psychic activity are immanent, they abide in the subject and do not operate outwardly; hence each individual soul has its own consciousness, and of any other knows absolutely nothing. A combination of cell-souls is by no means a unitary consciousness which contains many consciousnesses. But, even if it were possible, this composite consciousness would have a completely different content from the cell-souls, since it would be a marvel if all these felt, thought, and willed exactly the same. In this view immortality would be as completely done away with as it is in Materialism.

We have described this theory as an untenable fiction. R. Semon, however, undertakes to defend the existence of memory in all living beings in his work "Die Mneme als erhaltendes Prinzip im Wechsel des organischen Geschehens." (Leipzig, 1905). He says: "The effect of a stimulus on living substance continues after the stimulation, it has an engraving effect. The matter is called the effect of the stimulus, and the sum of the engrams, which the organism inherits or acquires during its life, is the mneme, or memory in the widest sense." Now, if by this word the persistence of psychic and corporeal states were alone signified, there would be little to urge against this theory. But by memory is understood a psychic function, whose presence in plants and minerals not the slightest plea can be offered. The persistence is even more easily explained in the case of inorganic nature. This Hypothesis, which, as Kant rightly declares, is the death of all science, is also called the "double aspect theory" (Zweiseitentheorie). Fechner indeed regards the material as only the outer side of the spiritual. The relation between them is that of the convex side of a curve to the concave; they are essentially one, regarded now from without and again from within—the same idea expressed in different words. By this explanation Materialism is not overcome but proclaimed. For as to the reality of matter no sensible man can doubt; conversely, if the spiritual is mere beauty, it also must be material. The convex side of a ring is really one thing with the concave; there is but the same ring regarded from two different sides. Thus Fechner, in spite of all his disclaimers of Materialism,
must deny the immortality of the soul, since in the dis-
solution of the body the soul must also perish, and he
labours to no effect when he tries to bolster the
doctrine of survival with all kinds of fantastic ideas.

Closely connected with this theory is the so-called
"psycho-physical parallelism", which most modern
psychologists since Fechner, especially Wundt and
Paulsen, energetically advocate. This emphasizes so
strongly the spirituality of the soul that it rejects as
impossible any influence from the body on the soul and
thus makes spiritual and bodily activities run side by
side (parallel) without affecting each other. Wundt,
indeed, goes so far as to make the whole world consist
of will-units, and regards matter as mechanized
spiritual activity. Paulsen, on the other hand, endeav-
sors to explain the concurrence of the two series of
activities by the thesis that the soul and the body are
the reflection of the spiritual. One might well think
that there could not be a more emphatic denial of
Materialism. Yet this exaggerated Spiritualism and
Idealism agrees with the fundamental dogma of
the Materialists in denying the substantiality and
immortality of the soul. It asserts that the soul is
nothing else than the aggregate of the successive in-
ternal activities without any physical essence. This
declaration leads inevitably to Materialism, because
activity without an active subject is inconceivable;
and, since the substantiality of the soul is denied, the
body must be the subject of the spiritual activities, as
other wise it would be impossible that to certain
physical impressions there should correspond con-
siderations, volitions, and movements. In any case this
exaggerated Spiritualism, which no intelligent person
can accept, cannot be regarded as a refutation of
Materialism. Apart from Christian philosophy no
philosophical system has yet succeeded in successfully
carrying through this attempt. One must have a somewhat
accurate knowledge of the recent literature of
natural science and philosophy to be convinced that the "re-
putation" of Materialism by means of the latest Ideal-
ism is idle talk. Thus, Ostwald proclaims his doctrine of
energy the refutation of Materialism, and, in his "Vorlesungen
über Naturphilosophie", endeavours "to fill the yawning chasm, which since Descartes
gapes between spirit and matter", by subordinating
the ideas of matter and spirit under the concept of
energy. Thus, consciousness also is energy, the nerve-
energy of the brain. He is inclined "to recognize
consciousness as an essential characteristic of the
energy of the central organ, just as space is an essential
class of energy of the nervous system, and inorganic
energy is motion." Is not this Materialism pure and
simple?

Entirely materialistic also is the widely accepted
physiological explanation of psychic activities, espe-
cially of the feelings, such as fear, anger etc. This is
defended (e.g.) by Uexkull, whom we have already
referred to as a vigorous opponent of Materialism. He
endeavours to found on it, at least to illustrate this by
the most modern experiment. In his work "Der
Kampf um die Tierseele" (1903), he says: "Sup-
pose that with the help of refined röntgen rays we
could project magnified on a screen in the form of
movable shadow-waves the processes in the nervous
system of man. According to our present knowledge,
we might thus expect the following. We observe the
subject of the experiment, when a bell rings near by,
and we see the shadow on the screen (representing the
wave of excitation) hurry along the auditory nerve to
the brain. We follow the shadow into the cerebrum,
and, if the person makes a movement in response to
the sound, centrifugal shadows are also presented to
our eyes. Observations of this kind suggest that..."
They are the same, but the way different from any physical experiment of a simi-
lar nature, except that in the case of the brain with its
intricate system of pathways the course of the stimulus
and the transformation of the accumulated energy
would necessarily form a very complicated and con-
fused picture." But what will be thereby proved or
even illustrated? Even without röntgen rays we
know that, in the case of hearing, nerve impulses proceed
to the brain, and that from the brain motor effects
pass out to the peripheral organs. But these effects are
mere movements, not psychical perception; for
consciousness attests that sensory perception, not to
speak of thought and volition, is altogether different
from movement, in fact the very opposite. We can
think... Not one of these opposite elements can be
simultaneously present in our consciousness, for
otherwise we could not compare them, nor perceive
and declare their oppositeness. Now, it is absolutely
impossible that a nerve or an atom of the brain should simultaneoulsy act as opposite move-
ments. And, not merely in the case of these opposites,
but also in the judgment of every distinction, the
nervous elements must simultaneously have different
movements, of different rapidity and in different
directions.

An undisguised Materialism is espoused by A. Kann
in his "Naturgeschichte der Moral und die Physik des
Denkens", with the subtitle "Der Idealismus eines
Materialisten" (Vienna and Leipzig, 1907). He says:
"To explain physically the complicated processes of
thought, it is above all necessary that the necessity of
admitting anything 'psychical' be eliminated. Our
ideas as to what is good and bad are for the average
man so intimately connected with physical activity
that a prime necessity to eliminate the psychical
from our ideas of morality, etc. Only when pure,
material science has built up on its own founda-
tions the whole structure of our morals and ethics
can one think of elaborating for unbiased readers
what I call the 'Physics of Thinking'. To prepare
the ground for the new science, one must first
'clear away the debris of ancient notions', that is 'God,
prayer, immortality (the soul)'." The reduction of
psychical life to physics is actually attempted by J.
Fikler in his treatise "Physik des Seelenlebens"
(Leipzig, 1901). He converses with a pupil of the
highest form, at first in a very childish way, but
finally heavy guns are called into action. "That all
the various facts, all the various phenomena of psychi-

cal life, all the various states of consciousness are
the self-preservation of motion, has not yet, I think,
been explained by any psychologist." Such is indeed
the case, for, generally speaking, gross Materialism has
been rejected. Materialism refers psychical phenom-
enas to the movements of nerve energy, and self-
preservation of motion is motion, and consequently
this new psycho-physics is pure Materialism. In any
case, material cannot "self-preserve" its motion;
motion persists on its own account in virtue of the law
of the conservation of energy. Therefore, according
to this theory, all matter ought to exhibit psychical
phenomena.

Still more necessary and simple was the evolution
of the world according to J. Lichtneckert (Neue wissen-
schaftl. Lebenslehre der Weltalls, Leipzig, 1903). His
"Ideal oder Selbstzweckmaterialismus als die absolute
Philosophie" (Ideal or End-in-itself Materialism as the
Absolute Philosophy) offers "the scientific solution of
all great physical, chemical, astronomical, theological,
philosophical, evolutionary, and physiological world-
riddles." Let us select a few ideas from this new
absolutist philosophy. "That God and matter are
absolutely identical notions, was until to-day un-
known." "Hitherto Materialism investigated the
external life of matter, and Idealism its internal life.
The fusion of the two conceptions, and the absorption
of the world, which since the earliest times have walked
their separate ways and fought each other, issues the
present 'Absolute Philosophy.' Heretofore Material-
ism has denied, as a fundamental error, teleology or
the striving for an end, and hence also the spiritual or
Anthropological Materialism is completely disproved by demonstrating for psychical activities a simple, spiritual substance distinct from the body,—i.e., the soul. The Idealist, or Monist, is the crown or acme of all philosophies, since in it is contained the absolute truth, to which the leading intellects of all times have gradually and laboriously contributed. Into it flow all philosophical and religious systems, as streams into the sea. "Spirit or God is matter, and, vice versa, matter is spirit or God. The Ideal is no raw, lifeless mass, as was hitherto generally assumed, since all chemico-physical processes are self-purposive. Matter, which is the eternal, unending, visible, audible, weighable, measurable, etc., deity, is gifted with the highest evolutionary and transforming spiritual or vital qualities, and indeed possesses power to feel, will, think, and remember. All that exists is matter or God. A non-matter being does not exist. Even space is matter..."

One needs only to indicate such fruits of materialistic science to illustrate in their absurdity the consequences of the pernicious conception of man and the universe known as Materialism. But we cite them only as an example. The much-lauded victory of modern Idealism over Materialism has no foundation in fact. To our own time may be applied what the well-known historian of Materialism, Friedrich Albert Lange (Geschichte des Materialismus u. Kritik seiner Bedeutung in der Gegenwart), wrote in 1875: "The materialistic strife of our day thus stands before us as a serious sign of the times. To-day, as in the period before Kant and the French Revolution, a general relaxation of philosophical effort, a retrogression of ideas, is the basic explanation of the spread of the idealistic belief."

"What he says indeed of the relaxation of philosophical effort is no longer true to-day: on the contrary, seldom has there been a better time for the elevation of man to the unqualified as at the beginning of the present and the end of the last century. Much labour has been devoted to philosophy and much has been accomplished, but, in the words of St. Augustine, it is a case of magni gresus praeter viam (i.e., long strides on the wrong road). We find simply philosophy without ideas, Positivism, Pragmatism, the psychology, and the numerous other modern systems are all enemies of ideas. Even Kant himself, whom Lange invokes as the bulwark against Materialism, is very appropriately called by the historian of Idealism, O. Willman, "the lad who throws stones at ideas". "If we start with the revival and development, as Lange expects, "will raise mankind to a new level" is nowhere to be found, not to be sought in non-Christian philosophy. Only a return to the Christian view of the world, which is founded on Christian philosophy and the teachings of the Socratic School, can prevent the catastrophes prophesied by Lange, and perhaps raise mankind to a higher cultural level. This philosophy offers a thorough refutation of cosmological and anthropological Materialism, and raises up the true Idealism. It shows that matter cannot of itself be uncreated or eternal, which indeed may be deduced from the fact that of itself it is inert, indifferent to rest and motion. But it must be either at rest or in motion if it exists; if it existed of itself, in virtue of its own nature, it would be also of itself in either one of these conditions. If it were of itself originally in motion, it could have never come to rest, and it would not be true that its nature is indifferent to rest and to motion and could be equally well in either of the two conditions. With this simple argument the fundamental error of materialism is falsified. An exhaustive refutation will be found in the "Göttliche Philosophie" (Paderborn, 1908): "Gott und die Schöpfung" (Ratisbon, 1910); "Die Theodizee" (4th ed., 1910); "Lehrbuch der Apologetik", I (3rd ed., 1940).
MATHIAS (B. Osmia, A. Mathias), one of the sons of Nebo who married an alien wife (1 Esd., x, 41) and later repudiated her; he is called Matthias in II Esd., ix, 35.

(2) MATHIAS (Sept. Mattathias), one of the six who stood at the right of Esdras while he read the law to the People (II Esd., viii, 4).

(3) MATHIAS (Sept. Mattathias), a Levite of Corite stock and eldest son of Sellum; he had charge of the frying of cakes for the temple-worship (1 Par., ix, 31).

(4) MATHIAS (Sept. Mattathias), a Levite, one of Aassaph's musicians before the ark (1 Par., xvi, 5).

(5) MATHIAS (I Mach., xi, 2), a captain of the army of Jonathan the Machabee; together with Judas the son of Calphi, he alone stood firm by Jonathan's side till the tide of battle turned away from them.

(6) MATHIAS (I Mach., xi, 14), a son of Simon the high priest; he and his father and brother Judas were murdered by Ptoleeme, the son of Abobus, at Doch.

(9 and 10) MATHIAS (Matthathias), two ancestors of Jesus (Luke, iii, 25, 26). WALTER DRUM.

Mathew, Theobald, Apostle of Temperance, b. at Thomastown Castle, near Cashel, Tipperary, Ireland, 10 Oct., 1790; d. at Queenstown, Cork, 8 Dec., 1856. His father was James Mathew, a gentleman of good family; his mother was Anne, daughter of George Whyte of Capsgghwyte. At twelve he was sent to St. Canice's Academy, Kilkenny. There he spent nearly seven years, during which time he became acquainted with two Capuchin Fathers, who seem to have influenced him deeply. In September, 1807, he went to Maynooth College, and in the following year joined the Capuchin Order in Dublin. Having made his profession and completed his studies, he was ordained. His description Dr. Zouch gives is this: "I go Easter Sunday, 1814. His first mission was in Kilkenny, where he spent twelve months. He was then transferred to Cork, where he spent twenty-four years before beginning his great crusade against intemperance. During these years he ministered in the "Little Friary," and organized schools, industrial classes, and benefit societies at a time when there was no recognized system of Catholic education in Ireland. He also founded a good library, and was foremost in every good work for the welfare of the people. In 1830 he took a long lease of the Botanic Gardens as a cemetery for the poor. Thousands, who died in the terrible cholera of 1832, owed their last resting-place as well as their interment in the Church, to Father Mathew. In 1828 he was appointed Provincial of the Capuchin Order in Ireland—a position which he held for twenty-three years.

In 1836 came the crisis of his life. Drunkenness had become widespread, and was the curse of all classes in Ireland. Temperance efforts had failed to cope with the evil, and after much anxious thought and prayer, and in response to repeated appeals from William Martin, a Quaker, Father Mathew decided to inaugurate a total abstinence movement. On 10 April, 1838, the first meeting of the Cork Total Abstinence Society was held in his own schoolhouse. He presided, delivered a modest address, and took the pledge himself. Then with the historic words, "Here goes in the Name of God", he entered his signature in a large book lying on the table. About sixty followed his example that night and signed the book. Meetings were held twice a week, in the evenings and after Mass on Sundays. The crowds soon became so great that the schoolhouse had to be abandoned, and the Horse Bazaar, a building capable of holding 4000, became the future meeting-place. Here, night after night, Father Mathew addressed crowded assemblies. In three months he had enrolled 25,000 in Cork alone; in five months the number had increased to 130,000. The movement now assumed a new phase. Father Mathew decided to go forth and preach his crusade throughout the kingdom. The Bazaar became capable of holding 6000, and became the center of the evangelistic movement. Thousands came in from the adjoining counties and from Connaught. In four days he gave the pledge to 150,000. In the same month he went to Waterford, where in three days he enrolled 50,000. In March, 1840, he enrolled 70,000 in Dublin. In Maynooth College he received a great har- vest, winning over 8 professors and 250 students, whilst in Maynooth itself, and the neighborhood, he gained 37,300 adherents. In January, 1841, he went to Kells, and in two days and a half enrolled 100,000. Thus in a few years he travelled through the whole of Ireland, and in February, 1843, was able to write to a friend in America: "I have now, with the Divine Assistance, hoisted the banner of Temperance in almost every parish in Ireland."

He did not confine himself to the preaching of temperance alone. He spoke of the other virtues also, denounced crime of every kind, and secret societies of every description. Crime diminished as his movement spread, and neither crime nor secret societies ever flourished where total abstinence had taken root. He was of an eminently practical, as well as of a spiritual turn of mind. Thackeray, who met him in Cork in 1842, wrote of him thus: "Avoiding all political questions, no man seems more eager than he for the practical improvement of this country. Leases and rents, farming improvements, reading societies, music societies—he was full of these, and of his schemes of temperance above all." Such glorious success having attended his efforts at home, he now felt himself free to answer the earnest invitations of his fellow-countrymen in Great Britain. On 13 August, 1842, he reached Glasgow, where many thousands joined the movement. In July, 1843, he arrived in England and opened his memorable campaign in Liverpool. From Liverpool he went to Manchester and Salford, and, having visited the chief towns of Lancashire, he went on to Yorkshire, where he increased his recruits by 200,000. His next visit was to London where he enrolled 74,000. During three months in England he gave the pledge to 600,000.

He then returned to Cork where trials awaited him. In July, 1845, the first blight destroyed the potato crop, and in the following winter there was bitter distress. Father Mathew was one of the first to warn the Government of the calamity which was impending. Famine with all its horrors reigned throughout the
country during the years 1846-47. During those years, the Apostle of Temperance showed himself more than ever the Apostle of Charity. In Cork he organized societies for collecting and distributing food supplies. He stopped the building of his own church, and gave the funds in charity. He spent £600 ($3000) a month in relief, and made his own land and America to obtain food and money. Ireland lost 2,000,000 inhabitants during those two years. All organization was broken up, and the total abstinence movement received a severe blow. In 1847 Father Mathew was placed first on the list for the vacant Bishopric of Cork, but Rome did not confirm the choice of the clergy. In the early part of 1849, in response to earnest invitations, he set sail for America. He visited New York, Boston, New Orleans, Washington, Charlestown, Mobile, and many other cities, and secured more than 500,000 disciples. After a stay of two and a half years he returned to Ireland in Dec., 1851. Men of all creeds and politics have borne important testimony to the wonderful progress and the beneficial effects of the movement he inaugurated. It is estimated that he gave the total abstinence pledge to 7,000,000 people, and everyone admits that in a short time he accomplished a great moral revolution. O'Connell characterized it as "a mighty miracle", and often declared that he would never have ventured to have a "monster meeting" were it not that he had the teetotalers "for his policemen".

His remains rest beneath the cross in "Father Mathew's Cemetery" at Queenstown. On 10 Oct., 1864, a fine bronze statue by Foley was erected to his memory in Cork, and during his centenary year a marble statue was erected in O'Connell Street, Dublin. The Mathew Memorial Hall, Dublin, is a centre of social, educational, and temperance work, and is modelled on the Temperance Institute, founded and maintained by the Apostle of Temperance himself. The Father Mathew Hall, Cork, is doing similar work. The Dublin Hall publishes a monthly magazine called "The Father Mathew Record", which has a wide circulation. "A "Memorial Crusade" was founded in Jan., 1905, and its membership is already over 100,000.

**Freeman's Journal (Dublin): The Nation (Dublin), contemporary**

Mathieu, Francois-Désiré, bishop and cardinal, b. 27 May, 1839; d. 26 October, 1908. Born of humble parents in the Moselle, France, he was made his studies in the diocesan school and the-seminary of the Diocese of Nancy, and was ordained priest in 1863. He was engaged successively as professor in the school (petit seminaire) of Pont-a-Mousson, chaplain to the Dominicanees at Nancy (1879), and parish priest of Saint-Martin at Foy (1886). In 1889, he had the Degree of Doctor of Letters with a Latin and a French thesis, the latter being honoured with a prize from the French Academy for two years. On 3 January, 1893, he was nominated to the Bishopric of Angers, was consecrated on 19 January, and consecrated on 20 March. He succeeded Mgr Freppel, one of the most remarkable bishops of his time, and set himself to maintain all his predecessor's good works. To these he added the work of facilitating the education of poor children destined for the priesthood. He inaugurated the same pious enterprise in the Diocese of Toulouse, to which he was transferred three years later (30 May, 1896) by a formal order of Leo XIII. In his new see he laboured, in accordance with the views of this pontiff, to rally Catholics to the French Government. With this aim he wrote the "Devoir des catholiques", an episcopal charge which attracted wide attention and earned for him the pope's congratulations. In addition he was summoned to Rome to be a cardenal at the conclave (19 June, 1899). Having resigned the See of Toulouse (14 December, 1899), his activities were henceforward absorbed in the work of the Roman congregations and diplomatic negotiations which have since been so "monotonous". Nevertheless, he found leisure to write on the Concordat of 1801 and the Conclave of 1903. In 1907 he was admitted to the French Academy with a discourse which attracted much notice. Death came to him unexpectedly next year in London, whither he had gone to assist at the Eucharistic Congress. Under a somewhat commonplace exterior he had a rich and active nature, an inquiring and open mind, a fine and well-cultivated intelligence which did credit to the Sacred College and the French clergy. His works include: "De Joannis abbatia Gorziensi vita" (Nancy, 1878); "L'Ancien Régime dans la Province de Lorraine et Barrois" (Paris, 1871; 3rd ed., 1907); "Le Concordat de 1801" (Paris, 1903); "Les derniers jours de Léon XIII et le concile de 1903" (Paris, 1904); a new edition of his works began to appear in Paris, July, 1910.


**Antoine Dégert.**

Mathusa, one of the Hebrew patriarchs, mentioned in the book of Genesis (v). The word is given in Mathusaleh in I Par. Luke, iii, 37; and in the Revised Version as Methuselah. Etymologists differ with regard to the signification of the name. Holzinger gives "man of the jelin" as the more likely meaning; Hommel and many with him think that it means "man of Selah", Selah being derived from a Babylonian word, given as a title to the god Sin; while De Wette makes it the Babylonian word which is not understood. The author of Genesis traces the patriarch's descent through his father Henoch to Seth, a son of Adam and Eve. At the time of his son's birth Henoch was sixty-five years of age. When Mathusa had reached the great age of one hundred and eighty-seven years, he became the father of Methusaleh. Of Methusaleh, he had a son named Jared. Following this he lived the remarkable term of seven hundred and eighty-two years, which makes his age at his death nine hundred and sixty-nine years. It follows thus that his death occurred in the year of the Deluge. There is no record of any other human being having lived as long as this, for which reason the name, Mathusa, is his become a synonym for longevity.
The tendency of rationalists and advanced critics of different creeds leads them to deny outright the extraordinary details of the ages of the patriarchs. Catholic commentators, however, find no difficulty in accepting the words of Genesis. Certain exegetes solve the difficulty to their own satisfaction by declaring that the year meant by the sacred writer is not the equivalent of our year. In the Samaritan text Mathusala was sixty-seven at Lamech's birth, and 720 at his death.

JOSPEH V. MOLLOY.

Matilda, Saint, Queen of Germany, wife of King Henry I (The Fowler), b. at the Villa of Engern in Westphalia, about 885; d. at Quedlinburg, 14 March, 968. She was brought up at the monastery of Erfurt. Henry, whose marriage to a young widow, named Hathburg, had been declared invalid, asked for Matilda's hand, and married her in 900 at Walshausen, which he presented to her as a dowry. Matilda became the mother of: Otto I, Emperor of Germany; Henry, Duke of Bavaria; St. Bruno, Archbishop of Cologne; Gerberga, who married Louis IV of France; Hedwig, the mother of Hugh Capet. In 912 Matilda's husband succeeded his father as Duke of Saxony, and in 918 he was chosen to succeed King Conrad of Germany. As queen, Matilda was humble, pious, and zealous, and was ready to help the oppressed and unfortunate. She wielded a wholesome influence over the king. After a reign of seventeen years, he died in 936. He bequeathed to her all his possessions in Quedlinburg, Poedzeln, Nordhausen, Grona, and Duderstadt.

It was the king's wish that his eldest son, Otto, should inherit his kingdom, but Matilda wanted her favourite son Henry on the royal throne. On the plea that he was the first-born son after his father became king, she induced a few nobles to cast their vote for him, but Otto was elected and crowned king on 8 August, 936. Three years later Henry revolted against his brother Otto, but, being unable to wrest the royal crown from him, they agreed to separate the kingdom of Saxony and Bavaria. Otto was made Duke of Bavaria. Soon, however, the two brothers joined in persecuting their mother, whom they accused of having impoverished the crown by her lavish almsgiving. To satisfy them, she renounced the possessions the deceased king had bequeathed to her, and retired to her villa at Engern in Westphalia. But Otto, her son, was not satisfied. In a letter to his mother, Matilda was called back to the palace, and both Otto and Henry implored her pardon.

Matilda built many churches, and founded or supported numerous monasteries. Her chief foundations were the monasteries at Quedlinburg, Nordhausen, Engern, and Poedzeln. She spent many days at these monasteries and was especially fond of Nordhausen. She died at the convent of St. Servatius and Dionysius at Quedlinburg, and was buried there by the side of her husband. She was venerated as a saint immediately after her death. Her feast is celebrated on 14 March.

The lives of Matilda are extant: one, Vita antiquior, written in the monastery of Nordhausen and dedicated to the Emperor Otto II; edited by KOEPE in Mon. Germ. Script., 3, 1845; 4, 1846, 1854, L. Cl. 119; in English, The other, Vita Matildis regina, written by order of the Emperor Henry II, is printed in Mon. Germ. Script., IV, 293-302, and in MOWS, P. L. Ch. V, 489-520. CLAVS, Die heilige Mathilde, ihr Gemahl Heinrich I. und ihre Söhne Otto I. Heinrich und Bruno (Münster, 1897); Schwabe, Die heilige Mathilde, Gemahlin Heinrichs I. Könige von Deutschland (Ratisbon, 1846); Acta SS., March, II, 351-56.

MICHAEL OTT.

Matilda of Canossa, Countess of Tuscany, daughter and heiress of the Marques Boniface of Tuscany, and Beatrice, daughter of Frederick of Lorraine, b. 1046; d. 24 July, 1114. In 1053 her father was murdered. Duke Gottfried of Lorraine, an opponent of the Emperor Henry III, went to Italy and married the widowed Beatrice. But, in 1055, when Henry III entered Italy he took Beatrice and her daughter Matilda prisoners and had them brought to Germany. Thus the young countess was early dragged into the bustle of these troublous times. That, however, did not prevent her receiving an excellent training; she was finely educated, knew Latin, and was very fond of serious books. She was also deeply religious, and even in her youth followed with interest the great ecclesiastical questions which were then prominent. Before his death in 1056 Henry III gave back to Gottfried of Lorraine his wife and stepdaughter. When Matilda grew to womanhood she was married to her stepbrother Gottfried of Lower Lorraine, from whom, however, she separated in 1071. He was murdered in 1076; the marriage was childless, but it cannot be proved that it was never consummated, as many historians asserted. From 1071 Matilda entered upon the government and administration of her extensive possessions in Middle and Upper Italy. These domains were of the greatest importance in the political and ecclesiastical disputes of that time, as the road from Germany by way of Upper Italy to Rome passed through them. On 22 April, 1073, Gregory VII (q. v.) became pope, and before long the great battle for the independence of the Church and the reform of ecclesiastical life began. In the controversy Matilda stood resolute, unyielding, and unwavering ally of Gregory and his successors.

Immediately on his elevation to the papacy Gregory entered into close relations with Matilda and her mother. The letters to Matilda (Beatrice d. 1076) give distinct expression to the pope's high esteem and sympathy for the princess. He called her and her mother "his beloved Matilda and Peter" (Regest., II, ix), and wished to undertake a Crusade with them to free the Christians in the Holy Land (Reg., I, xi). Matilda and her mother were present at the Roman Lenten synods of 1074 and 1075, at which the pope published the important decrees on the reform of ecclesiastical life. Both mother and daughter supported the pope in his efforts; the pope complained of the inconstancy and changeableness of the king, who apparently had no desire to be at peace with him. In the next year (1076) Matilda's first husband, Gottfried of Lorraine, was murdered at Antwerp. Gregory wrote to Bishop Hermann of Metz, 25 August, 1076, that he did not yet know in which state Matilda "the faithful handmaid of St. Peter" would, under God's guidance, remain.

On account of the action of the Synod of Worms against Gregory (1076), the latter was compelled to lay Henry IV under excommunication. As the majority of the princes of the empire now took sides against the king, Henry wished to be reconciled to the pope, and accordingly traveled to Hamburg in 1077. On this journey he was seized with a severe winter, in order to meet the pope there before the latter should leave Italian soil on his journey to Germany. Gregory, who had already arrived in Lombardy when he heard of the king's journey, betook himself at Matilda's advice to his mountain stronghold of Canossa for security. The excommunicated king had waited the Countess Matilda and her companions, Adelaide, and Abbot Hugh of Cluny, to intercede with the pope for him. These fulfilled the king's request, and after long opposition Gregory permitted Henry to appear before him personally at Canossa and alone for his guilt by public penance. After the king's departure the pope set out for Mantua. For safety Matilda accompanied him with armed men, but bearing a rumour that Archbishop Wibert of Ravenna, who

X-4
was unfriendly to Gregory, was preparing an ambush for him, she brought the pope back to Canossa. Here she drew up a first deed of gift, in which she ceded her domains and estates from Ceperano to Radiciofanò to the Roman Church. But as long as she lived she continued to govern and administer them freely and independently. When, soon after, Henry again renewed the contest with Gregory, Matilda constantly supported the pope with soldiers and money. On her security the monastery of Canossa had its treasure melted down, and sent Gregory seven hundred pounds of silver and nine pounds of gold as a contribution to the war against Henry. The latter withdrew from the Romagna to Lombardy in 1082, and laid waste Matilda's lands in his march through Tuscany. Nevertheless the countess did not desist from her adherence to Gregory. She was confirmed in this by her confessor, Anselm, Bishop of Lucca.

In similar ways she supported the successors of the great pope in the contest for the freedom of the Church. When in 1087, shortly after his coronation, Pope Victor III was driven from Rome by the Antipope Wilbert, Matilda advanced to Rome with an army, occupied the Castle of Sant' Angelo and part of the city, and called Victor back. However, at the threats of the emperor the Romans again deserted Victor, so that he was obliged to flee once more. At the wish of Pope Urban II Matilda married in 1089 the young Duke Welf of Bavaria, in order that the most faithful defender of the papal chair might thus obtain a powerful ally. In 1090 Henry IV returned to Italy to attack Matilda, whom he had already deprived of her estates in Lorraine. He laid waste many of her possessions, conquered Mantua, her principal stronghold, by treachery in 1091, as well as several castles. Although the vassals of the countess hastened to make their peace with the emperor, Matilda again promised fidelity to the cause of the pope, and continued the war, which now took a turn in her favour. Henry's army was defeated before Canossa. Welf, Duke of Bavaria, and his son of the same name, Matilda, went over to Henry in 1095, but the countess remained resolute. When the new German King, Henry V, entered Italy in the autumn of 1110, Matilda did homage to him for the imperial fiefs. On his return he stopped three days with Matilda in Tuscany, kept a proper mark of respect, and made her imperial vice-regent of Lucca.

In 1112 she confirmed the donation of her property to the Roman Church that she had made in 1077 (Mon. Germ. Hist.: Legum, IV, i, 653 sqq.). After her death Henry went to Italy in 1116, and took her lands—not merely the imperial fiefs, but also the freeholds. The Roman Church, though, put forward its legitimate claim to the inheritance. A lengthy dispute now ensued over the possession of the dominions of Matilda, which was settled by a compromise between Innocent II and Lothair III in 1133. The emperor and Duke Henry of Saxony took Matilda's freeholds as fiefs from the pope at a yearly rent of 100 pounds of silver. The duke took the feudal oath to the pope; after his death Matilda's possessions were to be restored wholly to the Roman Church. Afterwards there were again disputes about these lands, and in agreements between the popes and emperors of the twelfth century this matter is often mentioned. In 1213 the Emperor Frederick II recognized the right of the Roman Church to the possession of Matilda.

Matina.—I. NAME.—The word "Matina" (Lat. Mutilium or Mutatine), comes from Mutila, the Latin name for the Greek goddess Leucothea or Leucotothea, white goddess, or goddess of the morning (Aurora): Leucothea graius, Mutula vocabere nostris, Ovid, V, 545. Hence Mutatine, Mutatinus, Mutilatinum tempus, or simply Mutilatum. The word actually used in the Roman Breviary is Mutilatum (i.e. tempus); some of the old authors preferred Mutatine to Mutilatum. In any case the primitive signification of the word under these different forms was Aurora, sunrise. It was at first applied to the office of Lauds, which, as a matter of fact, was said at dawn (see Lauds), its liturgical synonym being the word Gallatinum (cock-crow), which also designated this office. The night-office retained its name of Vigils, since, by a rule, Vigils and Matins (Lauds) were combined, the latter serving, to a certain extent, as the closing part of Vigils. The name Matins was then extended to the office of Vigils, Matins taking the name of Lauds, a term which, strictly speaking, only designates the last three psalms of that office, i.e. the "Laudate" psalms. At a time when this change of the custom of saying Vigils at night was observed scarcely anywhere but in monasteries, whilst elsewhere they were said in the morning, so that finally it did not seem a misapplication to give to a night office a name which, strictly speaking, applied only to the office of day-break. The change, however, was only gradual. St. Benedict (sixth century) in his description of the Divine Office, always refers to Vigils as the Night Office, whilst that of day-break he calls Matins, Lauds being the last three psalms of that office (Regula, cap. XIII-XIV; see Lauds). The Council of Tours in 567 had already applied the title "Matins" to the Night Office: "ad Mutilumum sese antiqui; Laudes Matutina; Matistani grani" are also the names of ancient authors as synonymous with Lauds. (Hefer-Leclercq, "Hist. des Conciles" V, III, 188, 189.)
II. ORIGINS (Matins and Vigils).—The word Vigils, at first applied to the Night Office, also comes from a Latin source, both as to the term and its use, namely, the Vigilia or nocturnal watches or guards of the soldiers. The night from six o’clock in the evening to six o’clock in the morning was divided into four watches or vigils, and the third and fourth vigils. From the point of view and in its origin, the use of the term was very vague and elastic. Generally it designated the nightly meetings, synaxes, of the Christians. Under this form, the watch (Vigil) might be said to date back as early as the beginning of Christianity. It was either on the account of the secrecy of the meetings, or because of some mystical idea which made the middle of the night the hour par excellence for prayer, in the words of the psalm: media nocte surgebam ad confidendum tibi, that the Christians chose the night time for their synaxes, and of all other nights, preferably the Sabbath. There is an allusion to it in the Acts of the Apostles (xx, 4), as also in the letter of Pliny the Younger. The liturgical services of these synaxes was composed of almost the same elements as that of the Jewish Synagogue: readings from the Books of the Law, singing of psalms, divers prayers. What gave them a Christian character was the fact that they were followed by the Eucharistic service, and that to the reading from the prophets added that from the apocryphal. The Vigil was very soon added, as also the Gospels and sometimes other books which were non-canonical, as, for example, the Epistles of Saint Clement, that of Saint Barnabas, the Apocalypse of Saint Peter, etc.

The more solemn watches, which were held on the anniversaries of martyrs or on certain feasts, were also known by this title, especially during the third and fourth centuries. The Vigil in this case was also called vespers, because the greater part of the night was devoted to it. Commenced in the evening, they only terminated the following morning, and comprised, in addition to the Eucharistic Supper, homilies, chants, and divers offices. These last Vigils it was that gave rise to certain abuses, and they were finally abolished in the Church (see Vespers). Notwithstanding this, however, the Vigils, in their strictest sense of Divine Office of the Night, were maintained and developed. Among writers from the fourth to the sixth century we find several descriptions of them. The “De Virginitate”, a fourth-century treatise, gives them as immediately followed by the Eucharistic service. The Angels are invoked to determine the number of psalms which had to be recited. Methodius in his “Banquet of Virgins” (Symposium sine Conivium decem Virginum) subdivided the Night Office or vespers into watches, but it is difficult to determine what he meant by these nocturnes. St. Basil also gives a very vague description of the Night Office or Vigils, but in terms which permit us to conclude that the psalms were sung, sometimes by two choirs, and sometimes as responses. Cassian gives us a more detailed account of the Night Office of the fifth century monks. The number of psalms, which at first varied, was subsequently fixed at twelve, with the addition of a lesson from the Old and another from the New Testament. St. Jerome defied the attacks of Vigilantius, but it is principally concerning the watches at the Tombs of the Martyrs that he speaks in his treatise, Contra Vigilantium. Of all the descriptions the most complete is that in the “Peregrinatio in Aethiopiam”, the author of which assisted at Matins in the Churches of Jerusalem, where great solemnity was displayed (see, e.g., pp. 79, 122, 139, 186, 208, 246, etc.) Other allusions are to be found in Cæsarius of Arles, Nicetius or Nicetae of Treves, and Gregory of Tours (see Bäumer-Biron, loc. cit., 1, 216, 227, 232).

III. THE ELEMENTS OF MATINS FROM THE FOURTH TO THE SIXTH CENTURY.—In all the authors we have quoted, the form of Night Prayers would appear to have varied a great deal. Nevertheless in these descriptions, and in spite of certain differences, we find the same elements repeated: the psalms generally chanted in the form of responses, that is to say by one or more chanters, the choir repeating one verse, which served as a response, alternately with the verses of psalms which were sung by the chanters; readings taken from the Old and the New Testament; and litany or supplications; prayer for the divers members of the Church, clergy, faithful, neophytes, and catechumens; for emperors; travellers; the sick; and generally for all the necessities of the Church, and even prayers for Jews and for heretics. [Bäumer, Liturgie, 227, in Studien des Benedictines, II (Bauger, 1886), 257, 289.] It is quite easy to find these essential elements in our modern Matins.

IV. MATINS IN THE ROMAN AND OTHER LITURGIES.—In the modern Roman Liturgy, Matins, on account of its length, the position it occupies, and the matter of which it is composed, may be considered as the most important office of the day, and for the variety and richness of its elements the most remarkable. It commences more solemnly than the other offices, with a psalm (Ps. xcv) called the Invitatory, which is chanted or recited in the form of a response, in accordance with the most ancient custom. The hymns, which have been burnt out of the Matins of the primitive Liturgy, as well as the hymns of the other hours, form part of a very ancient collection which, so far at least as some of them are concerned, may be said to pertain to the seventh or even to the sixth century. As a rule they suggest the symbolic significance of this Hour (see No. V), the prayer of the middle of the night. This principal form of the Office should be distinguished from the Office of Sunday, of Feasts, and the ferial or week day Office. The Sunday Office is made up of the invitatory, hymn, three nocturns, the first of which comprises twelve psalms, and the second and third three psalms each; nine lessons, three to each nocturn, each lesson except the ninth being followed by a response; and finally, the canticle De Deum, which is recited or sung after the ninth lesson instead of a response. The Office of Feasts is similar to that of Sunday, except that there are only three psalms to the first nocturn instead of twelve. The week-day or ferial office and that of simple feasts are composed of one nocturn only, with twelve psalms and three lessons. The Office of Vespers in the three last days of Holy Week are simpler, the absolutions, benedictions, and invitatory being omitted, at least for the three last days of Holy Week, since the invitatory is said in the Offices of the Dead.

The principal characteristics of this office which distinguish it from all the other offices are as follows:
(a) The Psalms used at Matins are made up of a series commencing with Psalm i and running without intermission to Psalm xxi inclusive. The order of the Psalter is followed almost without interruption, except in the case of feasts, when the Psalms are chosen according to their signification, but always from the series i–viii, the remaining Psalms being repeated for Vespers and other Offices.

(b) The Lessons form a unique element, and in the other Offices give place to a Capitulum or short lesson. This latter has possibly been introduced only for the sake of symmetry, and in its present form, at any rate, gives but a very incomplete idea of what the true reading or lesson is. The Lessons of Matins on the contrary are readings in the proper sense of the term, for they comprise the most important parts of the Old and the New Testament, extracts from the works of the principal doctors of the Church, and legends of the martyrs or of the other saints. The lessons from Holy Scripture are distributed in accordance with certain fixed rules (rubrics) which assign such or such books of the Bible to certain seasons of the year.
this manner extracts from all the Books of the Bible are read at the Office during the year. The idea, however, of having the whole Bible read in the Office, as proposed by several reformers of the Breviary, more especially during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, has never been regarded favourably by the Church, which views the Divine Office as a prayer and not as an object of study for the clergy.

(c) The Invitatory and, on certain days, the Finale or Te Deum also form one of the principal characteristics of this Office.

(d) The Responses, more numerous in this Office, recall the most ancient form of psalmody; that of the psalmist seated alone in the whole choir, as opposed to the antiphonal form, which consists in two choirs alternately reciting the psalms.

(e) The division into three or two Nocturns is also a special feature of Matins, but it is impossible to say why it has been thought by some to be a souvenir of the military watches (there were not three, but four, watchen) or even of the ancient Vigils, since ordinarily there was but one meeting in the middle of the night. The custom of rising three times for prayer could only have been in vogue, as exceptional, in certain monasteries, or for some of the more solemn feasts (see Nocturnae).

In the Office of the Church of Jerusalem, of which the vigil ζεγήα gives us a description, the Vigils on Sundays terminate with the solemn reading of the Gospel, in the Grotto of the Holy Sepulchre. This practice of reading the Gospel has been preserved in the Benedictine Liturgy. It is a matter for regret that in the Roman Liturgy this custom, so ancient and so beautiful, was never represented but by the breviary.

The Ambrosian Liturgy, better perhaps than any other, has preserved traces of the great Vigils of παντοχρόνια, with their complex and varied display of processions, psalmody, etc. (cf. Dom Cagin; "Pélerinage Musical", vol. VI, p. 8, sq.; Paul Lejay; Ambrosien (rit.) in "Dictionnaire d'Archéol. Chrétiens du Liturgique", vol. I, p. 1423 sq.).

The Ambrosian Liturgy has also preserved Vigils of long psalmody. This Nocturnal Office adapted itself at a later period to a more modern form, approaching more and more closely to the Roman Liturgy. Here too are found the three Nocturns, with Antiphon, Psalms, Lessons, and Responses, the ordinary elements of the Roman Mass, and a few features quite Ambrosian. In the Benedictine Office, Matins, like the ext of the Office, follows the Roman Liturgy quite closely. The number of psalms, viz. twelve, is always the same, there being three or two Nocturns according to the degree of solemnity of the particular Office celebrated. Ordinarily there are four Lessons, followed by their responses, to each Nocturn. The two most characteristic features of the Benedictine Matins are: the Canticles of the third Nocturn, which are not found in the Roman Liturgy, and the Gospel, which is sung solemnly at the end, the latter trait, as already pointed out, being very ancient. In the Mozarabic Liturgy (q. v.), on the contrary, Matins are made up of a systematic series of Collects and Lessons, and its influence made them quite a departure from the Roman system.

V. SIGNIFICATION AND SYMBOLISM. — From the foregoing it is clear that Matins remains the principal Office of the Church, and the one which, in its origin, dates back the farthest, as far as the Apostolic ages, as far even as the very inception of the Church. It is doubtless passed through a great many transformations, the ancient Night Office, the Office of the Vigil. In a certain sense it is, perhaps, the Office which was primitively the preparation for the Mass, that is to say, the Mass of the Catechumens, which presents at any rate the same construction as that Office: the reading from the Old Testament, then the Epistles and the Acts, and finally the Gospel—the whole being intermingled with psalmody and termi-
obtained the upper hand, and the chiefs of the Ghibelline party were obliged to go into exile; among these was the poet Dante, who was exiled in 1302. "Divina Commedia" (Paradiso, XIII, 124-28), Dante certainly speaks as an extreme Ghibelline against Matteo of Aquasparta. Matteo, however, had died before this. He was buried in the Franciscan church of Ara Coeli, where his monument is still to be seen.

Matteo was a very learned philosopher and theologian; he was a personal pupil of St. Bonaventure, whose teaching, in general, he followed, or rather developed. In this respect he was one of what is known as the older Franciscan school, who preferred Augustinianism to the more pronounced Aristotelianism of St. Thomas Aquinas. His principal work is the acute "Questiones disputatione", which treats of various subjects. Of this one book appeared at Quaracchi in 1903 (the editing and issue are discontinued for the present), namely: "Questiones disputationes selectae", in "Bibliotheca Franciscana scholastica medii aevi", I; the "Questiones" are preceded by a "Tractatus de excellencia S. Scriptura" (pp. 1-22), also by a "Sermon de studio S. Scripturae" (pp. 22-26); it is followed by "Concessa sensitio suae..." (pp. 29-54). "Questiones de Cognitione" had already been edited in the collection called "De humane cognitionis ratione ancedota quedam" (Quaracchi, 1883), 87-182. The rest of his works, still unedited, are to be found at Assisi and Todi. Among them are: "Commentarius in libros Sententiarum" (autograph); "Concessa sensitio suae..." (autograph); "Postilla super librum Job"; "Postilla super Psalmistum" (autograph); "In 12 Prophetas Minores"; "In Danielem"; "In Ev. Matthaei"; "In Apocalypsim" (autograph); "In Epist. ad Romanos"; "Sermones dominicales et feriales" (autograph).

On the editions referred to (1903), pp. v-xvi, and De Hum. Cognit., pp. xiv-xv; Chronica XXIV Mo-nstr. Generali O. M. in Annuale Franciscana, III (Quaracchi, 1898), 408-19; 699; 703; 706-7; 131; 132; 135; 228; (Rome, 1560), 252, (1806), 172, (1806), 269-70; SHARANZ, Suppl. ad Script. O. M. (Rome, 1806), 525; DEMUS-CHATEL, Charitats. Univ. Parts. II (Paris, 1861), 56; EHRH. in Zeitschrift f. kathol. Theologie, VII (Innsbruck, 1883), 46; GRANZEN, Die philosophischen und theologischen Enzyklopelische des Kardinals Mathaus von Aquasparta (Vienna, 1900); Theologische Studien der Leo Gesellschaft, Pt. XIV.
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according to G. Milanesi (in his edition of Vassari, II, Florence, 1878, p. 483, note 3), the main portion of the structure of the poet Dante, while the lateral portions have been removed to the sacristy. Some other Madonnas of his deserve particular mention: one in the Palazzo Tolomei at Siena; the Virgin and Infant Jesus painted, in 1484, for the city palace of Siena, on a pilaster in the hall decorated by Spinello Aretino; in the duomo of Pienza, a Virgin and Child enthroned between St. Matthew and St. Catherine, St. Bartholomew and St. Luke. On the lunette Matteo painted the Flagellation, and on the predella three medallions—"Ecco Homo", the Virgin, and an Evangelist. The signature reads: "Opus Mathei Johannis de Senis". As decoration for the pavement of the cathedral of Siena, he designed three subjects: "The Sinful of Samsó", "The Death of Bethulia", and "The Massacre of the Innocents".

In 1477 he painted his "Madonna della Neve" (Our Lady of the Snow), for the church under that invocation at Siena. On comparing this with the Servite Madonna of 1470, it is seen to surpass the earlier work in beauty of types, symmetry of proportions, and colour-tone. The St. Barbara, a predella passion made for the church of San Domenico at Siena, is also a remarkable work: two angels are gracefully laying a crown on the saint's head, while others, accompanied by St. Mary Magdalene and St. Catherine of Alexandria and playing musical instruments, surround her. When Matteo treats subjects involving lively action, he loses a certain power of suggestion. Two characteristics are combined in a confused way, the expression of feeling is forced, and degenerates into grimace, and the general result is affected and caricature-like.


GASTON SORTELA.

Matteo of Aquasparta, a celebrated Italian Franciscan, b. at Aquasparta in the Diocese of Todi, Umbria, about 1235; d. at Rome, 29 October, 1302. He was a member of the Bentivogli family, to which Cardinal Bentivenga (d. 1290), also a Franciscan, belonged. Matteo, the Franciscan Order at Todi, took the degree of Master of Theology at Paris, and taught also for a time at Bologna. The Franciscan, John Peckham, having become Archbishop of Canterbury in 1279, Matteo was in 1280 made Peckham's successor as Lector sacri Palatii apostolici, i.e. he was appointed to the office of Master of Theology at Oxford. In 1287 the chapter held at Montpellier elected him general in succession to Arlotto of Prato. When Girolamo Masci (of Ascoli), who had previously been general of the Franciscan Order, became pope as Nicholas IV, 15 Feb., 1288, he created Matteo cardinal of the title of San Lorenzo in Damaso in May of that year. After this Matteo was made Cardinal Bishop of Porto and penitentiarius maior (Grand Penitentiary). He still, however, retained the direction of the order until the chapter of 1289. Matteo had summoned this chapter to meet at Assisi, but Nicholas IV caused it to be held in his presence at Rieti; here Raymond Guafredi, a native of Provence, was elected general. As general of the order Matteo maintained a moderate, middle course. Among other things he reorganized the studies pursued in the order. In the quarrel between Boniface VIII and the Colonna, from 1297 onwards, he strongly supported the pope, both in official memorials and in public sermons. Boniface VIII appointed him, both in 1297 and 1300, to an important embassy to Lombardy, where he attempted in vain to save the Blacks (Neri) and the Whites (Bianchi), that is, the Guelphs and Ghibellines, were violently at issue with each other. In 1301 Matteo returned to Florence, following Charles of Valois, but neither peace nor reconciliation was brought about. The Blacks finally
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Mater (Gr. ἡΔα; Lat. materia; Fr. matière; Ger. matter and stuff), the correlative of Form. See HYLOMORPHISM; FORM.

Taking the term in its widest sense, matter signifies that out of which an object is made or composed. Thus the original meaning of ἅνα (Homer) is "wood", in the sense of "grove" or "forest"; and hence, derivatively, "wood cut down" or timber. The Latin materia, as opposed to ligum (wood used for fuel), has also the meaning of timber for building purposes. In modern languages this word (signifying raw material) is used in a similar way. Matter is thus one of the elements of the becoming and continued being of an artificial product. The architect employs timber in the building of his house; the shoemaker fashions his shoes from leather. It will be observed that, as an intrinsic element, matter connotes composition, and is most easily studied in a consideration of the nature of change. This is treated of in a later article on CAUSE (q. v.). It will, however, be necessary to touch upon it briefly again here, since matter can only be rationally treated in so far as it is a correlate. The present article will therefore be divided into paragraphs giving the scholastic doctrine under the following heads: (1) Secondary Matter (in accidental exchange); (2) Permanent Matter (in accidental exchange); (3) The Nature of Primordial Matter; (4) Privation; (5) Permanent Matter; (6) The Unity of Matter; (7) Matter as the Principle of Individuation; (8) The Causality of Matter; (9) Variant Theories.

(1) Secondary Matter.—Accepting matter in the ori-
(2) Primordial Matter.—The explanation is not so obvious when it is extended to cover substantial change. It is indeed true that already, in speaking of the “matter” of accidental change (substance), we go beyond the experience given in sense perception. But, when we attempt to deal with the elements of corporeal substance, we proceed still further in the process of abstracting. It is, therefore, inevitable that we must form a concept of what we call “matter.” We have, however, no intuitive knowledge of these, nor of their principles. We may reason about them, indeed, and must so reason if we wish to explain the possibility of change; but to imagine is to court the danger of arriving at entirely false conclusions. Hence whatever may be asserted with regard to primordial matter must necessarily be the result of pure and abstract reasoning upon the concrete data furnished by sense. It is an inexisting principle invoked to account for substantial alteration. But, as St. Thomas Aquinas remarks, whatever knowledge of it we may acquire is reached only by its analogy to “form” (ibid.). The two are the inseparable companions of each other. The concepts of Aquinas may be briefly set out here as embodying that also of Aristotle, with which it is the main identical. It is the teaching commonly received in the School; though various other opinions, to which allusion will be made later, are to be found advanced both before and after its formulation by Aquinas.

(3) Prenatality.—The so-called “primordial matter” of St. Thomas is the common ground of substantial change, the element of indetermination in corporeal beings. It is a pure potentiality, or determinability, void of substantiality, of quality, of quantity, and of all the accidents that determine sensible being. It is not created, neither is it creatable, but is in a certain sense indefinable and undefined, (q. v.), to which it is opposed as a correlate, as one of the essential “intrinsic constituents” (De Principiis Naturae) of those corporeal beings in whose existence the act of creation terminates. Similarly it is not generated, neither does it corrupt in substantial change, since all generation and corruption is a transition in which one substance becomes another, and consequently can only take place in changes of composite subjects. It is produced out of nothing and can only cease to be by falling back into nothingness (De Natura Materie, i). Its potentiality is not a property superadded to its essence, for it is a potentiality towards substantial being (In I Phys., Lect. 14). St. Thomas says, to be for III, q. iv, a. 2 ad 4: “The relation of primordial matter...to passive potentiality is as that of God...to active (potentiam activam). Therefore matter is its passivity as God is His activity.” It is clear throughout that St. Thomas has here in view primordial matter in the uttermost degree of abstraction. Indeed, he is explicit upon the point. That is commonly called the “primordial matter” which is in the category of substance as a potentiality cognized apart from all species and form, and even from privation; yet susceptible of forms and privations” (De spiritual. creat., Q. i, a. 1).

If we were “obliged to define its essence, it would have for specific difference its relation to form, and for genus its substantiality” (Quod., IX, 6. 3). And again: “It has its being in the same manner that comes to it, since in itself it has incomplete, or rather no being at all” (De Principi. Nature). Such information is mainly negative in character, and the phrases employed by St. Thomas show that there is a certain difficulty in expressing exactly the nature of the principle under consideration. This difficulty evidently arises from the imagination, and with imagination the philosophy of matter has nothing to do. We must begin with the real, the concrete being. To explain this, and the changes it is capable of undergoing, we must infer the coexistence of matter and form determinate and determinant. We may then strip matter, by abstraction, of this, or that determination; we may consider its being apart from a representation, i.e., its being abstract to consider it apart from that analogy by which alone we can know it, once strip it mentally of its determinability by form, and nothing—absolute nothing—remains. For matter is neither realizable nor thinkable without its correlata. The proper object of intelligence, and likewise the subject of being, is Eux, being. Hence St. Thomas says that “primordial matter is a substantial reality” (i.e., a reality reductively belonging to the category of substance), “potential towards all forms, and, under the action of a fit and proportioned efficient cause, determinable to any species of corporeal substance” (In VII Met., sect. 2); and, again: “It is never stripped of form and privation; now it is under one form now under another. Of itself it can never exist” (De Principi. Natur.). What has been said may appear to deny to matter the reality that is predicated of it. This is not the case. As the determinable element in corporeal substance it must have a reality that is not that of the determinate forms. Therefore the process of abstraction may consider it as potential to form and privation, but not overstep the limit of its potentiality as existent (cf. Aristotle’s τῷ εὐνάρετον (Phys., iii, 194b, 16) and realized in bodies without finding itself contemplating absolute nothingness. Of itself matter can never exist, and consequently of itself it can never be thought.

(4) Prenatal Matter.—The notion of prenatal matter by Aquinas brings us to an exceedingly interesting consideration. While primordial matter, as “understood” without any form or privation, is an indifferent potentiality towards information by any corporeal form, the same matter, considered as realized by a given form, and actually existing, does not connote the same, if not indeed something to be formed. In fact, a certain rhythmic evolution of forms observable in nature. By electrolysis only oxygen and hydrogen can be obtained from water; from oxygen and hydrogen in definite proportions only water is generated. This fact St. Thomas expresses in the physical terms of his time: “If any particular matter, e.g. fire or air, were deprived of its form, it is manifest that the potentiality towards other edible forms remaining in it would not be so ample, as is the case in regard to matter (considered) universally” (De Nat. Mat., v). The consideration gives us the signification of “privation,” as used in the theory of substantial change. Matter is deprived of the form or forms towards which alone it has potential when deprived of the existent, or other state of determination. Hence the distinction that is found in the Opuscula “De Principiis Naturae”.

(5) Permanent Matter.—“Matter that does not con-
note a privation is permanent, whereas that which does is transient". The connotation of a privation limits primordial matter to that which is realized by a form disposing it towards realization by certain other definite forms. "Privation" is the absence of those forms. Permanent matter is matter considered in the hope of a desire for abstraction of accident, and there is no more nor less of its correlation to form in general.

(6) The Unity of Matter.—Further, this (permanent) matter is said to be one; not however, in the sense of a numerical unity. Every corporeal being is held to result from the union of matter and form. There are in consequence as many distinct individual realized portions of matter as there are distinct individual (atoms) in the universe. Nevertheless, when the severally determining principles and privations are abstracted from, when matter is cognized in its greatest abstraction, it is considered as possessing a logical unity. It is understood without any of those dispositions that make it appear numerically with the multiplication of bodies (De Principiis Naturae).

(7) Matter as the Principle of Individuation.—More important is the doctrine that grounds in matter the numerical distinction of specifically identical corporeal beings. In the general doctrine of St. Thomas, the individual—"this thing" (hoc aliquid)—is a primordial substance, by the face of it there is nothing else in the world ("Substantia individuatur per substantiam"; Summa, Pars I, Q. xxix, a. 1). It is intrinsically complete, capable of subsisting in itself as the subject of accidents, and of predicates in the logical. It is undivided in itself, distinct from all other, incommunicable (cf. De Principiis Individuationis). These characteristics are realized in the case of substances that differ by essence. Thus, for St. Thomas, no two angels (q. v.) are specifically identical (Summa, Pars I, Q. I, a. 4). More than this, even a corporeal form, however material and low in the hierarchy of forms, would not be other than unique in its species, if it could exist (or be thought), apart from its relation to matter (De Spiritu: Creaturis, Q. I, a. 5). Whence, if it could subsist without any subject, would be unique. If a plurality of such accidental forms could subsist they also would differ specifically—as whiteness, redness, etc. But this distinction evidently does not obtain in the case of a number of individuals belonging to one species. They are essentially identical in their nature, and yet, that the essence of any substance differs. The answer given by St. Thomas to this question is his doctrine of the Principle of Individuation. Whereas the plurality of simple substances, or "forms", is due to a real difference of their essences (as a triangle differs from a circle), the plurality of identical essences, or "forms", supposes an intrinsic principle of individuation for each (as two triangles realized in two pieces of wood). Thus, simple substances differ by reason of their nature, formally; while composite ones differ by reason of an inherent principle, materially. They are multiplied within a given species by reason of matter.

At this point a peculiarly delicate question arises. The abstract essence of a specific matter be the principle of individuation, it would seem that the abstract essence is already individualized. Werein lie the admitted difference between the species and the individual? On the other hand, if that be not the case, it would appear equally evident that, in adding to the individual a principle not contained in the thing, it is an action of classification in the species. It would not be merely the concrete realization of the essence, but something more. In either case the doctrine would seem to be incompatible with modern Realism. St. Thomas avoids the difficulty by teaching that matter is the principle of individuation, but only as correlated to quantity. The expressions that he uses are "materia signata", "materia subjecta dimensioni" (in Boeth. de Trin., Q. iv, a. 2), "materia sub certa dimensionibus" (De Nat. Mat., ii). This needs some explanation. Quantity, as such, is an accident; and it is evident that no accident can account for the individuality of its own subject. But quantity results in corporeal substance by reason of matter. Primordial matter, therefore, has a necessary relation to quantity consequent upon its necessary relation to form (De Nat. Mat., iv). When actuated by form it has dimensions—"the inseparable concomitants that determine it in time and place" (De Princ. Indiv.)). The abstract essence, then, embracing matter as it does form, will connotate an aptitude or potentiality towards fixed and determinate dimensions, that necessarily resultant in each concrete subject realized.

Here, as formerly, the fact must not be lost sight of that the reasoning begins with the concrete bodies actually existing in nature. It is by an abstraction that we consider matter without the actual quantity that it always exhibits when realized in corporeal substance. Peter, as a matter of fact, differs from Paul, yet they are specifically identical as rational animals. Peter is "this" man, and Paul is "that", but "this" and "that", because "here" and "there", "Form is not individuated in that it is received in matter, but only in that it is received in this or that distinct matter, and determined to here and now" (in Boeth. de Trin., Q. i, a. 1). It is evident that the immediate and inseparable signs for us of the individual. They indicate "aen caro et osa". And they are only possible by reason of (informed) matter, the ground of divisibility and location in space. Still, it must be noted that matter signata quantitate is not to be understood as primordial matter having an aptitude towards fixed and determinate dimensions.

The determined dimensions that are found in the existing subject are to be attributed, St. Thomas teaches, to matter as "individuated by indeterminate dimensions preunderstood in it" ("In Boeth. de Trin."); Q. iv, a. 2; "De Nat. Mat., iv, vii). This remark explains how an individual (as Peter) can vary in dimension without varying in identity; and at the same time gives the reply of Aquinas to the difficulty raised above. Primordial matter, as connoted in the essence, has an aptitude towards indeterminate dimensions. These dimensions when realized are the ground of the determined dimensions (ibid.) that make the individual hic et nunc an object of sense-perception (De Nat. Mater., iii).

(8) The Causality of Matter.—Since Primordial Matter is numbered among the causes of corporeal being, the nature of its causality remains to be considered. (See Cause.) All scholastics admit its concurrence with form, as an intrinsic cause; but they are not unanimous as to the precise part it plays. For neither is it unitive; for John of St. Thomas receptive. The Cominences places its causality in both notes. It would, perhaps, seem more consonant with the doctrine of St. Thomas to adopt Cardinal Merecey's opinion that the causality of matter is first receptive and second unitive; provided always that its essential potentiality be not neutral.

(9) Variant Theories of Matter.—The teaching of Aquinas has been given as substantially identical with that of Aristotle. The main point of divergence lies in the opinion of Aristotle that the world—and consequently matter—is eternal. St. Thomas, in accepting the doctrine of Creation, denies the eternity of primordial matter. He disapproves of the concept of matter, as the potential, or determinable, element in change, unites and corrects the views of Heraclitus, Parmenides, and Plato. The perpetual flux of the first is found in the continual transformations that take place in material nature. The changeless "one" of the second is recognized in the abstract essences eternally identical with themselves. And the world of "ideas" of Plato is assigned its place as a world of intellectual
abstractions practised upon the bodies that fall under the observation of the senses. The universal is imma-
ent in the individual and multiplied by reason of its man-
er, for Plato it is a form of substance. Plato (and the
"formless and invisible") is also the condition
under which being becomes the object of the senses.
It gives to being all its imperfections. It is by a mix-
ture of being and nothingness, rather than by the
realization of a potentiality, that sensible things
exist. While for Aristotle matter is a real element of
being, for Plato it is a form. For the Neoplatonists, Plato (fol-
lowing Plato and the Stoics) also considered matter
the principle of imperfection, of limitation and of evil;
Plotinus made it empty space, or a pure possibility of
Being.

These systems are mentioned here because through
them St. Augustine drew his knowledge of Greek
philosophy. And in the doctrine of St. Augustine and
the source of an important current of thought that
ran through the Middle Ages. He puts forward at differ-
ent times two views as to the nature of matter. It is
first, corporeal substance in a chaotic state; second,
an element of complete indetermination, approaching
to the ψής of Plato. St. Augustine was not directly
acquainted with the works of Aristotle, yet he
 came to consider matter very closely to this thought
(probably through the Latin writings of the Neoplatonists)
in certain passages of the "Confessions" (cf. Lib.
XIII, v, and xxxiii): "For the 'confabulation'
of changeable things is capable of all those forms to
which the changeable are changed. And what is this?
Is it soul? Or body? If soul, it could be said: "Nothing:
something that is and is not", that would I say."

"For from nothing they were made of Thee, yet not of Thee:
not of anything not Thine, or which was before,
but of concreted matter, because Thou didst
create its informity without any interposition of
time. St. Augustine does not teach the dependence
of quanta upon matter; and he admits a quite
inert matter in the angels. Moreover, his doctrine of the
rationes seminales (of Stoical origin), which found
many adherents among later scholastics, clearly
assigns to matter something more than the character
of pure potentiality attributed to it by St. Thomas.
It may be noted that Albert the Great, the predecessor
of St. Thomas, also taught this doctrine and, further,
was of the opinion that the angelic "forms" must be
held to have a fundamentum, or ground of differen-
tiation, analogous to matter in corporeal beings.

Following St. Augustine, Alexander of Hales and
St. Bonaventure, with the Franciscan School as
a whole, teach that matter is one of the intrinsic ele-
ments in nature and form together are the principles of individuation for St. Bonaventure.
Duns Scotus is more characteristically subtle on the
point, which is a capital one in his synthesis. Matter
is to be distinguished as: (a) Materia primo prima, the
universalized indeterminate element of contingent be-
ings. This has real and numerical unity. (b) Materia
secunda" (or "form" and "quod"
(c) Materia tertio prima, subject of accidental change
existing bodies. For Scotus, who acknowledges his
indebtedness to Avicenne for the doctrine (De rerum
princip., Q. vii., a. 4), Materia prima prima is homoge-
neous in all creatures without exception. His system
is dualistic. Among later notable scholastics Suarez
may be cited as attributing an existence to primordial
matter. This is a logical consequence of his doctrine
that no real distinction is to be admitted between
essence and existence (q. v.). God could, he teaches,
"preserve matter without a form as He can a form
without matter" (Disput. Metaph., xv, sec. 9). In
his opinion, also, quantified matter no longer appears as
the principle of individuation. A considerable number
of theologians and philosophers have professed his
document upon both these points.

Albertus Magnus, Opera (Lyons, 1561).—Alexander of

Hales, In duodecim Aristotelis Metaphysica libros (1572); Iadem,
Unius Theologiae Summae, (Lyons, 1582); St. Thomas
Aquinas, Opera (Paris, 1592—97), especially the
De Natura Materiae, De Principio Individuationes, De Spiritualibus
Creaturis, De Divinitate Mundi, De Naturis Rerum, De
libri, IX, Q. iv, De Misione Elementorum, Aristolet, Opera
(Paris, 1619); St. Augustine, Opera (Antwerp, 1679—1705); St.
Bonaventura, Opera (Venetiae, 1706).—Thomas a Vio . . . Commentarius illustratus (Lyons, 1562);
De Wulk, Histoire de la Philosophie Medievale (Louvain);
Paris, Mathec et Phurm (1689); Grote, Aristotle (London, 1873); Iadem, Plato and the other companions of Socrates (London, 1885); Harper, The Metaphysics of the School (1679); Lorenzei,
Philosophia Theoreticae Institutiones (Romae, 1686); Mercier,
Monistre (Lyons, 1692); Bare, Conceptuelle (Lyons, 1694);
Scotum, Opera (Lyons, 1630); St. Thomas, Opera,
Aristolet (Paris, 1837—92); Suarez, Metaphysicarum disputationum
(Naples, 1605); Uebereigen, Moras (1672); Windelband, A History of Philosophy, tr. Tufts (New
York, 1893).

Francis Aveling.

Matteucci, Carlo, physicist, b. at Forli, in the
Romagna, 21 June, 1811; d. at Ardezzo, near Leg-
horn, 25 July, 1868. He studied mathematics at the
University of Bologna, receiving his doctorate in
1829. Then he went to the Paris Ecole Polytechnique for two
years as a foreign student. In 1835 he went to
Forli and began to experiment in physics. In taking
up the Voltaic pile he took sides against Volta's con-
tact theory of electricity. He remained at Florence
until his father's death in 1834, when he went to
Ravenna and later to Pisa. His study of the Voltaic
battery led him to announce the law that the decom-
mposition in the electrolytic cells formed and
developed in the elements of the pile. From the ex-
ternal effect it became possible to calculate the ma-
terial used up in the pile. In 1837 he was invited by his
friend Buoninsegni, president of the Ravenna
Hospital, to take charge of its chemical laboratory and at
the same time assume the title and rank of professor
of physics at the college. There he did most excellent
work and soon became famous. Arago, hearing of
the vacancy in the chair of physics at the University of
Pisa, wrote to Humboldt asking him to recommend
Matteucci to the Grand-Duke of Tuscany. This appli-
cation was successful and there at Pisa he continued
his researches. Beginning with Arago's and Faraday's
discoveries he developed by ingenious experiments our
knowledge of electro-statics, electro-dynamics, in-
duced currents, and the like, but his greatest achieve-
ments however were in the field of electro-physiology,
with frogs, torpedoes, and the like.

He was also successful as a politician. In 1848
Commissioner of Tuscany to Charles Albert; sent to
Milan to plead the cause of the Northern school of the
German Assembly; 1849 in Pisa, director of the tele-
graphs of Tuscany; 1859 provisional representative
of Tuscany at Turin, and then sent to Paris with Peruzzi
and Neri Corsini to plead the annexation of Piedmont;
1860 Inspector-General of the telegraph lines of the
Italian Kingdom. Senator at the Tuscan Assembly
in 1848, and again in the Italian Senate in 1860; Minister
of Public Instruction, 1862, in the cabinet of Rattazzi.
He won the Copley medal of the Royal Society of
London, and was made corresponding member of
the Paris Academy of Sciences in 1844. He published
a great deal in English, French, and Italian journals of
science. His larger works were: "Lazioni di fisica"
(4th ed., Pisa, 1858); "Lazioni sui fenomeni fisico-
chimici dei corpi viventi" (2nd ed., Pisa, 1846); "Ma-
nuale di telegrafia elettrica" (2nd ed., Pisa, 1851);
"Cours special sur l'induction, le magnetisme de rota-
tion", etc. (Paris, 1854); "lettres sur l'instruction
publique" (Paris, 1864); "Trait des phenomenes elec-
trico-physiologiques de l'animal" (M.1. 1864).

Bianchi, Carlo Matteucci e l'Italia del suo tempo (Rome,
1874); Nuova Enciclopedia Italiana (Turin, 1892).

William Fox.

Matthew, Saint, Apostle and Evangelist.—The name Matthew is derived from the Hebrew Mattiha,
ST. MATTHEW

GIOVANNI FRANCESCO BARBIERI (IL GUERCINO), THE GALLERY, DRESDEN
being shortened to Maltai in post-Biblical Hebrew. In Greek it is sometimes spelled Maltaios, B D, and sometimes Maltheos, CEKL, but grammarians do not agree as to which of the two spellings is the original. Matthew is spoken of five times in the New Testament: first in Matt., ix, 9, when called by Jesus to follow Him; second in the "Protevangelium" of James, where he is mentioned in the seventh (Luke, vi, 15, and Mark, iii, 18), and again in the eighth place (Matt., x, 3, and Acts, i, 13). The man designated in Matt., ix, 9, as "sitting in the custom house", and "named Matthew" is the same as Levi, recorded in Mark, ii, 14, and Luke, v, 27, as "sitting at the receipt of custom", or "tax-gatherer", and is therefore, by the vocation of Matthew-Levi being alluded to in the same terms. Hence Levi was the original name of the man who was subsequently called Matthew; the Maltaios λεγομενος of Matt., ix, 9, would indicate this fact. The fact of one man having two names is of frequent occurrence among the Jews. It is true that the same person usually bears a Hebrew name such as "Shaoul" and a Greek name, Ναταλ. However, we have also examples of individuals with two Hebrew names as, for instance, Joseph-Caiphas, Simon-Cephas, etc. It is probable that Mattia, "gift of Iaveh", was the name conferred upon the tax-gatherer by Jesus Christ when He called him to the Apostolate, and by it He would distinguish him from the common city the other tax-gatherer, Levi being his original name. Matthew, the son of Alpheus (Mark, ii, 14) was a Galilean, although Eusebius informs us that he was a Syrian. As tax-gatherer at Capernaum, he collected custom-duities for Herod Antipas and, although a Jew, was despised by the Pharisees, who hated all publicans. When summoned by Jesus to leave these unclean offices and follow Christ, He anointed Him a feast in his house, where tax-gatherers and sinners sat at table with Christ and His disciples. This drew forth a protest from the Pharisees whom Jesus rebuked in these consoling words: "I came not to call the just, but sinners." No further allusion is made to Matthew in the Gospels, except in the list of the Apostles; as a disciple and an Apostle he is therefore for followed Christ, accompanying Him up to the time of His Passion and, in Galilee, was one of the witnesses of His Resurrection. He was also amongst the Apostles who were present at the Ascension, and afterwards withdrew to an upper chamber, in Jerusalem, praying in union with Mary, the Mother of Jesus, and with his brother James. Of Matthew's subsequent career we have only inaccurate or legendary data. St. Ireneaus tells us that Matthew preached the Gospel among the Hebrews, St. Clement of Alexandria claiming that he did this for fifteen years, and Eusebius maintains that, before going into other countries, he gave them his Gospel in the mother tongue. Ancient writers are not as one as to the countries evangelized by Matthew, but almost all mention Ethiopia to the south of the Caspian Sea (not Ethiopia in Africa), and some Persia and the kingdom of the Parthians, Macedonias, and Syria. According to Heracleon, who is quoted by Clement of Alexandria, Matthew did not die a martyr, but this opinion conflicts with all the traditions. Hence, however, that the account of his martyrdom in the apocryphal Greek writings entitled "Martyrium S. Matthiei in Ponto" and published by Bonnet, "Acta apostolorum apocrypha" (Leipzig, 1898), is absolutely devoid of historic value. Lipsius holds that this "Martyrium S. Matthiei", which contains traces of Gnosticism, was actually written in the third century. There is a disagreement as to the place of St. Matthew's martyrdom and the kind of torture inflicted on him, therefore it is not known whether he was burned, stoned, or beheaded. The Roman Martyrology simply says: "S. Matthae, qui in Ethio- piis predictans martyrium passus est". Various writings are now considered apocryphal, have been attributed to St. Matthew. In the "Evangelia apocrypha" (Leipzig, 1876), Tischendorf reproduced a Latin document entitled: "De Ortu beate Mariae et infantia Salvatoris", supposedly written in Hebrew by St. Matthew the Evangelist, and translated into Latin by Jerome, the priest. It is an abridged adaptation of the "Prophecies of Isaiah" (Jerome), and is therefore a Greek apocryphal of the second century. This pseudo-Matthew dates from the middle or the end of the sixth century, and M. Aman has just given us a new edition of it: "Le Protévangile de Jacques et ses remaniements latin" (Paris, 1910). The Latin Church celebrates the feast of St. Matthew on 21 November, and the Greek Church on 16 November. St. Matthew is represented under the symbol of a winged man, carrying in his hand a lance as a characteristic emblem.

E. JACQUEREL.

Matthew, Saint, Gospel of.—I. Canonicity.—The earliest Christian communities looked upon the Books of the Old Testament as Sacred Scripture, and read them at their religious assemblies. That the Gospels, which contained the words of Christ and the narrative of His life, soon enjoyed the same authority as the Old Testament, is made clear by Hegesippus (Eusebius, "Hist. eccl. IV, xxiii, 3), who tells us that the first reading in the synagogues of the law, the prophets, and the Lord. A book was acknowledged as canonical when the Church regarded it as Apostolic, and had it read at her assemblies. Hence, to establish the canonicity of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, we must investigate primitive Christian tradition for the use that was made of this document, and for indications proving that it was regarded as Scripture in the same manner as the Books of the Old Testament.

The first trace that we find of it are not indubitable, because post-Apostolic writers quoted the texts with a certain freedom, and principally because it is difficult to say whether the passages thus quoted were taken from oral tradition or from a written Gospel. The first Christian document whose date can be fixed with comparative certainty (95-98), is the Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians. It contains sayings of the Lord which closely resemble those recorded in the First Gospel (Clement, vii, 15 = Matt., xi, 28; Clem., xxiv, 5 = Matt., xiii, 9), but it is possible that they are independent. Questioned from Apostolic tradition, in Clement, and in the Gospel of St. John, on the other hand, we find a mixture of sentences from Matthew, Luke, and an unknown source. Again, we note a similar commingling of Evangelical texts elsewhere in the same Epistle of Clement, in the Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles, in the Epistle of Polycarp, and in Clement of Alexandria. Whether these texts were thus combined in oral tradition or through a collection of Christ's utterances, we are unable to say.—The Epistles of St. Ignatius (martyred 110-17) contain no literal quotation from the Holy Books; nevertheless, St. Ignatius borrowed expressions and some sentences from Matthew ("Ad Polyc. II, 2 = Matt., x, 18; "Eph.", xiv, 2 = Matt., xii, 33, etc.). In his Epistle to the Philippians (Phil., xiv, 12), he borrows the Gospel in which he takes refuge as in the Flesh of Jesus; consequently, he had an Evangelical collection which he regarded as Sacred Writ, and we cannot doubt that the Gospel of St. Matthew formed part of it.—In the Epistle of St. Polycarp (110-17), we find various passages from St. Matthew quoted literally (xiii, 3 = Matt., v, 44; xxvi, 4 = Matt., xxvii, 41, etc.). The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles contains sixty-six passages that recall the Gospel of Matthew; some of them are literal quotations (viii, 2 = Matt., vi, 7-13; vili, 1 = Matt., xxvii, 19; xi, 7 = Matt., xii, 31, etc.). In the so-called Epistle of Barnabas (117-30), we find a passage from St. Matthew (xxiii, 14), introduced by the scriptural formula, της ἐγγέννησις, which proves that the author considered
the Gospel of Matthew equal in point of authority to the writings of the Old Testament.—The "Shepherd of Hermas" has several passages which bear close resemblance to passages of Matthew, but not a single literal quotation from it.—In his "Dialogue" (xxix, 8), St. Justin quotes, almost literally, the prayer of Christ in the Garden of Olives, in Matthew, xxvi, 39, 40. In his "Dialogue" (xxxi, 4), St. Justin narrates a passage from the Gospel of Matthew, and proves that he ranked it among the Memoirs of the Apostles which, he said, were called Gospels (I Apol., lxvi), were read in the services of the Church (ibid., lxvii), and were consequently regarded as Scripture.—In his "Legatio pro christianis", xi, 11, Athenagoras (117) quotes almost literally, a sentence from the written on St. Mount (Matt., v, 44).—Theophilus of Antioch (Ad Autol., III, xiii-xiv) quotes a passage from Matthew (v, 28, 32), and, according to St. Jerome (In Matt. Prolog.), wrote a commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew.—We find in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs—drawn up, according to some critics, about the middle of the second century—numerous passages that closely resemble the Gospel of Matthew (Test. Gad, v, 3; vi, 6; v, 7 = Matt., xviii, 15, 35; Test. Jos., i, 5, 6 = Matt., xxxv, 35, 36, etc.), but Dr. Charles maintains that the Testaments were written in Hebrew in the first century before Jesus Christ, and translated into Greek in the middle of the same century. In the Testaments, the Gospel of Matthew is interwoven with the Testaments and not the Testaments upon the Gospel. The question is not yet settled, but it seems to us that there is a greater probability that the Testaments, at least in their Greek version, are of later date than the Gospel of Matthew; they certainly received numerous Christian additions.—The Greek text of the Clementine Homilies contains some quotations from Matthew (Hom. iii, 52 = Matt., xv, 13); in Hom. xviii, 15, the quotation from Matt., xiii, 35, is literal.—Passages which suggest the Gospel of Matthew might be quoted from heretical writings of the second century and from apocryphal gospels—the Gospel of Peter, the Protoevangelium of James, etc., in which the narrations, to a considerable extent, are derived from the Gospel of Matthew.—Tatian incorporated the Gospel of Matthew in his "Diatesseron"; we shall quote below the testimonies of Papias and St. Irenaeus. For the latter, the Gospel of Matthew, from which he quotes numerous passages, was one of the four that constituted the Gospels of the New Testament, and were of the new discovery of the single spirit.—Tertullian (Adv. Marc., IV, i) asserts, that the "Instrumentum evangelicum" was composed by the Apostles, and mentions Matthew as the author of a Gospel (De carnis Christi, xii.)—Clement of Alexandria (Strorn., III, xiii) speaks of the four Gospels that have been transmitted, and quotes over three hundred passages from the Gospel of Matthew, which he introduces by the formula, en oti tou ekkatalMatthew σαλµονιον or by φυλαρβα και.

It is unnecessary to pursue our inquiry further. About the middle of the third century, the Gospel of Matthew was received by the whole Christian Church as a Divinely inspired document, and consequently as canonical. The testimony of the Fathers ("In Matth."

quoted by Eusebius, "Hist. ecc.", III, xxv, 4), of Eusebius (op. cit., III, xxiv, 6; xxv, 1), and of St. Jerome ("De Viris Illi.", iii, "Prolog. in Matt.") are explicit in this respect. It might be added that this Gospel is found in the most ancient versions: Old Latin, Syriac, and Egyptian. Finally, it stands at the head of the four Gospels in the Codex Vaticanus of the Council of Laodicea (363) and in that of St. Athanasius (326-73), and very probably it was in the last part of the Muratorian Canon. Furthermore, the canonicity of the Gospel of St. Matthew is accepted by the entire Christian world.

II. AUTHENTICITY OF THE FIRST GOSPEL.—The question of authenticity assumes an altogether special aspect in regard to the First Gospel. The early Christian writers assert that St. Matthew wrote a Gospel in Hebrew; this Hebrew Gospel has, however, entirely disappeared, and the Gospel which we have, and from which ecclesiastical writers borrow quotations as coming from the Gospel of Matthew, is in Greek. What connexion is there between this Hebrew Gospel and the Greek Gospel, both of which tradition attributes to St. Matthew? Such is the problem that presents itself for solution. Let us first examine the facts.

A. Testimony of Tradition.—According to Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, xxxix, 16), Papias said that Matthew collected (συναγωγέω; or, according to two manuscripts, συνενωτέο; composed of τα Λογια (the oracles or sayings of Jesus) in the Hebrew (Aramaic) language, and that each one translated them as best he could.

Three questions arise in regard to this testimony of Papias on Matthew: (1) What does the word Λογια signify? Does it mean only detached sentences or sentences incorporated in a narrative, that is to say, a Gospel such as that of St. Matthew? Among classical writers, λόγιον, the diminutive of λόγος, signifies the "answer of oracles", a "prophecy"; in the Septuagint and in Philo, "oracles of God" (τα δευτερα λόγια, the Ten Commandments). It sometimes has a broader meaning and seems to include both facts and sayings. Thus the New Testament the signification of the word λόγιον is doubtful, and if it is used to indicate teachings and narratives, the meaning "oracles" is the more natural. However, writers contemporary with Papias—e.g. St. Clement of Rome (Ad Cor. lii), St. Irenaeus (Adv. Her. I, vii, 2), Clement of Alexandria (Strorn., I, cxxxii), and Origen (De Principio, B. 3, 5)—have used it to designate facts and sayings. The work of Papias was entitled "Exposition of the Oracles [λογια] of the Lord" and it also contained narratives (Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", III, xxxix, 9). On the other hand, speaking of the Gospel of Mark, Papias says that this Evangelist wrote all that Christ had said and done, but adds that he established no connexion between the Lord's sayings (συναγωγε των ευρασεων λογου). We may believe that here λογια comprises all that Christ said and did. Nevertheless, it would seem that, if the two passages on Mark and Matthew followed each other in Papias as in Eusebius, the author intended to emphasize a difference between them, by implying that Mark recorded Christ's sayings, while Matthew records his discourses. The question is still unsolved; it is, however, possible that, in Papias, the term λογια means deeds and teachings.

(2) Second, does Papias refer to oral or written translations of Matthew, when he says that each one translated the sayings "as best he could"? As there is nowhere any allusion in the numerous Greek translations of the Logia of Matthew, it is probable that Papias speaks here of the oral translations made at Christian meetings, similar to the extemporaneous translations of the Old Testament made in the synagogues. This would explain why Papias mentions that each one (each reader) translated "as best he could".

(3) Finally, were the Logia of Matthew and the Gospel to which ecclesiastical writers refer written in Hebrew or Aramaic? Both hypotheses are held. Papias says that Matthew wrote the Logia in the Hebrew (בָּבֶל) language; St. Irenaeus and Eusebius maintain that he wrote his Gospel for the Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue. Aramaic was also used in both; it is found in several writers. Matthew would, therefore, seem to have written in modernized Hebrew, the language then used by the scribes for teaching. But, in the time of Christ, the national language of the Jews was Aramaic, and when, in the New Testament, there is mention of the Hebrew language (בָּבֶל סדר), it is Aramaic that is implied. Hence, the aforesaid
writers may allude to the Aramaic and not to the Hebrew. Besides, as they assert, the Apostle Matthew wrote his Gospel to help popular teaching. To be understood by his readers who spoke Aramaic, he would have had to reproduce the original catechisms in this language, and it cannot be imagined why, or for whom, he should have taken the trouble to write it in Greek. For the second time in his life, however, he had to be translated hence into Aramaic for use in religious services. Moreover, Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, xxiv, 6) tells us that the Gospel of Matthew was a reproduction of his preaching, and this, we know, was in Aramaic. An investigation of the Semitic idioms observed in the Gospel does not permit us to conclude as to whether the original was in Hebrew or Aramaic. The two languages are so closely related. Besides, it must be borne in mind that the greater part of these Semiticisms simply reproduce colloquial Greek and are not of Hebrew or Aramaic origin. However, we believe the second hypothesis to be the more probable, viz., that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Aramaic.

Let us now recall the testimony of the other ecclesiastical writers on the Gospel of St. Matthew. St. Ireneus (Adv. Her., III, i, 2) affirms that Matthew published among the Hebrews a Gospel which he wrote in their own language. Eusebius (Hist. eccl., V, x, 3) says that, in India, Pantaenus found the Gospel according to St. Matthew written in the Hebrew language, and had left it there. Again, in his "Hist. eccl." (VI, xxv, 3, 4), Eusebius tells us that Origen, in his first book on the Gospel of St. Matthew, states that he has learned from tradition that the first Gospel was written by Matthew, who, having composed it in Hebrew, published it for the converts from Judaism according to Eusebius (Hist. eccl., V, x, 3). Matthew preached first to the Hebrews and, when obliged to go to other countries, gave them his Gospel written in his native tongue. St. Jerome has repeatedly declared that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew ("Ad Damasum," xx; "Ad Helif.," iv), but says that it is not known with certainty who translated it into Greek. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. Epiphanius, St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine, etc., and all the commentators of the Middle Ages repeat that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. Erasmus was the first to express doubts on this subject: "It does not seem probable to me that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, since no one is aware of an authoritative passage of the New Testament." This is not accurate, as St. Jerome uses Matthew's Hebrew text several times to solve difficulties of interpretation, which proves that he had it at hand. Pantaenus also had it, as, according to St. Jerome ("De Viris Illi.", xxxvi), he brought it back to Alexandria. However, the testimony of Pantaenus is only second-hand, and that of Jerome remains rather ambiguous, since in neither case is it positively known that the writer did not mistake the Gospel according to the Hebrew (written of course in Hebrew) for the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew. However, all ecclesiastical writers assert that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, and, by quoting the Greek Gospel and ascribing it to Matthew, thereby affirm it to be a translation of the Hebrew Gospel.

B. Examination of the Greek Gospel of St. Matthew.—Our chief object is to ascertain whether the characteristics of the Greek Gospel indicate that it is a translation from the Aramaic, or that it is an original document; but, that we may not have to revert to the peculiarities of the Greek Gospel of Matthew, we shall here treat them in full.

(1) The Language of the Gospel.—St. Matthew used about 1475 words, 137 of which are ἀραὶ λέγεμα (words used by him alone of all the New Testament writers). Of these latter 76 are classical; 21 are found in the Septuagint; 15 (ἀπαντάσεις, βεβήλη, εἰσόδημα, etc.) were introduced for the first time by Matthew, or at least he was the first writer in whom they were discovered; 8 words (ἡσυχασία, ἀποκάλυψις, etc.) were employed for the first time by Matthew and Mark, and 15 others (ἐνθάνεται, ἵππος, etc.) by Matthew and another New Testament writer. It is probable that, at the time of the Evangelist, all these words were in current use. Matthew's Gospel contains many peculiar expressions which help to decide decisively in his style. Thus, he employs thirty-four times the expression βασιλεία τῶν οχρών; this is never found in Mark and Luke, who, in parallel passages, replace it by βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, which also occurs four times in Matthew. We must likewise note the expressions: ἐν ᾧ ἦσαν, ἐν τῷ ὀλίγῳ, συνήθει τοῦ, ἐν τῷ ὀλίγῳ, κύριος, etc., which are common to Matthew and Luke and never occur in Mark.

Matthew prefers the expression τῆς Παλαιστίνης for Jerusalem, and not Ἰερουσαλήμ, which he uses but once. He has a predilection for the prepositions ἐν, ἐκ, ἐν τῷ, καὶ ὑπὸ, etc. He adopts the Greek form ἄνθρωπον for Jerusalem, and not Ἰσραήλ, which he uses but once. He has a predilection for the preposition ἐν, using it even when Mark and Luke use ἐκ, and for the expression στὰς ἐν τῇ. Moreover, Matthew is fond of repeating a phrase or a special construction several times within quite a short interval (cf. i, 1, 13, and 19; iv, 12, 18, and v, 2; vii, 2–3 and 28; ix, 26 and 31; xiii, 44, 45, and 47, etc.). Quotations from the Old Testament are variously introduced, as: ἄναφθηκε ἐπάνω, ἢ ἂν, ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ γῆ, ὡς τὸ Κορινθίου ἀναθηματισμοὶ, etc. These peculiarities of language, especially the repetition of the same words and expressions, would indicate that the Greek Gospel was an original rather than a translation, and this is confirmed by the paronomasia (βασιλεία, τολμηρία, ὑποτάσσεται, καὶ ἔφεστο, etc.), which ought not to have been found in the Aramaic, by the employment of the genitive in some cases and, above all, by the linking of clauses through the use of μὲν...δὲ, a construction that is peculiarly Greek. However, let us observe that these various characteristics prove merely that the writer was thoroughly conversant with his language, and that he translated his text rather freely. Besides, these same characteristics are noticeable in Christ's sayings, as well as in the narratives, and, as these utterances were made in Aramaic, they were consequently translated; thus, the construction μὲν...δὲ (except in one instance) and all the examples of paronomasia occur in discourses of Christ. The fact that the genitive absolute is used mainly in the paronomasia, in the narrative, and in the genitive absolute of the Septuagint, a marked difference is at once apparent. The original Hebrew shines through every line of the latter, whereas, in the First Gospel Hebraisms are comparatively rare, and are merely such as might be looked for in a book written by a Jew and reproducing Jewish teaching. However, these observations are not conclusive in view of the fact that, in the first place, the unity of style that prevails throughout the book, would rather prove that we have a translation. It is certain that a good portion of the matter existed first in Aramaic—at all events, the sayings of Christ, and thus almost three-quarters of the Gospel. Consequently, these at least the Greek writer has translated. And, since no difference in language and
style can be detected between the sayings of Christ and the narratives that are claimed to have been composed in Greek, it would seem that these latter are also translated from the Aramaic. This conclusion is based on the fact that they are of the same origin as the discourses. The unity of plan and the artificial arrangement of the subject matter, as well as the fact that the narrative in the Aramaic Gospel has been made in Matthew's Aramaic as in the Greek document; the fine Greek construction, the lapidary style, the elegance and good order claimed as characteristic of the Gospel, are largely a matter of opinion, the proof being that critics do not agree on this question. Although the phraseology is not more Hebraic than in the others, the same is not true of the Aramaic Gospel. All this, as well as the fact that from a literary examination of the Greek Gospel, no certain conclusion can be drawn against the existence of a Hebrew Gospel of which our First Gospel would be a translation; and inversely, this examination does not prove the Greek Gospel to be a translation of an Aramaic original.

(3) Quotations from the Old Testament.—It is claimed that most of the quotations from the Old Testament are borrowed from the Septuagint, and that this fact proves that the Gospel of Matthew was composed in Greek. The first proposition is not accurate, and, even if it were, it would not necessitate this conclusion. Let us examine the facts. As established by Stuart, the New Testament Gospels as Hebrew or Aramaic (Cambridge, 1909, p. 342), the quotations from the Old Testament in the First Gospel are divided into two classes. In the first are ranged all those quotations the object of which is to show that the prophecies have been realized in the events of the life of Jesus. They are introduced by the words: · · · Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet · · · or other similar expressions. The quotations of this class do not in general correspond exactly with any particular text. Three among them (ii, 15; viii, 17; xxvii, 9, 10) are borrowed from the Hebrew; five (ii, 15; iv, 15, 16; xi, 18–21; xiii, 35; xxi, 4, 5) bear points of resemblance to the Septuagint, but were not borrowed from that version. In the answer of the chief priests and scribes to Herod (ii, 6), the text of the Old Testament is slightly modified, without, however, conforming either to the Hebrew or the Septuagint. The Prophet Michaes writes (v, 2): · · · And thou Bethlehem, Ephratah, art a little one among thousands of Judah · · · whereas Matthew says vii, 6, 8: And there shall be a great astonishment among the princes of Judah. A single quotation of this first class (iii, 2) conforms to the Septuagint, and another (i, 23) is almost comparable. These quotations are to be referred to the first Evangelist himself, and relate to facts, principally to the birth of Jesus (i, ii), then to the mission of John the Baptist, the preaching of the Gospel by Jesus (v, 17; xiii, 30, 55), the miracles of Jesus, etc. It is surprising that the narratives of the Passion and the Resurrection of Our Lord, the fulfillment of the very clear and numerous prophecies of the Old Testament, should never be brought into relation with these prophecies. Many critics, e.g. Burkitt and Stanton, think that the quotations of the first class are from a collection of passages forming a part of the Messiahian expectations. Stanton being of opinion that they were accompanied by the event that constituted their realization. This · · · catena of fulfilments of prophecy · · · as he calls it, existed originally in Aramaic, but whether the author of the First Gospel had a Greek translation of it is uncertain. The second class of quotations from the Old Testament is chiefly comprised of passages that are sometimes repeated either by the Lord or by His interrogators. Except in two passages, they are introduced by one of the formulæ: · · · It is written · · · ; · · · As it is written · · · ; · · · Have you not read? · · · ; · · · Moses said: · · · . Where Matthew alone quotes the · · · Lord's words, the quotation is sometimes borrowed from the Septuagint (v, 21 a, 27, 58) or, again, it is a free translation which we are unable to refer to any definite text (v, 21 b, 23, 43). In those passages where Matthew runs parallel with Mark and Luke or with either of them, all the quotations save one (xi, 10) are taken almost literally from the Septuagint.

(4) Analogy to the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke.—From a first comparison of the Gospel of Matthew with the two other Synoptic Gospels we find (a) that 330 verses are peculiar to it alone; that it has between 330 and 370 in common with both the others, from 170 to 180 with Mark's, and from 230 to 240 with Luke's; (b) that in like parts the same ideas are expressed sometimes in identical and sometimes in different terms; that Matthew and Mark most frequently agree and Matthew and Luke are agreeing with Mark against Luke. The divergence in the use of the same expressions is in the number of a noun or the use of two different tenses of the same verb. The construction of sentences is at times identical and at others different. (γ) That the order of narrative is, with certain exceptions which we shall later indicate, almost the same in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. These facts indicate that the three Synoptists are not independent of one another. They borrow their subject—matter from the same oral source or else from the same written documents. To declare oneself upon this alternative, it would be necessary to treat the synoptic question, and on this critics have not yet agreed. We cannot deal with these documents (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) here. We shall, therefore, deal with the Gospel of St. Matthew. From a second comparison of this Gospel with Mark and Luke we ascertain: (a) that Mark is to be found almost complete in Matthew, with certain divergences which we shall note; (b) that Matthew records many of our Lord's discourses in common with Luke; (c) that Matthew has special passages which are unknown to Mark and Luke. Let us examine these three points in detail, in an endeavour to learn how the Gospel of Matthew was composed.

(a) Analogy to Mark.—(i) Mark is found complete in Matthew, with the exception of numerous slight omissions and the following pericopes: Mark, i, 23–28, 35–37; iv, 26–29; vii, 33–36; xx, 29 ix, 1–40; xii, 41–44. In all, 31 verses are omitted. (ii) The general order is identical except that, in chapters v–xiii, Matthew groups facts of the same nature and sayings conveying the same ideas. Thus, in Matt., viii, 1–15, we have three miracles that are separated in Mark; in Matthew, viii, 23–ix, 9, there are gathered together events otherwise separated and placed sentences in a different environment from that given them by Mark. For instance, in chapter v, 15, Matthew inserts a verse occurring in Mark, iv, 21, that should have been placed after xiii, 23, etc. (iii) In Matthew the narrative is usually shorter because he suppresses a great number of details. Thus, in Mark, we read: · · · And the wind ceased; and there was a great calm · · · whereas in Matthew the first part of the sentence is omitted. All unnecessary particulars are dispensed with, such as the numerous picturesque features and indications of time, place, and number, in which Mark's narrative abounds. (iv) Sometimes, however, Matthew is the more detailed. Thus, in Mark, xii, 22–45, he has a discursive speech of Jesus; in Matthew, xiii, 33, he repeats some of these repeated either by the Lord or by His interrogators. Except in two passages, they are introduced by one of the formulæ: · · · It is written · · · ; · · · As it is written · · · ; · · · Have you not read? · · · ; · · · Moses said: · · · . Where Matthew alone quotes the · · · Lord's words, the quotation is sometimes borrowed from the Septuagint, (v) Changes of terms or divergences in the mode of expression are extremely frequent. Thus, Matthew often uses εἰρήνη, when Mark has εἰρωνεία; μῦρος · · · δέ, instead of καθ, as in Mark, etc.; the aorist instead of the imperfect employed by Mark. He avoids double negatives and the construction of the participle with ἐν· his style is more correct and less harsh than that of Mark,
resolves Mark's compound verbs, and replaces by terms in current use the rather unusual expressions introduced by Parts pewc [(vii)] to Mark. Matthew.—These are numerous, as Matthew has 330 verses that are distinctly his own. Sometimes long passages occur, such as those recording the Nativity and early childhood (i, ii), the cure of the two blind men and one dumb man (ix, 27-34), the death of Judas (xxvii, 3-10), the guard placed at the Sepulchre (xxvii, 62-66), the imposture of the two blind priests (xxviii, 11-15), the parable of Judas (Galilee (xxviii, 16-20), a great portion of the Sermon on the Mount (v, 17-37; vi, 1-8; vii, 12-23), parables (xii, 24-30; 35-53; xxv, 1-13), the Last Judgment (xxv, 31-46), etc., and sometimes detached sentences, as in xxvii, 3, 28, 33; xxviii, 25, etc. (cf. Rushbrooke, "Synopticon", pp. 171-97). Those passages in which Matthew reminds us of another writer, or of the fulfillment of the prophecies, are likewise noted as peculiar to him, but of this we have already spoken.

These various considerations have given rise to a great number of hypotheses, varying in detail, but agreeing fundamentally. According to the majority of recent critics—H. Holtzmann, Wendt, Jülicher, Wernle, von Soden, Wellhausen, Harnack, B. Weiss, Nicolaudot, W. Allen, Montefiore, Plummer, and Stanton—the author of the First Gospel used two documents: the Gospel of Mark in its present or an earlier form, and a collection of discourses or sayings, which is designated by the letter Q. The repetitions occurring in Matthew (v, 29, 30 = xviii, 8, 9; v, 32 = xx, 10; vi, 22 et al.); the partial identity of parallel passages in Mark and Matthew may be explained by the fact that two sources furnished the writer with material for his Gospel. Furthermore, Matthew used documents of his own. In this hypothesis the Greek Gospel is supposed to be original, and not the translation of a complete Aramaic Gospel. It is admitted that the collection of sayings Q predates the Gospel of Mark, but the question of whether the Evangelist had it in this form or in that of a Greek translation. Critics also differ regarding the manner in which Matthew used the sources. Some would have it that Matthew the Apostle was not the author of the First Gospel, but merely the collector of the sayings of Christ mentioned by Papias. However, says Jülicher, "the author's individuality is so strikingly evident in his style and tendencies that it is impossible to consider the Gospel a mere compilation". Most critics are of a like opinion. Endeavours have been made to reconcile the information furnished by tradition with the facts resulting from the study of the Gospel as follows: Matthew was known to have been associated in Aramaic with Jesus; on the other hand, there existed at the beginning of the second century a Gospel containing the narratives found in Mark and the sayings gathered by Matthew in Aramaic. It is held that the Greek Gospel ascribed to Matthew is a translation of it, made by him or by other translators whose names was later attempted to ascertain.

To safeguard tradition further, while taking into consideration the facts we have already noted, it might be supposed that the three Synoptists worked upon the same catechesis, either oral or written and originally in Aramaic, and that they had detached portions of this catechesis, varying in literary condition. The diversities may be explained first by this latter fact, and then by the hypothesis of different translations and by each Evangelist's peculiar method of treating the subject-matter, Matthew and Luke especially having adapted it to the purpose of their Gospel. There is nothing to prevent the supposition that Matthew worked on the Aramaic catechesis; the divergences may have been due to the translator, who was more conversant with Greek than was the popular preacher who furnished the catechesis reproduced by Mark. In reality, the only difficulty lies in explaining the simi-
larity of style between Matthew and Mark. First of all, we may observe that the points of resemblance are less numerous than they are said to be. As we have seen, they are very rare in the narratives at all events, much more so than in the discourses of Christ. Why, then, should we not suppose that the three Synoptists, depending upon the same Aramaic catechism, sometimes agreed in rendering similar Aramaic expressions in the same words? It is also possible to suppose that sayings of Christ, which in the three Synoptic Gospels (or in two of them) differed only in a few expressions, were unified by copyists or other persons. To us it seems probable that Matthew’s Greek translator used Mark’s Greek Gospel, especially for Christ’s discourses. Luke, also, may have similarly utilized Mark’s Gospel, or at least his version of Mark’s discourses of Christ. Finally, even though we should suppose that Matthew were the author only of the Logia, the full scope of which we do not know, and that a part of his Greek Gospel is derived from that of Mark, we would still have a right to ascribe this First Gospel to Matthew as its principal author.

Other hypotheses have been put forth. In Zahn’s opinion, Matthew wrote a complete Gospel in Aramaic; Mark was familiar with this document, which he used while abridging it. Matthew’s Greek translator utilized Mark, but only for form, whereas Luke depended upon Mark and secondary sources, but was not acquainted with Matthew. According to Belser, Matthew’s Gospel was made by a Greek of the first century b.c. The translation of it being made in 59–60, and Mark depended on Matthew’s Aramaic document and Peter’s preaching. Luke made use of Mark, of Matthew (both in Aramaic and Greek), and also of oral tradition. According to Camerlynck and Coppieters, the First Gospel in its present form was composed either by Matthew himself, or by another Apostle; in any case, lengthier than the second century of the first century by combining the Aramaic work of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke.

III. PLAN AND CONTENTS OF THE FIRST GOSPEL.—The author did not wish to compose a biography of Christ, but to demonstrate, by recording His words and the deeds of His life, that He was the Messiah, the Head and Founder of the Kingdom of God, and the promulgator of its laws. One can scarcely fail to recognize that, except in a few parts (e.g. the Childhood and the Passion), the arrangement of events and of discourses is artificial. Matthew usually combines facts and precepts of a like nature. Whatever the reader gets through to the fifty or forty (thirty or thirty-nine) which may be counted—three divisions in the genealogy of Jesus (i, 17), three temptations (iv, 1–11), three examples of justice (vi, 1–18), three cures (vii, 1–15), three parables of the seed (xiii, 1–32), three denials of Peter (xxvi, 69–75), etc.; of five (these are less numerous)—five long discourses (vii–viii, 27; x, xii, 1–52; xviii, 31–44; xxvii–xxx, 31), etc., the First Gospel can be very naturally divided as follows:—

A. Introduction (i–iii).—The genealogy of Jesus, the prediction of His Birth, the Magi, the Flight into Egypt, the Massacre of the Innocents, the return to Nazareth, and the life there.

B. The Public Ministry of Jesus (iii–xxvii).—This may be divided into three parts, according to the place where He exercised it.

1. In Galilee (iii–xxiv).—(a) Preparation for the public ministry (iii, 1–iv, 11): John the Baptist, the Baptism of Jesus, the Temptation, the return to Galilee. (b) The preaching of the Kingdom of God (iv, 17–xviii, 35): the preparation of the Kingdom by the preaching of penance, the call of the disciples, and numerous cures (iv, 17–25), the promulgation of the code of the Kingdom of God in the Mount (v, 1–xii, 29); (ii) the propagation of the Kingdom in Galilee (vii, 1–xvii, 35). He groups together: (e) the deeds by which Jesus established that He was the Messiah and the King of the Kingdom: various cures, the calming of the tempest, missionary journeys through the land, the calling of the Twelve Apostles, the principles that should guide them in their missionary travel (viii, 1–x, 42); (b) divers teachings of Jesus called forth by circumstances: Jesus answers Judas’s question and the Lord’s answer, Christ’s confutation of the false charges of the Pharisees, the departure and return of the unclean spirit (xi, 2–xii, 50); finally, the parables of the Kingdom, of which Jesus makes known and explains the end (xiii, 3–52). (iii) Matthew then relates the different events that terminate the preaching in Galilee: Jesus’s visit to the Nacarouses of Christ. Finally, even though we should suppose that Matthew were the author only of the Logia, the full scope of which we do not know, and that a part of his Greek Gospel is derived from that of Mark, we would still have a right to ascribe this First Gospel to Matthew as its principal author.

2. Outside Galilee on the way to Jerusalem (xix–xxv).—Jesus leaves Galilee and goes beyond the Jordan; He discusses divorce with the Pharisees; answers the rich young man, and teaches self-denial and the danger of wealth; explains by the parable of the labourers how the elect will be called; replies to the indirect question of the mother of the sons of Zebedee and curtsies the request of James and John; In Jerusalem (xxvi–xxvii).—Jesus makes a triumphal entry into Jerusalem; he curses the barren fig-tree and enters into a dispute with the chief priests and the Pharisees who ask Him by what authority He has banished the sellers from the Temple, and answers them by the parable of the two sons of the husbandman, and the marriage of the king’s son: New questions are put to Jesus concerning the tribute, the resurrection of the dead, and the greatest commandment. Jesus anathematizes the scribes and Pharisees and foretells the events that will precede and accompany the fall of Jerusalem and the end of the world.

C. The Passion and the Resurrection of Jesus (xxvii–xxxviii).—(1) The Passion (xxvi–xxxvi).—Events are now hurrying to a close. The Sanhedrin plots for the death of Jesus, a woman anoints the feet of the Lord, and Judas betrays his Master. Jesus eats the passch with His disciples and institutes the Eucharist. In the Garden of Olives, He enters upon His agony and prays the Agnus Dei. All the disciples are brought before the Sanhedrin. Peter denies Christ; Judas hangs himself. Jesus is condemned to death by Pilate and crucified; He is buried, and a guard is placed at the Sepulchre (xxvi, 1–xxvii, 66).

(2) The Resurrection (xxxvii).—Jesus rises the third day and appears first to the holy women at Jerusalem, then in Galilee to His disciples. From then He sends forth to propagate throughout the world the Kingdom of God.
cause of their sins, the Jews, as a nation, shall have no part in this kingdom; (C) the Gospel will be announced to all nations, and all men are called to salvation.

A. St. Matthew has shown that in Jesus all the ancient prophecies on the Messias were fulfilled. He was the Emmanuel, born of a Virgin Mother (i, 22, 23), announced by Isaia (vii, 14); He was born at Bethlehem (ii, 6), as had been predicted by Micah (v, 2); He went to Nazareth, as foretold by Osai (xi, 1). According to the prediction of Isaia (xi, 3), He was heralded by a precursor, John the Baptist (iii, 1 sqq.); He cured all the sick, as foretold by Osai (xi, 1). Finally, He suffered, and the entire drama of His Passion and Death was a fulfilment of the prophecies of Scripture (Isaia, iii, 12-13; Ps. xxi, 13-22). Jesus proclaimed Himself the Messias by His approbation of Peter's confession (xvi, 16, 17) and by His answer to the high priest (xxvi, 63, 64). St. Matthew also endeavours to show that the Kingdom inaugurated by Jesus Christ is the Messianic Kingdom. From the beginning of His public life, Jesus proclaims that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand (iv, 17); in the Sermon on the Mount He proclaims the charter of this kingdom, and in parables He speaks of its nature and conditions. In His answer to the high priest (xxvi, 64), He declares that the Messianic Kingdom, foretold by the Prophets, has come to pass, and He describes its characteristics: "The blind see, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, the poor have the gospel preached to them." It was in these terms that Isaia had described the future kingdom (xxvi, 5, 6; xxxv, 5; Lam. iii, 17). Matthew expresses very formally the Lord's coming upon the Jews; "But if I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you" (xxii, 28). Moreover, Jesus could call Himself the Messias only as much as the Kingdom of God had come. That the pagans were called to salvation instead of the Jews, Jesus declared explicitly to the unbelieving Israeitels: "Therefore I say to you, that the kingdom of God shall be declared to you, and shall be given to a nation yielding the fruits thereof" (xxv, 43); "He that soweth the good seed, is the Son of man, and the field is the world" (xiii, 38-39). "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" (xxiv, 14). Finally, appearing to His Apostles in Galilee, Jesus gives them this supreme command: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Therefore go, teach ye all nations" (xxviii, 18, 19). These last words of Christ are the summary of the First Gospel. Efforts have been made to maintain that these words of Jesus, commanding that all nations be evangelized, were not authentic, but in a significant number of manuscripts, and in upper cases, the Lord's sayings, recorded in the First Gospel, proceed from the teaching of Jesus. For this particular question see, Meinert, "Jesus und die Heidenmission" (Münster, 1908).

V. DESTINATION OF THE GOSPEL.—The ecclesiastical writers Papias, St. Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, and St. Jerome, whose testimony has been given above (II, A), agree in declaring that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel for the Jews. Everything in this Gospel proves, that the writer addresses himself to Jewish readers. He does not explain Jewish customs and usages to them, as do the other Evangelists for their Greek and Latin readers, and he assumes that they are acquainted with Palestine, since, unlike St. Luke, he mentions places without giving any indication of their topographical position. It is true that the Hebrew words, Emmanuel, Golgotha, Elios, are translated, but it is likely that these translations were inserted when the Aramaic text was reproduced in Greek. St. Matthew chronicles those discourses of Christ that would interest the Jews and leave a favourable impression on them. The law is cited, but not fulfilled (v, 17). He emphasizes more strongly than either St. Mark or St. Luke the false interpretations of the law given by the scribes and Pharisees, the hypocrisy and even the vices of the latter, all of which could be of interest to Jewish readers only. According to certain critics, St. Irenæus (Fragment xxix) said that Matthew wrote to convert the Jews by proving to them that Christ was the Son of David. This interpretation is badly founded. Moreover, Origen (In Matt., i) categorically asserts that this Gospel was published for Jews converted to the Faith. Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, xxiv) is also explicit on this point, and St. Jerome, summarizing tradition, declares that St. Matthew wrote for the Jewish people, both in Palestine and in the Hebrew language, principally for those among the Jews who believed in Jesus, and did not observe even the shadow of the Law, the truth of the Gospel having replaced it (In Matt. Prol.). Subsequent ecclesiastical writers and Catholic exegetes have taught that St. Matthew wrote for the converted Jews. The ecclesiastical writers of the early Church (e. g., to the N. G. Testament, ii, 562), "the apologetical and polematic character of the book, as well as the choice of language, make it extremely probable that Matthew wished his book to be read primarily by the Jews who were not yet Christians. It was suited to Jewish Christians who were still exposed to Jewish influence, and also to Jews who still resisted the Gospel".

VI. DATE AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.—Ancient ecclesiastical writers are at variance as to the date of the composition of the First Gospel. Eusebius (in his Chronicle), Theophylact, and Euthymius Zigabenus are of opinion that the Gospel of Matthew was written about the years 30-41; but following Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, v, 2), it is possible to fix the definitive departure of the Apostles about the year 60, in which event the writing of the Gospel would have taken place about the year 60-68. St. Irenæus is somewhat more exact concerning the date of the First Gospel, as he says: "Matthew produced his Gospel when Peter and Paul were evangelizing and founding the Church of Rome, consequently about the years 64-67." However, this text presents difficulties of interpretation which render its meaning uncertain and prevent us from deducing any positive conclusion. In our day opinion is rather divided. Catholic critics, in general, favour the years 40-45, although some (e. g. Patrial) go back to 36-39 or (e. g. Aberle) to 43-45; Belser assigns the composition to 50-51; Hug, Reuschl, Schanz, and Rose, 60-67. This last opinion is founded on the combined testimonies of St. Irenæus and Eusebius, and on the remark inserted parenthetically in the discourse of Jesus in chapter xxiv, 15: "Therefore when you shall see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of by Daniel the
prophet, standing in the holy place"; here the author interrupts the sentence and invites the reader to take heed of what follows, viz.: "Then they that are in Judea, let them flee to the mountains." As there would have been no occasion for a like warning had the destruction of Jerusalem already taken place, Matthew must have written his Gospel before the year 70 (and probably 66-67 according to Bittel). Protestant and Liberalistic critics also are greatly at variance as regards the time of the composition of the First Gospel. Zahn sets the date about 61-66, and Godet about 60-66; Keim, Meyer, Holtzmann (in his earlier writings), Beyschlag, and Maclean, before 70; Bartlet about 68-69; W. Allen and Plummer, about 66-75; Harnack (in his later works) after 70; B. Weisse and Harnack, about 70-75; Renan, later than 85; Réville, between 89 and 96; Jullicher, in 81-96; Montefiore, about 90-100; Volkmar, in 110; Baur, about 130-34. The following are some of the arguments advanced to prove that the First Gospel was written several years after the Fall of Jerusalem. When Jesus prophesies to His Apostles that they will be delivered up to the councils, scourged in the synagogues, brought before governors and kings for His sake; that they will give testimony of Him, will for Him be hated and driven from city to city (x, 17-23); and when He commissions them to teach all nations and make them His disciples, His words intimate, it is clear, that the established Church in distant parts, and its cruel persecution by the Jews and even by Roman emperors and governors. Moreover, certain sayings of the Lord—such as: "Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church" (xvi, 18); "If He [thy brother] will not hear us: tell the Church" (xviii, 10)—carry us to the time when the Christian Church was not yet constituted, a time that could not have been much earlier than the year 100. The fact is, that what was predicted by Our Lord, when He announced future events and established the charter and foundations of His Church, is converted into reality and made coexistent with the writing of the First Gospel. Hence, to give these arguments a probatory value it would be necessary either to deny Christ's knowledge of the future or to maintain that the teachings embodied in the First Gospel were not authentic.

VII. Historical Value of the First Gospel.—Of the Narratives.—(1) Apart from the narratives of the Christ's life, the cup of the two blind men, the tribute money, and a few incidents connected with the Passion and Resurrection, all the others recorded by St. Matthew are found in both the other Synoptics with one exception (viii, 5-13) which occurs only in St. Luke. Critics agree in declaring that, regarded as a whole, the events of the life of Jesus recorded in the Synoptic Gospels are fictitious. For us, these facts are historic even in detail, our criterion of truth being the same for the aggregate and the details. The Gospel of St. Mark is acknowledged to be of great historic value because it reproduces the preaching of St. Peter. But, for almost all the events of the Gospel, the information given by St. Mark is found in St. Matthew, while such as are peculiar to the latter are of the same nature as events recorded by St. Mark, and resemble them so closely that it is hard to understand why they should not be historic, since they also are derived from the primitive catechism. It may be further: observed that the narratives of St. Matthew are never contradictory to the events made known to us by profane doctors; that they give us the same moral and religious ideas, the manners and customs of the Jewish people of that time. In his recent work, "The Synoptic Gospels" (London, 1909), Montefiore, a Jewish critic, does full justice to St. Matthew on these different points. Finally, all the objections that could possibly have been raised against their veracity vanish, if we but keep in mind that the standpoint of the author, and what he wished to demonstrate. The comments that we are about to make concerning the Lord's utterances are also applicable to the Gospel narratives. For a demonstration of the historic veracity of the narratives of the Holy Childhood, we recommend Father Durand's scholarly work, "L'enfance de Jésus-Christ d'après les évangiles canoni ques" (Paris, 1907). Of the remaining part of Christ's short sayings are found in the three Synoptic Gospels, and consequently spring from the early catechism. His long discourses, recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke, also formed part of an authentic catechism, and critics in general are agreed in acknowledging their historic value. There are, however; some who maintain that the sayings (in the latter 24 chapters) of Jesus that were intended to adapt them to the faith professed in Christian communities at the time when he wrote his Gospel. They also claim that, even prior to the composition of the Gospel, Christian faith had altered Apostolic reminiscences. Let us first of all observe that these objections would have no weight whatever, unless we were to concede that the First Gospel was not written by St. Matthew. And even assuming the same point of view as our adversaries, who think that our Synoptic Gospels depend upon anterior sources, we maintain that these changes, whether attributable to the Evangelists or to their sources (i.e. the faith of the early Christians), could not have been effected. We have already been introduced into Christ's teachings could not have been made by the Evangelists themselves. We know that the latter selected their subject-matter and disposed of it each in his own way, and with a special end in view; but this matter was the same for all three, at least for the whole contents of the pericopes, and was taken from the original sources. It is clear that these sources were well established not to admit of the introduction into it of new ideas and unknown facts. Again, all the doctrines which are claimed to be foreign to the teachings of Jesus are found in the three Synoptists, and are so much a part of the very framework of each Gospel that their removal would mean the destruction of the order of the narrative. Under these conditions, that there might be a substantial change in the doctrines taught by Christ, it would be necessary to suppose a previous understanding among the three Evangelists, which seems to us impossible, as Matthew and Luke at least appear to have worked independently of each other, and it is in their Gospels that Christ's longest discourses are recorded. Some of the sayings are already embodied in the sources used by the three Synoptists, could not have resulted from the deliberations and opinions of the earliest Christians. First of all, between the death of Christ and the initial drawing up of the oral catechism, there was not sufficient time for originating, and subsequently enjoying upon the Christian conscience, ideas so radically opposed to those said to have been exclusively taught by Jesus Christ. For example, let us take the doctrines claimed, above all others, to have been altered by the belief of the first Christians, namely, that Jesus Christ had called all nations to salvation. It is said that the Lord restricted His mission to Israel, and that all those texts wherein He teaches that the Gospel should be preached throughout the entire world originated with the early Christians and especially with Paul. Now, in the first place, these universalist doctrines could not have sprung up among the Apostles. They and the primitive Christians were Jews of poorly developed intelligence, with very narrow outlook, and were moreover marked with particularism and ethnocentricism. From the Gospels and Acts it is easy to see that these men were totally unacquainted with universalist ideas, which had to be urged upon them, and which, even then, they were slow to accept. Moreover, how could this first Christian generation, who, as we are told, believed that Christ's Second Coming was close at hand, have origins'
these passages proclaiming that before this event took place the Gospel should be preached to all nations. A youthful convert made a deep impression on his neighbors. Long before St. Paul could have exercised any influence whatever over the Christian conscience, the Evangelical sources containing these precepts had already been composed. The Apostle of the Gentiles was the special propagator of these doctrines, but he was not their creator. Enlightened by the Holy Spirit, he understood the religious precepts, and this he transmitted in the Person of Jesus, and that the doctrines taught by Christ were identical with those revealed by the Scriptures.

Finally, by considering as a whole the ideas constituting the basis of the earliest Christian writings, we ascertain that these doctrines, taught by the prophets, and accentuated by the life and words of Christ, form the framework of the Church and the basis of Pauline preaching. They are, as it were, a kind of fuses which it would be impossible to unbind, and into which no new idea could be inserted without destroying its strength and unity. In the prophecies, the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, and the first Christian writings an internal correlation joins all together, Jesus Christ himself being the bond and the only bond. What one has said of Him, the others reiterate, and never do we hear an isolated or a discordant voice. If Jesus taught doctrines contrary or foreign to those which the Evangelists placed upon His lips, then He becomes an inexplicable phenomenon, because, in the matter of ideas, He is in contradiction to the idea of the Church, and is therefore to be ranked with the least intelligent sections among the Jewish people. We are justified, therefore, in concluding that the discourses of Christ, recorded in the First Gospel and reproducing the Apostolic catechesis, are authentic. We may, however, again observe that, his aim being chiefly apostolic, Matthew selects the discourses most characteristic of Christ, and also those discourses in a way that would lead up to the conclusive proof which he wished to give of the Messiahship of Jesus. Still the Evangelist neither substantially altered the original catechesis nor invented doctrines foreign to the teaching of Jesus. His action bore upon details or form, but not upon the basis of words and ideas.
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Non-Catholic Authors: MANSELL and COOK, The Gospel according to St. Matthew in The Speaker's Com. New Testament, I (London, 1878); BUCKNER, The Synoptic Gospel according to St. Matthew (London, 1905, 1908); WILCOCKS, Allen, Commentaries on the Gospel according to St. Matthew (Edinburgh, 1907); PLUMMER, Commentaries on the Gospel according to St. Matthew (London, 1899); HAWKES, Horae Synopticae (2nd ed. Oxford, 1908); B. WEISS, Evangelium Matthei (Göttingen, 1886); IDEM, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Halle, 1889); HOULTMANN, Die Synoptiker (3rd ed., Tübingen, 1900); ZAHN, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Leipzig, 1892); WEITHE, Das Evangelium Matthias (Berlin, 1904); J. WEISS, Die Briefe des N. T., I, Matthias (3rd ed., Tübingen, 1898); GREGGEBORN and KLOPPERKAMP, Matthias (Tübingen, 1900).

E. JACQUET.

Matthew, Liturgy of Saint. See Syro-Jacobite Liturgy.

Matthew, Pseudo-Gospel of. See Apocrypha.

Matthew, Sir Tobie, English priest, b. at Salisbury, 3 Oct., 1577; died at Ghent, 13 Oct., 1655. He was the son of Dr. Tobie Matthew, then Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, afterwards Anglican Bishop of Durham, and finally Archbishop of York, and Frances, daughter of William Barlow, Anglican Bishop of Chichester. Tobie Matthew matriculated from Christ Church, Oxford, 13 March, 1659-60, and became M.A. 5 July, 1597. He seems to have been harshly treated by his parents, who were angered at his conversion. On 18 May, 1599, he was admitted at Gray's Inn, where he was instructed in the law. In 1601 he made an acquaintance with Francis Bacon, and two years later became M.P. for Newport, Cornwall. During this period of his life he frequented the dissolute court of Elizabeth. On the accession of James I he sat in Parliament for St. Alban's, and joined the new court, receiving a large grant from the Crown which empirically provided for his future needs. In 1603 he went to travel, he left England in November, 1604, visiting France on his way to Florence, though he had promised his father he would not go to Italy. At Florence he came into the society of several Catholics and ended by being received into the Church. A new persecution was raging in England, but he determined to return. He was imprisoned in the Fleet for six months, and every effort was made to shake his resolution. Finally he was allowed to leave England, and he travelled in Flanders and Spain. In 1614 he studied for the priesthood at Rome and was ordained by Cardinal Bellarmine (20 May). The king allowed him to return to England in 1617, and he stayed for a time in London with Bacon, and then moved to Italy. From 1619 to 1622 he was again exiled, but on his return was favourably received by the king, and acted as an agent at court to promote the marriage of Prince Charles with the Spanish Infanta. In the same cause James sent him to Madrid and on his return knighted him, 20 Oct., 1623. During the reign of King Charles I he remained a foreigner, and his life was spent in helping the Jesuits and the English Catholic cause. When the Civil War broke out in 1640 he, now an old man, took refuge with the English Jesuits at their house at Ghent, where he died. He was always an ardent supporter of the Jesuits, and, though it has long been denied that he was ever himself a Jesuit, he was recently discovered to have been at one time a Jesuit, a strong reason for supposing that he was in fact a member of the Society. Besides the Italian version of Bacon's "Essays," he translated St. Augustine's "Confessions" (1620), the Life of St. Teresa written by herself (1623), and Father Arias's "Treatise of Patience" (1650). His original works were: "A Relation of the death of Gulio Ludovico Solerti, Governor of Rome" (1620); "A Missive of Consolation sent from Flanders to the Catholics of England (1647); "A True Historical Relation of the Conversion of Sir Tobie Matthew to the Holy Catholic Faith" (first published in 1604); some manuscript works (see GILLOW, "Bibl. Dict. Engl. Cath." 1V, 841-42). His letters were edited by Dr. John Donne in 1660.


EDWIN BURTON.

Matthew of Cracow, renowned scholar and preacher of the fourteenth century, b. at Cracow about 1335; d. at Pisa, 5 March, 1410. The view, once generally held, that he was descended from the Pomeranian noble family of Crakow, is now entirely discredited (cf. Sommerlad, "Matthäus von Krakow", 1891). His father was probably a notary in Cracow. Entering the University of Prague, Matthew graduated bachelor of arts in 1335 and master in 1337, and later filled for several terms the office of dean in the same faculty. In 1357 we first find documentary reference to him as professor of theology, and this usage continued of him as "city preacher of Prague." About 1382 he headed an embassy from his university to Urban VI, before whom he delivered a dissertation in favour of reform. Accepting an invitation from the University of Heidelberg, he joined its professorial staff in 1386, and a year later was appointed rector. In 1395 he was
named councillor to Ruprecht II, and the raising of Ruprecht III to the dignity of King of Rome in 1400 marks the beginning of Matthew's career as a statesman. Frequently employed by the king both at court and on embassies, he appeared at Rome in 1403 to solicit Boniface IX's confirmation of Ruprecht's claims. On the elevation of Innocent VII to the papal throne in 1404, Matthew greeted him on behalf of Ruprecht. The same year, Matthew was appointed Bishop of Worms, but, beyond his settling of the dispute between the people and clergy of that city, we know little of his episcopal activity.

That he continued to reside at Heidelberg is very probable, and also that he continued to act as professor. Gregory XII wished to name him Cardinal Priest. During the next few years, Matthew declined the honour. As ambassador of Ruprecht to the Council of Pisa, he displayed the greatest zeal on behalf of Gregory XII, whom he regarded as the legitimate occupant of the papal throne. He was a very prolific theological writer. Apart from Biblical commentaries, sermons, and works on current topics, the most important of his writings are: "De consolations theologis", "De modo confendi", "De puritate conscientiae", "De corpore Christi"; "De celebratione Missae". That he wrote "De arte moriendo"—to be distinguished from a similar work by Cardinal Capran—cannot be maintained with certainty, and recent investigation has shown beyond doubt that the work "De arte moriendo" attributed to Matthew of Rome was, in fact, a Scheme of the hands (Schaeuffgen, "Beiträge zur Gesch. des gréven Schismas", 1889, p. 91).


MATTHEW WESTMINSTER. See WESTMINSTER, MATTHEW.

MATTHIAS, SAINT, APOSTLE. — The Greek Matthias, Μ. Α. C. E., or Matthias, R. D*, is a name derived from Mariadatos, Heb. Mattithiah, signifying "gift of Jehovah." Matthias was one of the seventy disciples of Jesus, and had been with Him from His baptism by John to the Ascension (Acts, i, 21, 22). It is related (Acts, i, 15-26) that in the days following the Ascension, Peter proposed to the assembled brethren, who were now, in the number of seventy, to select one to fill the place of the traitor Judas in the Apostolate. Two disciples, Joseph, called Barsabas, and Matthias were selected, and lots were drawn, with the result in favour of Matthias, who thus became associated with the eleven Apostles. Zeller has declared this narrative unhistoric, on the plea that the Apostles were in Galilee after the death of Jesus. As a matter of fact they did return to Galilee, but the Acts of the Apostles clearly state that about the feast of Pentecost they went back to Jerusalem.

All further information concerning the life and death of Matthias is vague and contradictory. According to Nicophorus (Hist. eccl., 2, 40), he first preached the Gospel in Judea, then in Ethiopia (that is to say, C. chis), and was crucified. The Synopsis of Dorotheus contains this tradition: Matthias in intérieu Ethiopis, ubi Syrus maris portus et Phasis fluvis ost, hominibus barbaris et carnivoris predicavit Evangelium. Mortuis est autem in Sebastopolis, ibique proue templum Solis sepultus (Matthew preached to barbarians and carnivorous peoples in the interior of Ethiopia, at the harbour of the sea of Syrus, at the mouth of the river Phasis. He died at Sebastopolis, and was buried there, near the Temple of the Sun). Still another tradition maintains that Matthias was stoned at Jerusalem by the Jews, and then beheaded (cf. Tillemon, "Mémoire sur l'apparition à l'histoire eccl. des six premiers siècles", i, 406-7). It is said that St. Helena brought the relics of St. Matthias to Rome, and that a portion of them was at Trier. Bollandus (Acta SS., May, III) doubts if the relics that are in Rome are not rather those of the St. Matthias who was Bishop of Jerusalem about the year 120, and whose history would seem to have been confounded with that of the Apostle. The Latin Church celebrates the feast of St. Matthias on 24 February, and the Greek Church on 9 August.

Clement of Alexandria (Strom., III, 4) records a sentence that the Nicoldians ascribe to Matthias: "We must combat our flesh, set no value upon it, and concede to it nothing that can flatter it, but rather follow the footsteps of the Lord in everything." This teaching was probably found in the Gospel of Matthias which was mentioned by Origen (Hom. i in Lucam); by Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, 25), who attributes it to heretics; by St. Jerome (Pref. in Math.); and in the Decree of Gelasius (VI, 8) which declares it apocryphal. It is at the end of the list of the Codex Baroccianus (205). This Gospel is probably the document whence Clement of Alexandria quoted several passages, saying that they were borrowed from the traditions of Matthias, Patapoböes, the testimony of which he claimed to have been invoked by the heretics Valentineus, Marcion, and Basilides (Strom., VII, 17). According to the Philosopheropoeus (Strom., VII, 17), Matthias, as not being dead, was not of the number of the martyrs which he attributed to Matthias. These three writings: the Gospel, the Traditions, and the Apocryphal Discourses were identified by Zahn (Gesch. des N. T., Kanon, II, 751), but Harnack (Chron. der altchristl. Litteratur, 597) denies this identification. Tischendorf, in his Apocryphon, Leipzic, 1851, published after Thilo, 1846, "Acta Andreae et Pauli in urbe anthropophagorum", which, according to Lipsius, belonged to the middle of the second century. This apocrypha relates that Matthias went among the cannibals and, being cast into prison, was delivered by Andrew. Needless to say, the entire narrative is without historical value. Moreover, it should be remembered that, in the apocryphal writings, Matthew and Matthias have sometimes been confounded.

E. JACQUIER.

MATTHIAS, GOSPEL OF. See APOCRYPHA.

MATTHEW CORVINUS, King of Hungary, son of János Hunyady (see HUNYADDY, JÁNOS) and Elisabeth Szécsi, born at Hont, Hungary, 23 Feb., 1440; d. at Vienna, 6 April, 1490. In the house of his father he received along with his brother Ladislaus, a careful education under the supervision of Gregor Sanocki, who taught him the humanities. Johann Vitez, Bishop of Grosswardein from 1446, the friend of Matthias's father when a boy, and himself an enthusiastic patron and promoter of classical studies, had a decided influence on his education. The chequered career of his father likewise left its imprint on the life of Matthias. On political grounds he was betrothed in 1455 to Elisabeth, the daughter of Count Ulric Cailey, his father's deadly enemy, with the aim of effecting the reconciliation of the two families. The noisy defeat of Elisabeth interfered with this plan, and after the death of János Hunyady, Cailey's emnity was directed against the sons. At the instigation of Cailey and his accomplices, who accused Ladislaus and Matthias Hunyady of a conspiracy against King Ladislaus V, both were arrested, Ladislaus being executed, and Matthias being sent to Vienna castle, where he was not allowed to follow the king to Prague. After the death of King Ladislaus at Prague, Matthias settled down at the court of the Bohemian king, George Podiebrad, who betrothed him to his daughter Catharine. On 23 Jan., 1458, Matthias was proclaimed King of Hungary shortly afterwards, the Pope recognizing him as such.
Buda, his uncle Michael Siságyi at the same time being appointed governor for five years. Matthias soon freed himself, however, from the regency of Siságyi, and took the reins of government into his own hands. At the very beginning of his reign he had to contend with a movement among discontented Hungarians, who offered the crown to the Emperor Frederick III, who had assumed the title of King of Hungary. The quarrel with Frederick lasted till 1462, when an agreement was made by which, among other things, it was settled that if Matthias should die without leaving an heir, Frederick would be authorized to bear the title of King of Hungary as long as he lived. At the same time Frederick adopted Matthias as his son, and pledged himself to deliver up the Hungarian crown which he had in his possession. The treaty was confirmed by the Hungarian Reichstag and Matthias was crowned king in 1463. Not long before he had married Catharina, the daughter of the Bohemian king, Podiebrad, who, however, died at the beginning of 1464. Relations with the Emperor Frederick again became strained; political conditions and, in particular, the question of the Bohemian crown, affected the relations considerably. The friction between the Holy See and King Podiebrad led to the deposition of the latter, and Matthias was now called upon by the pope to take up arms against the deposed king. In 1468 came the Bohemian expedition of Matthias, elected king by the Catholics of Bohemia. The war continued till the death of Podiebrad in 1471, when the Bohemians, defeating Matthias, chose Vladislav, son of Casimir, King of Poland, as king. The years up to 1474 were marked by indecisive battles with the Bohemian king and with the Emperor Frederick. An armistice caused a brief cessation of hostilities, but from 1476 relations with the Emperor Frederick grew continually more strained. In 1477 Matthias, invading Austria, besieged Vienna. Peace was effected between Matthias and Frederick by the intervention of the papal legate in 1477, but war soon broke out again, and in 1485 Matthias took Vienna. In the war with the Emperor Frederick, Matthias had made an alliance with the Austrian archbishop. In this connection he was led not merely by the aim of securing for Hungary a leading position in the West of Europe, but also by the design to unite the powers of Europe in a crusade against the Turks. He was obliged, however, to abandon this scheme. Equally fruitless was the plan of a crusade against the Turks; nevertheless he managed to fix a limit to the advance of the Turks, and to strengthen the supremacy of Hungary over Bosnia. In 1463 Bosnia fell again into the hands of the Turks. The victory of Matthias over the Turks in Servia, Bosnia, and Transylvania resulted in 1483 in a truce with the Sultan Bajazet. Matthias's relations with the Catholic Church were good till the year 1477. The latter part of his reign was marked by a series of most serious blunders and acts of violence. In spite of legal enactments, he gave bishoprics to foreigners, and rewarded political services with gifts of church property, which he dealt with as though it were the property of the state. His relations with the Holy See were at first decidedly cordial, but later there was danger of a rupture, which was happily avoided. Under Matthias's reign the Hungarians made their entry into Hungary. His library in Buda, the Bibliotheca Corviniana, wins just admiration even to-day by virtue of the remanent which it scattered over Europe. During his reign the first printing press in Hungary was established, that at Buda, the first known production of which is the "Chronicle of Buda", printed in 1473. The area, too, found in Matthias a generous benefactor. He introduced reforms in the army, in finance, and in the administration of the courts and the law. The reorganization of military affairs was based on the principle of a standing army. With this body, the so-called black troops, he defeated the Turks and the Hussite troops of Sikus, which were laying waste Upper Hungary. In financial affairs, a reform in the mode of taxation was introduced, while his enactments in judicial affairs earned for him among the people the title of "The Just". In 1476 he married Beatrice, the daughter of the King of Naples, but the union was childless. His exertions to secure the throne for his illegitimate son John Hunyadi were rewarded by the title by the opposition of Hungary and the plotting of Beatrice. Matthias was buried at Székes-Fehérvár (Stuhlweissenberg).

Matthias of Neuburg of Neuenburg (Neuburgensis), chronicler, b. towards the close of the thirteenth century, possibly at Neuburg, in Baden; d. between 1364 and 1370, probably at Strasburg, in Alsace. He studied jurisprudence at Bologna, and later received minor orders, but never became a priest. In 1367 we meet him as a papal legate at Basle, and shortly after, while clerk to Bishop Berthold von Buchecke, holding a similar position in Strasburg. At present he is generally considered the author of a Latin chronicle from 1243 to 1350, and of its first continuation from 1350 to 1355. Later, three other writers carried on the work to 1386, and two have been known in an alternate form. Matthias's works have been compared with Alsatian and Halberstadt history and for the times in which Matthias lived; indeed, the part covering the period between 1346 and 1350 is one of the best authorities, not only for the history of his own country, but for that of the entire empire. It has been attributed to different writers, among them to the Speyer notary, Jacob of Mainz (cfr. Wichert "Jacob von Maimz", Königsberg, 1881), also to Albert of Strasburg, especially by earlier editors, while those of later times attribute it to Matthias of Neuburg. For the voluminous literature on this controversy see Pothast, "Bibliotheca Kin. Med. Évt." (Berlin, 1896). Among the editions may be mentioned: "Ecclesiastical Carlsbad"—"Annales Radbolenses"—"Annales Aurelii Reports"—"Annales Casinensia". The last contains a parallel account of the proceedings of Henry IV, first as taken from an appendix to Cuspinian's work "De consilibus Romanorum commentarii" (Basle, 1553), 667-710, very much abridged; G. Studer, "Matthio Neuburgensis
chronica cum continuatione et vita Berchtoldii"; "Die Chronik des Matthäus von Neuenburg" from the Berne and Strasbourg manuscripts (Berne, 1866); A. Huber, "Mathiae Neuenburgensis Chronicae, 1273-1350" in Böhrer, "Fontes rerum Germanicarum", IV (Stuttgart, 1868), 149-276; "Continuatio" pp. 276-297. It has also been edited from a Vienna and a Vatican manuscript in "Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften", xxxvii-xxxviii (Göttingen, 1891-2), and translated into German by Grandaur (Leipzig, 1892).

POTTHAST, Bibliotheca (Berlin, 1890), 790 sq.; WEILLAND, Introduction to the above-mentioned German version, pp. xxviii.

Patriicus Schlagter.

Maturins. See Trinitarian Order.

Maia, Nicholas C. See Denver, Diocese of.

Maundy Thursday.—The feast of Maundy (or Holy) Thursday solemnly commemorates the institution of the Eucharist and is the oldest of the observances peculiar to Holy Week. In Rome various accessory ceremonies were early added to this commemoration, namely the consecration of the holy oils and the reconciliation of penitents, ceremonies obviously practical in character and readily explained by the proximity of the Christian Easter and the necessity of preparing for it. Holy Thursday could not but be a day of liturgical reunion since, in the cycle of movable feasts which surrounds the anniversary of the institution of the Liturgy. On that day, whilst the preparation of candidates was being completed, the Church celebrated the Missa chrismalis of which we have already described the rite (see Holy Oils) and, moreover, proceeded to the reconciliation of penitents. In Rome everything was carried on in daylight, whereas in Antwerp on Holy Thursday was celebrated after the evening meal, in view of more exact conformity with the circumstances of the Last Supper. Canon xxix of the Council of Carthage dispenses the faithful from fast before communion on Holy Thursday, because, on that day, it was customary to take a bath, and the bath and fast were considered incompatible. St. Augustine, too, speaks of this custom (Ep. civ, vii and Januarium, n. 7); he even says that, as certain persons did not fast on that day, the oblation was made twice, morning and evening, and in this way those who did not observe the fast could partake of the Eucharist after the morning meal, whilst those who fasted awaited the evening repast.

Holy Thursday was taken up with a succession of ceremonies of a joyful character: the baptism of neophytes, the reconciliation of penitents, the consecration of the holy oils, the washing of the feet, and the commemoration of the Blessed Eucharist, and, because of all these ceremonies, the day received different names, all of which allude to one or another of its solemnities.

Reddito symboli was so called because, before being admitted to baptism, the catechumens had to recite the creed from memory, either in presence of the bishop or his representative.

Pedilium (washing of the feet), traces of which are found in the most ancient rites, occurred in many churches on Holy Thursday, the capitulium (washing of the head) having taken place on Palm Sunday (St. Augustine, "Ep. cvii, exxii", c. 18).

Exomologesis, and reconciliation of penitents: the letter of Pope Innocent I to Decentius of Gubbio, testifies that in Rome it was customary "quinta feria ante Pascha" to absolve penitents from their mortals and venial sins, except in cases of serious illness which kept them away from church (Labbe, "Concilia", II, col. 1247; St. Ambrose, "Ep. xxxii ad Marcellinam"). The penitents heard the Missa pro reconciliations penitentium, and absolution was given them before the offertory. The "Sacramentary" of Pope Gelasius contains an Ordo aequitis publico pontificis (Muratori, "Iturgia romana vetus", I, 548-551).

Olei exordiati confecti.—In the fifth century the custom was established of consecrating on Holy Thursday all the chrisir necessarium for the anointing of the newly baptized. The "Comes Hieronymi", the Gregorian and gelasian sacramentaries and the "Missae presbesci" of Pamfilus, all agree upon the consecration of the chrisir on that day, as does also the "Ordo romanus I".

Anniversarium Eucharisticum.—The nocturnal celebration and the double oblation early became the object of increasing disfavour, until in 692 the Council of Trullo promulgated a formal prohibition. The Eucharistic celebration then took place in the morning, and the bishop reserved a part of the sacred species for the communion of the morrow, Missa presanctificatorum (Muratori, "Iturg. rom. Vetus", II, 993).

Other Observances.—On Holy Thursday the ringing of bells ceases, the altar is stripped after vespers, and the night office is celebrated under the name of Tenebrae.

H. Leclercq.

Maunoury, Auguste-Louis, Hellenist and exegete, b. at Champeceet, Orne, France, 30 Oct., 1811; d. at Sées, Orne, 17 Nov., 1898. He made brilliant classical studies at the preparatory seminary at Sées, to which institution he returned in 1854 as a professor. He taught the whole of his long priestly career. Until 1852, he taught the classics with great success, and then became professor of rhetoric, a position which he occupied for twenty-two years. During this period, keeping abreast of the progress of Hellenistic studies in France and Germany, he composed, published, and published again, a series of his works ("Grammaire de la Langue Grecque", "Christomathie" etc.) which proved him to be one of the best Greek scholars of his day. Towards 1866, Maunoury began his work as a commentator of Holy Writ, by treating some sections of the Gospel in the "Semaene Catholiquet" of his native diocese; but it was only after 1875, that he gave himself fully to the pursuit of Biblical studies. In 1877, he became canon of the cathedral of Sées; and the following year, he began to publish his commentaries on all the Epistles of the New Testament.

These commentaries appeared in five volumes, as follows: (1) "Com. sur L'Épitre aux Romains" (Paris 1887); (2) "Com. sur les Épitres aux Grecs" (Paris, 1879); (3) "Com. sur les Épitres aux Galates, aux Ephésiens, aux Philippiens, aux Colossiens, et aux Thessaloniciens" (Paris, 1880); (4) "Com. sur les Épitres à Timothée, à Titre, à Philémon, aux Hébreux" (Paris, 1882); (5) "Com. sur les Épitres Catholiques de St. Jacques, St. Pierre, St. Jean et St. Jude" (Paris, 1888). In explaining the Sacred Text he made an excellent use of his great familiarity with Greek grammar and authors, availed himself chiefly of the commentaries of St. John Chrysostom and Theodoret, and always remained an enlightened and safe theologian. In 1894, he published his "Com. in Psalmos" (2 vols., Paris), a Latin work, written with elegance, almost exclusively on the basis of the Vulgate and the Septuagint. His only contribution to apologetics is a volume entitled "Sorires d'Autome, ou la Religion prouvé aux gens du monde" (Paris, 1887).

HUNTER, Nomenclatur; Vtg., Dict. de la Bible, s. v.

Francis E. Gigot.

Maurice, Saint, leader (primicerius) of the Theban Legion, massacred at Agaunum, about 287 (286, 297, 302, 303), by order of Maximian Herculius. Feast, 22 Sept. The legend (Acta SS., VI, Sept., 308, 895) relates that the legion, composed entirely of Christians, had been called from Africa to suppress a revolt
of the Bagaudae in Gaul. The soldiers were ordered to sacrifice to the gods in thanksgiving but refused. Every tenth was then killed. Another order to sacrifice and another refusal caused a second decimation and then a general massacre. (On the value of the legions, see also the Appendix and Themist Legion.) St. Maurice is represented as a knight in full armour (sometimes as a Moor), bearing a standard and a palm; in Italian paintings with a red cross on his breast, which is the badge of the Sardinian Order of St. Maurice. Many places in Switzerland, Piedmont, France, and Germany have chosen him as their patron, as have also the dyers, clothmakers, soldiers, swordsmiths, and others. He is invoked against gout, cramps etc.

See Chevalier, Bic-Bul., s.v.; Histoire X, 733.

Francis Mershman.

Maurice (MAURICIUS, MAURICUS), Roman Emperor, b. in 539; d. in Nov., 602.

He sprang from an old Roman (Latin) family settled in Cappadocia, and began his career as a soldier. Under the Emperor Tiberius II (578-582) he was made commander of a new legion levied from allied barbarians, with which he did good service against the Persians.

When he returned triumphantly to Constantinople, Tiberius gave him his daughter Constantina in marriage and appointed him his successor (578). Almost immediately afterwards (Theophylact, Infra, says the next day) Tiberius died and Maurice succeeded peacefully. At his accession he found that the overthrow of the Greek church, the exchequer was empty and the State bankrupt. In order to remedy this Maurice established the expenses of the court on a basis of strict economy. He gained a reputation for parsimony that made him very unpopular and led eventually to his fall. The twenty years of his reign do not in any way stand out conspicuously from early Byzantine history. The forces at work since Justinian, or even Constantine, continued the gradual decay of the Empire under Maurice, as under Tiberius his predecessor and Phocas his successor. For the first ten years the long war with the Persians continued; then a revolution among the enemy brought a respite and the Roman Emperor was invoked by Chosroes II to restore him to his throne. Unfortunately Maurice was not clever enough to draw any profit for the Empire from this situation. The Avars and Slavs continued their invasion of the northern provinces. The Slavs penetrated even to the Peloponnesus. The Lombards ravaged Italy with impunity. As the Empire could do nothing to protect the Italians, they invaded them with nothing to protect the Greeks, they invaded them with nothing to protect the Greeks, they invaded them with nothing to protect them (584). This first invasion of Italy by the Franks began the process that was to end in the separation of all the West from the old Empire and the establishment of the rival line of Emperors with Charles the Great (800). Maurice had to buy off the Avars with a heavy bribe that further reduced his scanty resources and made economy still more imperative. The emperor became more and more unpopular. In 599 he could not or would not ransom 12,000 Roman soldiers taken by the Avars, and they were all murdered. Further harassing regulations made for the army with a view to more economy caused a revolt that became a revolution. In 602 the soldiers drove away their officers, made a certain centurion, Phocas, and their leader, then Maurice of Constantinople. Maurice, finding that he could not or would not organize a resistance, fled across the Bosporus with his family. He was overtaken at Chalcedon and murdered with his five sons. Phocas then began his tyrannical reign (602-610).

In Church history Maurice has some importance through his relations with Gregory I (590-604). As soon as Gregory was elected, he wrote to the emperor begging him to annul the election. The fact has often been quoted as showing Gregory's acceptance of an imperial right of veto. Later the pope's organization of resistance against the Lombards was very displeasing to the emperor, though the government at Constantinople did nothing to protect Italy. Further trouble was caused by the tyranny of the imperial exarch at Ravenna, Romulus. Against this person the pope took the Italians under his protection. On the other hand the exarch and the emperor repulsed the bishops in the North of Italy who still kept up the schism that began with the Three Chapters quarrel (Pope Vigilius, 540-555). The assumption of the title of 'ecumenical patriarch' by John IV of Constantinople (see John the Faster) caused more friction. All this explains St. Gregory's unfriendly feeling towards Maurice, and it also helps to explain his ready and friendly recognition of Phocas which has been alleged by some to be a blot in the great pope's career. But it is quite probable that the pope was misinformed and not placed in full possession of all the circumstances attending the change of government in the distant East.

Evagrius, Hist. Eccl. VI; Theophylact, Historia, ed. de Boor (Leipzig, 1857); Adametz, Besriige zur Gesch. des Kaisertums Mauricius (Graz, 1891); Gibbon, Decline and Fall, XIV, ed. Bury, V (London, 1889), 92-93; Bury, History of the Later Roman Empire, II (London, 1890), 93-94.

Adrian Fortescue.

Maurice and Lazarus, Knights of. See Lazarus, Knights of Saint.

Maurienne. See Saint Jean de Maurienne.

Maurists, The, a congregation of Benedictine monks in France, whose history extends from 1618-1818. It began as an offshoot from the famous reformed Congregation of St-Vannes. The reform had spread from Lorraine in France under the influence of Dom Laurent Bénard, Prior of the Collège de Cluny in Paris, who inaugurated the reform in his own college. Thence it spread to St-Augustine de Limoges, to Nouillère, to St-Faron de Meaux, to Jumièges, and to the Blanches-Manteaux in Paris. In 1618 a general chapter of the Congregation of St-Vannes was held at St-Mauusot de Toul, whereas it was decided that an independent congregation should be erected for the
MAURISTS

reformed houses in France, having its superior residing within that kingdom. This proposal was supported by Louis XIII as well as by Cardinals de Retz and Richelieu; letters patent were granted by the king, and the new congregation was named of St-Maur in order to obviate any rivalry between its component houses. It was formally approved by Pope Gregory XV on 17 May, 1621, an approval that was confirmed by Urban VIII six years later. The reform was welcomed by many of great influence at the Court as well as by some of the greater monastic houses in France. Already under the first presidency of the congregation, Dom Martin Testière (1618–21), it had included about a dozen great houses. By 1630 the congregation was divided into three provinces, and, under Dom Grégoire Tarisse, the first Superior-General (1630–48), it included over 80 houses. Before the end of the seventeenth century the number had risen to over 180 monasteries, the congregations being divided into six provinces: France, Normandy, Britany, Burgundy, Chelis-Benolt, and Gascony.

In its earlier years, however, the new congregation was forced, by Cardinal Richelieu, into an alliance with the Congregation of Cluny. Richelieu desired an amalgamation of all the Benedictines in France and eventual bringing into being of an organization that was called the “Congregation of St. Benedict” or “of Cluny and St-Maur”. This arrangement, however, was short-lived, and the two congregations were separated by Urban VIII in 1644. From that date the Congregation of St-Maur grew steadily both in extent and in influence. Although the twenty-one houses in France steadily resisted all attempts to establish the congregation beyond the borders of France, yet its influence was widespread. In several of its houses schools were conducted for the sons of noble families, and education was provided gratuitously at St-Martin de Vertou for those who had become poor. But from the beginning the Maurists established a number of monasteries of nuns of the congregation, the only exception being the Abbey of Chelles, where, through Richelieu’s influence, a house was established with six monks to act as confessors to the nuns.

The congregation soon attracted to its ranks many of the most learned scholars of the period, and though its greatest glory was in the seventeenth century, yet, throughout the eighteenth century also, it continued to produce works whose solidity and critical value still render them indispensable to modern students. It is true that the Maurists were not free from the infiltration of Jansenist ideas, and that the work of some of its most learned sons was hampered and coloured by the factionist spirit of the period. The Congregation of France had already under its presidency of philosophy and theology, spent a “year of recollection” before they were admitted to the priesthood. The discipline was marked by a return to the strict rule of St. Benedict. All laboured with their hands, all abstained from flesh-meat, all embraced regular poverty; the Divine Office was recited at the canonical hours, and the history of the congregation, a long and useful history, was observed as for the advancement of their intellectual achievements.

To the great body of students, indeed, the Maurists are best known by their services to ecclesiastical and literary history, to patrology, to Biblical studies, to diplomacy, to chronology and to liturgy. The names of D. Luce d’Achery, Jean Mabilon, Thury, Francois Lonzi, Pierre Coursant, Denys de Sainte-Marthe, Edmond Martene, Bernard de Montfacon, 1. Francais Dantin, Antoine Rivet de la Grange and Martin Bouquet recall some of the most scholarly works ever produced. To these and to their confreres we are indebted for critical and still indispensable editions of the great Latin and Greek scholars, of the history of the Benedictine Order and the liturgy of its saints, for the “Gallia Christiana” and the
"Histoire Littéraire de la France,"" for the "De re Diplomatica" and "L’art de vérfier les dates" for "L’antiquité expliquée et représentée" and the "Paleographia Graeca," for the "Recueil des historiens des Gaules," the "Veterum scriptorum amplissima collection," the "Thesaurus Aenectorum," the "Spicilegium veterum scriptorum," the "Museum Italicum," the "Scriptores veterum," the "Scriptores antiquorum," and the "Scriptores hiérarchiques" that are the foundation of modern historical and liturgical studies. For nearly two centuries the great works that were the result of the foresight and high ideals of Dom Grégoire Tarisse, were carried on with an industry, a devotion, and a mastery that aroused the admiration of the learned world. To this day, all who read them will say that there is no other work that can stand the growth of Western Christendom, must acknowledge their indebtedness to the Maurist Congregation.

The following were the monasteries of the Maurist Congregation in the latter half of the eighteenth century.

(1) Province of France.—Diocese of Amiens: Corbie, St.-Fuscien-aux-Bois, St.-Jesse-sur-mer, St. Riquier, St.-Valéry.—Diocese of Beauvais: Breteuil-sur-Noye, St.-Lucien-de-Beauvais.—Diocese of Boulogne: St.-Saüveur-de-Montreuil, Samer.—Diocese of Chartres: Meulan.—Diocese of Laon: Nangis-sous-Couey, Ribemont, St.-Jean-de-Laon, St-Nicholas-aux-Bois, St-Vincent-de-Laon.—Diocese of Meaux: Reims, St.-Symphorien.—Diocese of Meslay-de-Ville: St.-Philippe-en-Vienne, St.-Paul-Mont-Quentin, St.-Eloi-de-Noyon, St.-Quentin-en-l’Isle.—Diocese of Paris: Argenteuil, Chelles, Lagny, Les-Blancs-Manteaux-de-Paris, St.-Denis-de-Paris, St.-Germain-des-Prés.—Diocese of Reims: Notre-Dame-de-Rethel, St.-Basié, St-Marcouf-de-Corbeny, St.-Nicolas-des-Ateliers, St.-Pierre-de-Fricourt, St.-Remi.-Diocese of Rouen: Le Tréport, St.-Martin-de-Pontoise.—Diocese of Soissons: Château, Orbais, St.-Côme-de-Compiègne, St-Crépin-de-Soissons, St.-Médard-de-Soissons.

(2) Province of Normandy.—Diocese of Bayeux: Cerisy-la-Foret, Fontenay, St-Étienne-de-Caen, St-Vigor-le-Grand.—Diocese of Beauvais: St-Germer-de-Fly.—Diocese of Chartres: Guilmont, Josephailles-Chartres, St-Florentin-de-Boenneval, St-Père-en-Vallée, Tiron.—Diocese of Coutances: Lesay.—Diocese of Evreux: Conches, Ivry-la-Bataille, Lyre, St-Taurin d’Evreux.—Diocese of Le Mans: Lonlay-l’Abbaye.—Diocese of Lisieux: Beaumont-en-Auge, La Couture-d’Ennery, St-Evroul-d’Auge, St.-Flour-du-Tancay, Fréteval.—Diocese of Rouen: Pont-de-l’Arche, Bonne-Nouvelle, Fécamp, Jumièges, Le Bec, St.-Georges-de-Boscherville, St-Ouen-de-Rouvroy, St-Wandrille-Rençon, Valmont.—Diocese of Sées: St-Martin-de-Sées, St-Pierre-sur-Dive.

(3) Province of Brittany.—Diocese of Angers: Bourgueil, Château-Cher, Crecy, Notre-Dame-de-l’Eve, St-Florent-en-Saumur, St-Florent-le-Vieil, St-Maur-sur-Loire, St-Nicolas-d’Angers, St-Serge-d’Angers.—Diocese of Avranches: Mont-Saint-Michel.—Diocese of Dol: Le Tronchet, St-Jacut-de-la-Mer.—Diocese of Le Mans: Evron, St-Pierre-de-la-Couture, St-Vincent-du-Mans, Solesmes, Tuffé.—Diocese of Nantes: Blanche-Couronne, Notre-Dame-de-Chantemerle, St-Gildas-d’Intrezec, Vez.-Diocese of Poitiers: Montmelou-Belley.—Diocese of Quimper: Landevenec, Quimperlé.—Diocese of Rennes: St-Magoire-de-Lehon, St-Maléine-de-Rennes, Ste-Croix-de-Vitré.—Diocese of St-Brieuc: Lantenac.—Diocese of Saint-Malo: St-Malo.—Diocese of St-Malo-de-Léon: St-Mathieu-de-Fine-Terre.—Diocese of St-Maurice-de-Pontlevoy, St-Julien-de-Tours, Turpenay, Villedon.—Diocese of Vannes: St-Gildas-de-Rhuys, St-Sauveur-de-Redon.

(4) Province of Burgundy.—Diocese of Autun: Corbigny, Flavigny, St-Martin-de-Cures.—Diocese of Auxerre: St-Germain.—Diocese of Blois: Punt-le-Voy, St-Laumer-de-Blois, Ste-Trinité-de-Vendôme.—Diocese of Chalon-sur-Saône: St-Pierre.—Diocese of Dijon: St-Bénigne-de-Dijon, St-Seine-l’Abbaye.—Diocese of Langres: Bèze, Molemes, Molotme, Montier-Saint-Jean, St-Michel-de-Tonnere.—Diocese of Le Mans: St-Calais.—Diocese of Lyons: Ambronay.—Diocese of Orleans: Bonne-Nouvelle, St-Benoît-sur-Loire.—Diocese of Orleans-sous-Sére, St-Benoît-sur-Loire, Melun, St-Pierre-le-Vif-de-Sens, St-Colombe-la-Sens.

(5) Province of Cholet-Bolbec.—Diocese of Bourges: Cholet-Bolbec, St-Benoît-du-Sault, St-Sulpice-de-Bourges, Vierzon.—Diocese of Cahors: Souillac.—Diocese of Clermont: Chaise-Dieu, Issoire, Mauriac, St-Allyre-de-Clermont.—Diocese of La Rochelle: Ste-Croix-sur-Sèvre, St-Vincent-de-Paul, Ste-Beauregard, Meymac, St-Angel, St-Augustin-de-Limoges, Solignac.—Diocese of Luçon: St-Michel-en-L’Herm.—Diocese of Lyons: Saigneville.—Diocese of Périgueux: Brantôme.—Diocese of Poitiers: Nouailhac, St-Cyprien-de-Poitiers, St-Jouin-de-Marnes, St-Léonard des Ferrières, St-Maixent, St-Savin.—Diocese of St-Flour: Chateauguay.—Diocese of Saintes: Bassac, St-Jean-d’Angely.

(6) Province of Gascogne.—Diocese of Agde: St-Tibéry.—Diocese of Agen: Eysses, St-Maurin, Ste-Livrade.—Diocese of Aire: La Reule, St-Pé-de-Génes, St-Savin, St-Séver-Cap-de-Gascogne.—Diocese of Alais: St-Pierre-de-Salève.—Diocese of Aumale: Montrouge, St-Avignonec-Rochefort, Ste-Andrée-de-Villeneuve.—Diocese of Bayonne-Montagne.—Diocese of Bordeaux: La Sauge-Majeure, Ste-Croix-de-Bordeaux.—Diocese of Carcassonne: Montolieu, Notre-Dame-de-la-Grave.—Diocese of Dax: St-Jean-de-Sordes.—Diocese of Grenoble: St-Robert-de-Cornillon.—Diocese of Lavaur: Sornèse.—Diocese of Leccé: St-Pierre-de-la-Breteille.—Diocese of Lodève: St-Guillaume-de-Durt.—Diocese of Mirepoix: Camon.—Diocese of Montpellier: St-Sauveur-d’Aniane.—Diocese of Narbonne: La Murguer, St-Pierre-de-Caunes.—Diocese of Nimes: St-Baisselle.—Diocese of St-Pons: St-Chinian.—Diocese of Toulouse: St-Marc-Garnier, Notre-Dame-de-la-Daurade.

The Superiors of the Congregation were:—Presidents: D. Martin Tesnière (1613-21), D. Columban Régnier (1621-24), D. Martin Tesnière (1624-27), D. Maur Dupont (1627-30).


The Procurateurs-General in Rome, who were all of importance in the history of the Congregation, were:—D. Placie Le Simon (1623-61); D. Gabriel Flambart (1665-72), D. Antoine Durban (1672-81), D. Camille Flammart (1681-84), D. Claude Estienne (1684-99), D. Bernard de Montfaucon (1699-1701), D. Guillaume Laparre (1701-11), D. Philippe Raier (1711-16), D. Charles Conrade (1716-25), D. Pierre Malet (1721-33). No successor to D. Malet was appointed.

MAURUS, Sulpicer. Writer on philosophy and theology. b. at Spoleto, 31 Dec., 1619; d. in Rome, 13 Jan., 1657. He entered the Society of Jesus, 21 April, 1636. After finishing his course of studies and preparing himself by teaching humanities at the College of Macerata, he held in the same place the chair of philosophy for three years, and subsequently in Rome for several years. Then he was promoted to the chair of theology at the Roman College, and remained in this position for a considerable number of years. For a period he was also rector of the latter institution. The mental endowment of Father Maurus was a brilliant combination of speculative and practical turn of mind. His doctrine was noted for its soundness and solidity; at the same time, he constantly put in practice St. Paul’s principle, “not to be more wise than it behoves to be wise, but to be wise unto sobriety”. Though he was a good philosopher and theologian, he was a better religious. Those well acquainted with him are convinced that he never lost his baptismal innocence. Neither his holiness nor his learning made him a disagreeable companion or an undesirable friend. It would be hard, therefore, he was more admired or loved by those who came into contact with him.

The following works of Father Maurus deserve mention: (1) "Questionum philosophicarum S. Vicentii Mauri, Soc. Jesu, in Collegio Romano Philosophiae Professoris". This work is divided into four books, and appeared at Rome in 1658. A second edition was issued in 1670. The latest edition, in three volumes, appeared at Le Mans, 1875-76. (2) "Aristotelis opera quae extant omnia, brevi paraphasii, ac litterae perspicuo inherente explanatione illustratae". The work appeared in six volumes. In this second volume, containing Aristotle’s moral philosophy, was added anew in 1696-98. The whole work was published again in Paris, 1855-57, by Fathers Ehrle, Fechlin, and Beringer; this edition formed part of the collection entitled "Bibliotheca Theolgete et Philosophiae Scholasticae". (3) "Opus theologicum ill. 6.," published at Rome, 1676-79; this edition contains all the principal theological treatises. (4) "Opus theologicum," published in three folio volumes at Rome, 1657, treats of all the main questions of theology accurately, concisely, and clearly. The first volume contains some information concerning the author, and also his picture engraved by Louis LeFant.

A. J. MAAR

MAURUS, Rabanus. See Rabanus.
applause. As a reward he received a benefice and appointment as royal preacher. At the General Synod of 1775 he fearlessly exposed the failings of the court bishops, and in 1784, preaching on St. Vincent of Paul, he denounced the ingratitude of France towards one of her most illustrious sons. If his name were preserved; the remainder were burnt by Maury himself—to save, as he said, his reputation. Nevertheless, it was owing to them that he obtained a seat in the Académie (1784). In 1789 he was elected by the clergy of Péronne to be their deputy in the States-General, and soon became the acknowledged leader of the Court and Church party. Mirabeau's name at once occurs whenever the National Assembly is mentioned. Little is heard of the Abbé Maury, who was the great tribune's most docty adversary, and who, though always defeated on the vote, was not seldom the conqueror in the debate. In September, 1791, the Assembly was dissolved, and Maury quitted France for Coblenz, the headquarters of the emigrants. Here he was received by the king's brothers with extraordinary attention. Pius VI invited him to reside in Rome, and created him Archbishop of Nicaea (April, 1792). Soon afterwards he represented the Holy See at the Diet of Frankfort, where Francis II was elected emperor. The royal and noble personages who thronged the palaces and streets in his honour. On his return he was made cardinal and Archbishop of Montefiascone. When the Republican armies overran Italy in 1798, Maury fled to Venice, and took a prominent part, as representative of Louis XVIII, in the circle at which Pius VII was elected (1800). He did his best to stop the drawing up of the Concordat and the organization of the French bishops, to support his royal master and returning to Paris. Just as he had given his whole energies to the royal cause, so now he devoted himself entirely to Napoleon. In the difficult question of the divorce he sided with the emperor, and it was he who suggested a means of dispensing with the papal institution of the bishops. He accepted from Napoleon in this way the See of Paris, though he never styled himself anything but archbishop-elect. At the fall of the Empire (April, 1814), he was ordered to quit France, and was suspended by the pope. During the Hundred Days he was confined in the Castle of St. Angelo. Consalvi obtained his release, and brought about his reconciliation with Pius VII. He was restored to his See, and invited him, and he was made a member of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. Maury did not live long to enjoy his restoration to papal favour. The hardships of his prison life had destroyed his constitution, and aggravated the malady from which he had long been suffering. Early in May, 1817, his strength had so failed that the Last Sacraments were administered to him. During the night of 10 May his attendants found him lying dead with his rosary still in his grasp.

Louis XVIII had obstinately refused all reconciliation, and now forbade his body to be buried in his titular church, Trinità dei Monti. By order of the pope the body was laid before the high altar of the Chiesa Nuova, by the side of Baronius and Tarugi. When Pius VII heard of his death he said: "He combated many faults, but who is there that has not done the like? I myself have committed many grave ones."


T. B. SCANNELL.

MAXENTIUS, Marcus Aurelius, Roman Emperor 306-12, son of the Emperor Maximianus Herculeus and son-in-law of the chief Emperor Galerius. After his father's abdication he lived in Rome as a private citizen; but when Galerius established in Rome and Italy the new poll and land taxes decreed by Diocletian he was elected (25 October, 306) rival emperor. Maxentius owed his elevation not to personal merit but to the senators and people who disliked the unusual measures of the emperor, feared lest they should lose their privileged position. Maxentius's adherents then summoned his father from Campania to Rome; and the young ruler invested him with the purple as co-regent. Thus the Roman empire had six rulers. Severus, the Augustus of the West, received a commission from Galerius to expel the youthful usurper from Rome; but when he reached the capital, part of his army deserted to their old commander, Maximian. Severus with a few followers escaped to Ravenna so as to maintain military relations with Galerius. He then made terms with Maximian and surrendered to him, expecting honourable treatment, but he was imprisoned and afterwards, and Galerius approaching from Illyria with an army, he was forced to commit suicide. Alberti at Galerius's intervention, Maximian on behalf of Maxentius,

519 and 520. These monks adopted the formula: "One of the Trinity suffered in the flesh" to exclude Nestorianism and Monophysitism, and they sought to have the works of Faustus of Riez condemned as being tainted with Pelagianism. On both these points they acted with opposition. John Maximian sent an appeal to the papal legates then at Constantinople (Ep. ad legatos sedis apostolicae, P. G., LXXVI, i, 75-86); but it failed to bring forth a favourable decision. Some of the monks (not Maximian, however) proceeded, therefore, to Rome to lay the case before Pope Hormisdas. As the latter delayed his decision, they addressed themselves to some African bishops, banished to Sardinia, and St. Fulgentius, answering in the name of these prelates, warmly endorsed their cause (Fulg. ep. xxvii in P. L., LXV, 451-93). Early in August, 520, the monks left Rome. Shortly after, 13 August, 520, Hormisdas addressed a letter to the African bishop, Possessor, then at Constantinople, in which he severely condemned the conduct of the Scythian monks, also declaring that the writings of Faustus were not received among the authoritative works of the Fathers and that the sound doctrine on grace was contained in the works of St. Augustine (Hormisdas ep. xxviii Thel, p. 928). Maximian assailed this letter in the strongest language as a document written by heretics and circulated under false names, and accused Hormisdas to Sardinia, and St. Fulgentius, answering in the name of these prelates, warmly endorsed their cause (Fulg. ep. xxvii in P. L., LXV, 451-93). This is the last trace of the Scythian monks and their leader in history. The identification of John Maximian with the priest John to whom Fulgentius addressed his "De veritate predestinationis etc." and with the priest and archimandrite, John, to whom the Archbishop of Carthage sent the "Epi wellassumed, on a baseless assumption. Maximian is also the author of: (1) two dialogues against the Nestorians; (2) twelve anathematisms against the Nestorians; (3) a treatise against the Aæphal (Monophysites). As to the "Profe de Christo", printed as a separate work, it is but a part of the "Epistola ad legatos sedis apostolicae". His works, originally written in Latin, have reached us in a rather unsatisfactory condition. They were first published by Cochleus (Basle and Hagenau, 1520), reprinted in P. G., LXXVI, i, 75-158.

NOVIN, Opera Omnia (Venosa, 1729), I, 474-504; III, 775-924; LOOPE, Leonii von Episcopis, 228-41, in Texte und Unter- such., III (Leipzig, 1887); DAVIES in Dict. Christ. Biog., s. v MAXIMUS (4); GANDENBÜHNER, Patrology, tr. SHARAN (St Louis, 1908), 548-546.
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MAXENTIUS, Joannes, leader of the so-called Scythian monks, appears in history at Constantinople.

W.
tius, negotiated with Constantine to whom he gave his
daughter Fausta as bride. Meanwhile Galerius with his
Illyrian legions pushed forward to the neighbour-
hood of the Christians in Italy and Africa, but finding
that he was unable to occu-
py it or any of the fortified places, he withdrew his
forces. At this suggestion a conference of all the
Caesars took place at Carnuntum on the Danube (307)
in which the prestige of Diocletian had great influence.
Maxentius retained his imperial dignity. Though
it is true that soon after this he put an end to the persecu-
tion of the Christians in Italy and Africa, his reign
was stained with acts of debauchery and cruelty.

After his father's death, Maxentius and Maximin,
Emperor of the East, fearing the political alliance
of Constantine and Licinius, came to an understanding
unfriendly to Constantine. Maxentius made exten-
sive military preparations, and destroyed the statues
and paintings of Constantine. 'Constantine advanced
over what is now Mont Cenis with a comparatively
small but well-drilled army and, victorious in several
battles, occupied Upper Italy; he then marched
against Rome, where his opponent, strongly en-
trenched behind the Tiber and the walls of Aurelian,
hoped to resist him successfully. Thoughtlessly
and imprudently, Maxentius, in an attempt to
outmanoeuvre Constantine, moved his army from a
convenient position, made a bridge of boats across the
Tiber (near the Milvian Bridge now Ponte Molle),
and awaited the troops of Constantine on the right bank
of the river. It was then that occurred the miracle
related by Eusebius (Vita Constant. I, 28-30), that when
Constantine implored supernatural aid, a fiery cross
appeared over the camp, and Constantine, in a
solitary cell, witnessed the phenomenon. To this sig-

Further, he was advised by
Christ, in a dream the previous night, to go into
battle armed with this sign. Maxentius' soldiers
were thrown into confusion by the impetuosity of the
Gallic horsemen, and in the efforts of the retreating
army to escape over the narrow bridge, many were
thrown into the Tiber, and drowned, among those
were
Maxentius (28 October, 312). His son and coun-
celors were put to death, but his officials and depen-
dents retained their positions.

SCHILLER, Gesch. d. römischen Kaiserzeit, II (Gotha, 1887);
DE WAILLY, Roma Sacra (Munich, 1908).

KARL HOEBER.

MAXFIELD, (vorne MACKESFIELD), THOMAS, VENER-
ABLE, English priest and martyr; b. in Stafford gaol,
about 1590, martyred at Tyburn, London, Monday,
1 July, 1616. He was one of the younger sons of
William Mackesfield of Chesterton and Maer and As-
ton, Staffordshire (a firm recusant, condemned to
death in 1597). Being a harbouring priest, one of whom
was his father, he received from his father's sister, the
Hon. Ursula, daughter of Francis Roos, of Laxon, Nottinghamshire. William
Mackesfield is said to have died in prison and is one of the
protomartyrs as William Maxfield; but, as his death
occurred in 1608, this is doubtful. Thomas arrived at
the English College at Douai on 16 March, 1602-3, but
had to return to England 17 May, 1610, owing to ill
health. On 9 June he was ordained priest, and
in the next year came to London.
Within three months of landing he was arrested, and
sent to the Gatehouse, Westminster. After about
eight months' imprisonment, he tried to escape by a
rope let down from the window in his cell, but was
captured on reaching the ground. This was at mid-
night 14-15 June, 1616. For seventy hours he was
placed in the stocks in a filthy dungeon at the Gate-
house, and was then on Monday night (17 June) re-
moved to Newgate, where he was set amongst the
worst criminals, two of whom he converted. On
Wednesday, 26 June, he was brought to the bar at the
Old Bailey, and the next day was executed. He
was beheaded under 27 Ec. 1, 2. The Spanish
ambassador did his best to obtain a pardon, or at least
a reprieve; but, finding his efforts unavailing, had
solemn exposition of the Blessed Sacrament in his
chapel during the martyr's last night on earth. The
procession to Tyburn early on the following morning
was joined by many devout Spaniards, who, in spite of
the threats of the sheriffs, insisted on offering a gar-
ment for the honour for the martyr. Tyburn-tree itself
was found decorated with garlands, and the ground round
about strewn with sweet herbs. The sheriff ordered
the martyr to be cut down alive, but popular feeling
was too strong, and the dismembering did not take
place till he was quite senseless. Half of his relics are
now in St. Mary's, Duras, in France, the other halves
are in miraculous shrines in the churches of
Life and Martyrdom of Mr. Maxfield, Priest 1616, ed.
POOLE, in Catholic Record Society, III, 30-58; CHALLOXER.
Dictionnaire des Mémoires de Missionary Priests (London, 1833), 51;
POLLARD in Dict. Nat. Bio., a. v.; STANTON, Menology of Eng-
land and Wales (London, 1887), 298; The William Salt Archae-
ological Society's Correspondence for 1817-1900, II, iii, v, vi, 207; new series, v, 128; XII, 248.
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MAXIMIANopolis, a titular see of Palestina Secunda.
suffragan of Scythopolis. Its ancient name, Adad-
Rammon, according to the Vulgate (according to the
Hebrew, Haddad-Rimon) is found in Zach., xi, 11:
"... there shall be a great lamentation in Jerusalem
like the lamentation of Adadrammon in the plain of
Mageddon," an allusion to the death of Josias, King of
Judah, whom, killed by the king of Babylon, he fought near this place (IV Kings, xxxii, 29; II Par.
xxxv, 20-25). In the time of the so-called "Pilgrim of
Bordeaux" (ed. Geyer, 19, 27) and of St. Jerome
(Comment. in Zach. , ad cap. xii, 11; Comment. in Os. , 5), Adad-Rammon already bore the name of
Maximinopolis. Three of its ancient bishops are
known: Paul, in 325 (Gælag. "Patrum Nicæensium
nomina", lxi)—not Maximus, as Le Quien gives it in
"Oriens Christianus", III, 703; Megas, in 518, and
Domnus, in 536 (Le Quien, op. cit., 708-06). Maximi-

now has resumed its ancient name of Rimmom, and
is now the almost deserted little village of Roum-
manch, nearly four miles to the south of Ledjum, or
Maleo (see LEGIO).

GÉRARD, Description de la Palestine: Samarée (Paris, 1875).
II, 229-230; Gælag. Georgii Cyrillic Descriptio orbis roman.
(Leipsig, 1890), 193-96; LEGENDAE IN VIG. Dict. de la Bible,
a.v. Adadrammon.

S. VAILHÉ.

MAXIMIANUS, MARCUS AURELIUS VALERIUS, sur-
named HERCULIUS, Roman Emperor, was adopted
by Diocletian and named his co-regent in 285, because
by this division of the sovereignty the danger of the war-
ners' mutiny, the ambitious efforts of the usurpers,
and the attacks of foreign enemies seemed to be pre-
vented. The son of a simple peasant, he possessed only
very little education; he was violent and brutal, but
was a brave fighter. For this reason, when Diocletian
was struggling with the Persians in Asia, Maximianus
was entrusted with the leadership of the punitive expedition
against the peasants and field slaves (Bagaudas) in
Gaul who, driven by economical causes, had risen
against Diocletian. The new emperor soon restored
peace, and received from Diocletian, in token of the
latter's gratitude, the title of Augustus on 1 April, 286.
However, only the administration of the empire was
divided; the sovereignty remained centralized now as
ever, and the will of the emperor-in-chief, Diocletian,
was absolute. While Maximianus, having established
his residence in Aquileia (II, 11-13), was spending
his days with the Burgundians and the Alamanni, who
had crossed the frontier and the Rhine, he found many ob-
stacles in repulsing the Menapian pirate chief Carau-
Sius. Originally commander-in-chief of the Roman
Maximilian had pursued and conquered the pirates of the German ocean; then, driven by greed and ambition, he had forced Britain to do homage to him, and seized the whole trade in Gaul and Britain. In 1286 he even appropriated the title of Augustus, and caused coins to be struck which bore his own portrait. Even Diocletian, by a compromise in 290, was forced to recognize Carausius as the legal emperor, while the latter agreed to supply Diocletian with corn, as had been the custom.

As Diocletian left Syria to enter the countries of the Lower Danube, he met Maximianus, and both the emperors crossed the Alps in the beginning of 291 in order to attend a conference at Milan, there to discuss the better administration of the empire and the improvement of the state. Instead of conferring the titles of Caesar on his sons, Constantius and Galerius were proclaimed Caesars 1 March, 293; the first was forced to marry the stepdaughter of Maximianus, Theodora, after the exile of his mother Helena. Maximianus now took charge of the administration of Italy, Africa, and Spain. His residence was Milan, where he was surrounded by 6000 Illyrian picked troops, called Hercules. Constantius on his part was now successful in his struggle with Carausius. The war came quickly to an end, as Carausius was assassinated by Allectus, prefect of his guard, in 293. Constantius then reunited Britain with the Roman Empire, while Maximianus gave the Gauls occasion to assure their Teutons on the Upper Rhine. When Constantius had returned from Britain, Maximianus went in 297 to Africa, where he successfully made war upon rebellious tribes of the Moors, and sent a great many captives into the other provinces. In 302 he celebrated a great triumph with Diocletian in Rome; seventeen times he held the sword of the emperor. The possession of the Christians, which Diocletian had conducted with reckless brutality in the East since 303, was also taken up by Maximianus in the western provinces, of which he was governor.

It is said that during these persecutions—it is impossible to state the time correctly—the Christian soldiers of the Theban legion also suffered martyrdom in Agaunum (St-Maurice, Canton of Valais, Switzerland) in the then Diocese of Octodurum. The Christian soldiers of this legion refused to execute his orders when Maximianus, on a march over what is now the Great St. Bernard, commanded them to punish the Christians living in these districts; for this refusal the legate threatened them with the sword, and warned the survivors held out to the last, all the soldiers were massacred by order of the emperor. Because Rome was degraded by Diocletian more and more to the position of a provincial town, and because Galerius’s new and hard system of taxes was to be extended also to Italy and to Rome, the senators and the pretorians proclaimed the Caesar M. Aurelius Maximianus, the son of Maximianus; the latter laid down the purple at Milan. But the new emperor proved to be incapable of governing, and Maximianus, who was popular with the army, was recalled to restore order for the new Augustus. His he did not accomplish, and the old Diocletian, living as a private person in Salona, called a meeting of all the members of the dynasty at Carnuntum for the end of the year 307. Maximianus had to renounce the purple for the second time. He now went to Gaul, and gave his youngest daughter Fausta in marriage to Constantine. As his hope to regain his former imperial dignity failed here also, he returned to his son Maxentius in Italy. Reunited by the latter and all the members of the dynasty at Carnuntum he departed once more for Gaul and donned the imperial purple for the third time. When the news of Constantine’s approach reached his own soldiers, they surrendered him to his rival and opponent at Marsilia. Although Constantine in his generosity pardoned him, he returned to the forging of nefarious schemes against his son-in-law, and finally was compelled to take his own life in 310.


Karl Houbemer.

Maximilian, the name of several martyrs. (1) Maximilian of Antioch, a soldier, martyred at Antioch, Jan. 353, with Bonoetus, a fellow soldier, of the Herculean cohort; they were standard-bearers, and refused to remove the chrismion (monogram of Christ) from the standard, as had been ordered by Julian. Count Julian, beside of the emperor, commanded them to replace the chrismion with images of idols, and, upon their refusal, had them tortured and beheaded. The Roman martyrology and most other calendars mention them on 21 August, while in a few martyrologies and in the heading which is prefixed to their Acts, 21 Sept. (XII Kal. Oct.) is designated as the day of their martyrdom. Both dates are wrong, as is evident from the Acts of the two martyrs, which represent Count Julian as inflected with an ugly disease, contracted at the martyrdom of St. Theodoret 23 Oct., 362. (2) Maximilian of Celeia.—His Acts, composed in the thirteenth century and unreliable, say he was b. at Celeia (Cilli, Styria), made a pilgrimage to Rome, went as missionary to Noricum, and here was the bishop of Laureacum (Lorch, near Passau), and suffered martyrdom under Numerianus (283–4). It is historically certain that Maximilian was a missionary in Noricum during the latter half of the third century, founded the church of Lorch, and suffered martyrdom. His cult dates at least from the eighth century. In that century St. Rupertus founded a church at Bischofshofen, and brought his relics thither. They were transferred to Passau in 985. His feast is celebrated 12 Oct., at some places 29 Oct. (3) Maximilian of Thebeste, martyred at Thebeste near Carthage, 12 March, 295. Thinking a Christian was not permitted to be a soldier, he refused to enter the army and was beheaded. Since death was not then the legal punishment for those who refused to join the army (Arrius Menander, Digesto XLIX, xvi, 4 P. 10), it is probable that he was beheaded because he gave his Christianity as the reason of his refusal. He was buried at Carthage by the noble matron Pompejana. Dods, A. 258, 438; A. 39, 403, 429; Ambrosio, (Ratibon, 1589), 606–12; Lecjesc, Les Martyrs I, III (Paris, 1904), 100–4; Tillotson, Menes pour servir à l’État, col. 107–8; Denis pour servir à l’État, col. 100–3; Lecjesc, Les Martyrs II, (Paris, 1904), 105–105; Harnack, Mélites (Tubingen, 1895), 114; Ruhnau, Acta Martyrum (Ratibon, 1589), 340–2, Fr. tr, Lecjesc, Les Martyrs II, (Paris, 1905), 182–5.

Michael Ott.

Maximilian I, Duke of Bavaria, 1598–1622, Elector of Bavaria and Lord High Steward of the Holy Roman Empire, 1623–1651; b. at Munich, 17 April, 1573; d. at Ingolstadt, 27 September, 1651. The last being in the country and the Catholic Church justified the dogma of the Incarnation of the Holy. He was the son of zealous Catholic parents, William V, the Pious, of Bavaria, and Renate of Lorena. Mentally well endowed, Maximilian received a strict Catholic training from private tutors and later (1587–91) studied law, history, and mathematics at the University of Ingolstadt. He further increased his knowledge by visits to Italy, Greece, and Naples, and to places of pilgrimage including Rome, Loretto, and Einsiedeln. Thus equipped Maximilian assumed (15 Oct., 1597) the government of the small, thinly populated country at his father’s wish during the latter’s lifetime. Owing to the over-learned rule of
the two preceding rulers the land was burdened with a heavy debt. By curtailing expenditure and enlarging the revenues, chiefly by working the salt-mines himself and by increasing the taxes without regard to the complaints of the powerless estates, the finances were not only brought into a better condition but it was also possible to collect a reserve fund which, in spite of the necessity of supplying the troops during the difficult times of his reign, was never quite exhausted. At the same time internal order was maintained by a series of laws issued in 1616. Maximilian gave great attention to military matters. No other German prince of that time possessed an army so well organized and equipped. Its commander was the veteran soldier from the Netherlands, Johann Tilly, Count of Tilly, who, austere himself, knew how to maintain discipline among his troops. The fortifications at Ingolstadt on the Danube were greatly strengthened, and Munich and other towns were surrounded by walls and moats. Well-filled arsenals were established in different places as preparation for time of need. Opportunity for the use of this armament soon offered itself.

The small free city of Donauwörth fell under the imperial ban for violating the religious peace. In executing the imperial decree Maximilian not only succeeded in bringing this city into submission to Bavaria but also in re-establishing the Catholic Church as the one and only religion in it. This led to the forming (1609) of the Protestant Union, an offensive and defensive confederation of Protestant princes, in opposition to which arose in 1609 the Catholic League organized by Maximilian. Oddly enough, both coalitions were headed by princes of the Wittelsbach line: Maximilian as head of the League, Frederick IV of the Palatinate, of the Union. The Thirty Years' War, during which Bavaria suffered terribly, broke out in 1619. Under Tilly's leadership the Bohemian revolt was crushed at the battle of the White Mountain (Weissen Berg) near Prague, 8 November, 1620, and the newly elected King of Bohemia, Frederick V, fled to flee. His allies, the Margrave of Baden and the Duke of Brunswick, were defeated by the forces of Bavaria and the Upper Palatinate, in the Leukfeld (1622), as was also at a later date (1626) King Christian of Denmark. Conditions, however, changed when Maximilian, through jealousy of the House of Haps- burgh, was led in 1630 to seek the dismissal of the head of the imperial army, Wallenstein. The youthful Swedish king, Gustavus Adolphus, defeated Tilly, the veteran leader of the army of the League, at Breitenfeld (1631), and in a battle with Gustavus Adolphus near the Lech, 16 April, 1632, Tilly was again vanquished, receiving a wound from which he died two weeks later at Ingolstadt. Although the siege of this city by the Swedes was unsuccessful, Gustavus plundered the Bavarian towns and villages, laid waste the country around Munich.

Maximilian, who since 1623 had been both Elector and ruler of the Upper Palatinate, implored Wallenstein, now once more the head of the imperial forces, for help in vain until he agreed to place himself and his army under Wallenstein's command. The united forces under Wallenstein took up an entrenched posi-
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Maximilian, who since 1623 had been both Elector and ruler of the Upper Palatinate, implored Wallenstein, now once more the head of the imperial forces, for help in vain until he agreed to place himself and his army under Wallenstein's command. The united forces under Wallenstein took up an entrenched posi-tion near Nuremberg where Wallenstein repulsed the Swedish attacks; by advancing towards Saxony he even forced them to evacuate Maximilian's territories. The relief to Bavaria, however, was not of long duration. After the death of Gustavus Adolphus at the battle of Lützen (1632) Bernhard of Weimar, unmo-
ested by Wallenstein, ravaged Bavaria until he re-

received a crushing defeat at the field of Nördlingen (6 Sept., 1634). Even in the last ten years of the war the country was not spared from hostile attacks. Consequently Maximilian sought by means of a truce with the enemy (1647) to gain for Bavaria an opportu-

ity to recover. The desired result, however, not being attained, he united his forces to those of the imperial army, but the all-out effort of Nördlingen to overthrow the confederated French and Swedes, and Bavaria once more suffered all the terrors of a pitiless invasion. The fighting ended with the capture of the Swedish generals, 6 Oct., 1648, and the Peace of Westphalia was signed at Munster, 24 Oct. of the same year. The material benefits derived by Maximilian from his attitude in politics were meagre: the Electoral digni-
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buried in the church of St. Michael at Munich. A fine equestrian statue, designed by Thorwaldsen and cast by Stiglmayer, was erected at Munich by King Louis I in 1839.

Although there was almost incessant war during his reign, and Bavaria in the middle of the seventeenth century was like a desert, nevertheless Maximilian did much for the arts, e.g. by building the palace, the Mariensäule (Mary's Column). Learning also, especially at the University of Ingolstadt, had in this era distinguished representatives. The Jesuit Balde was a brilliant writer both of Latin and German verse, and Father Scheiner, another member of the same order, was the first to discover the spots on the sun; historians also, such as Heinrich Canisius, Matthäus Rader, etc., produced important works of lasting merit.

Maximilian, however, gave far more attention to the advancement of religion among the people than to art and learning. He founded five Jesuit colleges: Amberg, Burghausen, Landshut, Mindelheim, and Straubing. Besides establishing a monastery for the Minims and one for the Carmelites at Munich, he founded nine monasteries for Franciscans and fourteen for Capuchins who venerate him as one of their greatest benefactors. He also founded at Munich a home for aged and infirm Court officials, and gave 30,000 guilders for the Chinese missions, as well as large sums to the Scotch-English college of the Jesuits at Liège.
His private charities among the poor and needy of all descriptions were unlimited. Maximiilill was also sincerely religious and rigidly moral in conduct; he even went beyond the permissible in his efforts to uphold and spread the faith. Maintaining like all princes of his time the axiom "Cujus regio ejus religio", he not only put down every movement in opposition to the Church in his own country but also exterminated Calvinists. Luther was his bitterest and most bitterest rival in the territory he had acquired. Where admonition and instruction were not sufficient the soldier stepped in, and the poor people, who had already been obliged to change their faith several times with change of ruler, had now no choice but return to the Church or exile. Maximilian, in addition, never lost sight of secular advantage, as shown by his numerous acquisitions of territory. Especially valuable was the purchase of two-thirds of the countship of Helfenstein, now a part of Württemberg, which as a Bavarian dependence was preserved to the Church and has remained Catholic up to the present time, notwithstanding its Protestant surroundings. Maximilian was twice married. His first marriage was childless. By his second wife Maria, daughter of the Emperor Ferdinand II, whom he married 15 July, 1635, he had two sons; the elder of these, Ferdinand Maria, as already mentioned, succeeded him.


Maximinus, Saint, Bishop of Trier, b. at Silly near Poitiers, d. there, 29 May, 352 or 12 Sept., 349. He was educated and ordained priest by St. Agrarius, whom he succeeded as Bishop of Trier in 332 or 335. At that time Trier was the government seat of the Western Emperor and, by force of his office, Maximinus stood in close relation with the Emperors Constantine II and Constans. He was a strenuous defender of the orthodox faith against Arianism and an intimate friend of St. Athanasius, whom he harboured as an honoured guest during his exile of two years and four months (353-355) at Trier. He likewise shared with him honours the banished patriarch Paul of Constantinople in 341 and effected his recall to Constantinople. When four Arian bishops came from Antioch to Trier in 342 with the purpose of receiving Maximinus in order to induce the emperor to reject their proposals. In conjunction with Pope Julius I and Bishop Hosius of Cordova, he persuaded the Emperor Constans to convene the Synod of Sardica in 343 and probably took part in it. That the Arians considered himself as one of their chief opponents is evident from the fact that they condemned him by name along with Pope Julius I and Hosius of Cordova at their heretical synod of Philippopolis in 343 (Mansi, „Sacrorum Conc. nova et ampl. Col.„, III, 136 sqq.). In 345 he took part in the Synod of Milan and is said to have presided over a synod held at Cologne in 346, where Bishop Euphrates of Cologne was deposéd on account of his leanings towards Arianism. [Concerning the authenticity of the Acts of this synod see the new French translation of Hefele's „Conc. Presbyter. et Conc. Antiqu. I“ (1906), p. 330-340.] He also sent Sts. Castor and Lucubius as missionaries to the valleys of the Mosel and the Lahn. It is doubtful whether the Maximinus whom the usurper Magnenius set as legate to Constantinople in the interests of peace is identical with the Bishop of Trier (Athanasius, „Apol. ad Const. Imp.„, 9). His cult began right after his death. His feast is celebrated on 29 May, and once a day his name still occurs in the Martyrology of St. Jerome, St. Bede, St. Ado, and others. Trier honours him as its patron. In the autumn of 353 his body was buried in the church of St. John near Trier, where in the seventh century was founded the famous Benedictine Abbey of St. Maximinus, which flourished till 1803.

Maximianus, Caius Valerius Daja, under his uncle Augustus Galerius, the Caesar of Syria and Egypt, from the year 305; in 307 following the example of Constantine, he assumed the title of Augustus. When Galerius died in 311, the Caesar, Licinius, set out for the Hellespont to besiege the provinces of the Near East. Maximinus obtained the sympathy of the population by granting indulgence to all Christians who would return to the threatened provinces; also, he had in his power Galerius' widow and Valeria, Diocletian's daughter. An agreement was made fixing the Ægean Sea and the straits between Europe and Asia as the boundaries of the dominions and as no new Caesars were appointed, there were three legal emperors. Thus Diocletian's plan of governing the empire was abandoned. Maximinus, a fanatical idolater and tyrant, continued the persecution of the Christians in his part of the empire with especial severity and persistency, even where the cruel Galerius had ceased. Besides sanguinary measures for the suppression of Christianity, he made attempts to establish in both Roman and country a heathen or Catholic Church. The emperor made the then high-priests and magicians of equal rank with the governors of provinces. His attempt to achieve renown by a war against the Persians in Armenia was frustrated by pestilence and bad harvests (Eusebius). When Constantine and Licinius published the edict of toleration for the Christians at Milan in 312, Maximinus was asked to promulgate it in his part of the empire, he did so, because he saw clearly that it was directed against his anti-Christian policy. When in the winter of 312 Constantine's Gallic troops were withdrawn from Italy, and Licinius was still at Milan, Maximinus pushed on his well armed marches towards the capital, Byzantium, and captured it together with his brother, who was at the court of Maximus. His news was taken by surprise, offered to make terms with him, which Maximinus trusting to gain an easy victory refused. Contrary to his expectation, and in spite of the superiority in numbers of his troops, he was defeated near Adrianople, 30 April, 313, and fled precipitately to Nicomedia there to endear himself to his army. Licinius harassing him incessantly, published an edict of toleration for the Christians of Nicomedia so that Maximinus was obliged to withdraw to the Taurus where he entrenched himself in the passes. He then tried to win the Christians by issuing an edict of toleration; but his military situation was hopeless and he took poison (313). Licinius exterminated the Jovian family, murdering all the relatives who were at the court of Maximus. The edicts of the deceased emperor were cancelled, and decrees favourable to the Christians were now promulgated in the East.

Maximinus Thrax, Caius Julius Verus, Roman Emperor 235-8, son of a Goth and an Albanic mother. When the Emperor Septimius Severus was returning
through Thrace in 202, Maximinus, a shepherd of enormous stature and strength, distinguished himself in a contest with the soldiers by such Herculean strength and bravery that the emperor enrolled him in the Roman body-guard. Refusing to serve under the worthless emperors, Macrinus and Heliogabalus, he withdrew from the army; but under the righteous Alexander Severus he was entrusted with the command of the newly raised Pannonian troops. Desiring a real warrior at their head instead of the youthful and timid Alexander, who was entirely subject to his mother Julia Mamaea, invested him with the purple at Mainz, in March, 235, at the same time proclaiming his son Maximus co-regent. The adherents of the former Syrian dynasty and of the senate tried unavailing to stop Maximinus. They were successful when Maximinus took the field with great energy and persistence against the Germans across the Rhine, regained the district of the Agricolae and then waged successful war against the Sarmatians and the Dacians on the Danube. Assuming the names of Germanicus and Sarmaticus, he proceeded with sentences of death and confiscation against the patrician Romans, who disliked him as a wild and uncultured barbarian; on the other hand he distributed the State revenues among the soldiers who were devoted to him. He had the bronze statues of the gods and their treasures melted down and coined; he plundered cities and temples, and caused so much confusion that a rebellion broke out in Pannonia, 238, among the partisans in Africa. The procurator and the octogenarian consul at Carthage were killed.

M. Antonius Gordianus and his son of the same name, were made co-regent emperors. The Roman senate willingly recognised them, because they promised, like the Antonines in former times, to forego most of the decisions; the people despairing Maximinus, who had never once set foot in the capital of the empire, agreed with the senate. Maximinus was outlawed, and his death was rumoured, but he sent Capellianus, Procurator of Numidia, against the adherents of the Gordiani, and in the struggle, the younger Gordian lost his life whereupon the senior handed himself in despair. Their reign had lasted little more than a month. The senate now decided to elect two emperors with equal authority, M. Clodius Pupienus Maximinus who was to exercise the military power de facto, and Decimus Ceilius Balbinus who was to direct the civil government in the capital. The Roman senate, intricately involved with this plan, had expected great advantages from the rule of the African emperors, raised to the rank of Caesars the elder Gordian’s twelve year old grandson (afterwards Gordian III), then residing in Rome. Severe street fighting occurred in Rome between the veterans of Maximinus and the people. Owing to scanty commissariat Maximinus could only move his troops slowly from Pannonia. Meanwhile the senate levied troops, constructed arsenals, and by creating twenty military districts, placed Italy in a satisfactory defensive position. When Maximinus arrived in Upper Italy, he could not at once cross the Isonzo on account of the floods and his attacks on the stronghold of Aquileia were repulsed. Under the foolish impression that his officers were the cause of his misfortunes, he had several of them executed, thereby arousing discontent among the soldiers, especially in the Second Parthian Legion whose wives and children were in the power of the Roman Senate at Albano. A mutiny suddenly occurring, Maximin and his son were murdered. Persecutions followed from Rome, who sentenced the troops liberally and administered to them the oath of fidelity on behalf of the three senator emperors resident in Rome.

Maximins, a titular see of Arabia, suffragan of Bostra. The true name of the city is Maximinoplis, and it so appears in the “Notitia episcopatum” of the Patriarch Anastasius in the sixth century (“Echos d’Orient”, X, Paris, 1907, 145). Pursuant to a decree of the Propaganda (1885), the title is to be suppressed in future; Torquato Armellini having confounded this town with Maximinoplis in Palestina Secunda (Catalogo dei vas. Istitut. Libr., Rome 1930, p. 203, index 5). Its last titular was consecrated in 1876. Two ancient bishops of this see are known: Severus, a signatory of the Council of Chalcedon in 451 (Mansi, “Coll. Conc.”, VII, 168), and Peter, known by an inscription (Waddington, “Inscriptions grecques et latines de Grèce et l’Asie-Mineure”, no. 2361). The name which has been supposed that of Maximinoplis is not known, and we are equally ignorant of its actual identification, though many authorities place it at Sheikh-Miskin, a locality in the Hauran, famous for the extent and beauty of its ruins, where an inscription has been found bearing the name of Bishop Thomas (“Bulleten de corresp. hellénique,” Paris, 1897, 52).

Maximus of Constantinople, Saint, known as the Theologian and as Maximus Confessor, b. at Constantinople about 580; d. in exile 13 August, 662. He is one of the chief names in the Monothelite controversy, one of the chief doctors of the theology of the Incarnation and of ascetic mysticism, and remarkable as a witness to the respect for the Church in his day. This great man was of a noble family of Constantinople. He became first secretary to the Emperor Heraclius, who prized him much; but he quitted the world and gave himself up to contemplation in a monastery at Chrysopolis, opposite Constantinople. He became abbot there; but seems to have left this retreat on account of its insularity from hostile attacks. He speaks of the Palestinian ascetic, St. Sophronius, afterwards Patriarch of Jerusalem, as his master, father, and teacher (Ep. 13), so that he probably passed some time with him, and he was with him in Africa with other monks during the preparations which issued in the “watery union” by which Cyrus the Patriarch reconciled a number of Monophysites to the Church by rejecting the doctrine of “two operations” in Christ (see Monothelitism). The first action of St. Maximus that we know of in this affair is a letter sent by him to Pyrrhus, then an abbot at Chry- sopolis, a friend and supporter of Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, the patron of the Monothelite expression of Monophysite. The two operations undertook a long voyage on the monks who carried it. St. Maximus was perhaps already in Africa when he wrote it. Pyrrhus had published a work on the Incarnation, for which St. Maximus gives him rather fulsome praise, as an introduction to the question (which he puts with much difference and many excuses) what Pyrrhus means by the hypostasis of the Person of Christ. Maximus is clearly anxious to get him to withdraw or explain the mistaken expression, without exasperating him by contradiction.

The Ectesis of Heraclius was published in 638, and Sergius and Pope Honorius both died in that year. A letter of Maximus tells us on the authority of his friends at Constantinople, that the Roman synod, who had come thither to obtain the emperor’s confirmation for the newly elected Pope Severinus, were met by the clergy of Constantinople with the demand that they should promise to obtain the pope’s signature to the Ectesis, otherwise they should receive no assistance in the matter for which they had made so long a journey. “Having discovered this movement, since by refusing they would have caused the first and Mother of Churches, and the city, to remain so long a time in widowhood, they replied quietly: We cannot act with authority in this matter, for we have received a commission to execute, not an order to
make a profession of faith. But we assure you that we will relate all that you have put forward, and we will show the document itself to him who is to be consecrated, and if he should judge it to be correct, we will ask him to append his signature to it. But do not therefore place any obstacle in our way now, or do violence to us by delaying us and keeping us here. For none has a right to use violence especially when faith is in question. For herein even the weakest waxes mighty and the meek becomes a warrior, and by combating his soul with the Divine Word, is hardened against the greatest attack. How much more in the case of the clergy and Church of the Romans, which from of old until now, as the elder of all the Churches under the sun, presides over all? Having surely received and preserved the light of the True Light as given to the Apostles, as from the princes of the latter, and being numbered in their company, she is subject to no writings or issues of synodical documents, on account of the eminence of her pontificate, even as in all these things they are all equally subject to her according to ecclesiastical law. And so when without fear but with all holy and becoming confidence, those ministers of the truly firm and immovable rock, that is, of the most great and Apostolic Church at Rome, had so replied to the clergy of the royal city, they were seen to have conciliated them and to have acted prudently, that the others might be humble and modest, while they made known the orthodoxy and purity of their own faith from the foundation of the Church. But the clergy of Rome, admiring their piety, thought that such a deed ought to be recompensed; and ceasing from urging the document on them, they promised by their diligence to procure the issue of the emperor's order with regard to the episcopal election. . . . Of the aforesaid document a copy has been sent to me also. They have explained in it that the universa fidei, or universal faith, in Christians our God, that is, in His natures, of which and in which He is believed to be; and how in future neither one nor two are to be mentioned. It is only to be allowed to confess that the divine and human (works) proceeded from the same Word of God incarnate, and are to be attributed to one and the same (person). This passage does not call the prohibition of "two operations" yet by the name of heresy, and does not mention the "one Will" confessed in the Euthemia. But it gives very clearly St. Maximus's view that the smallest point of faith is to be held at the risk of one's life, and it demonstrates the ample admission made at Constantinople, before the struggles began, of the Holy Roman Church.

When in 641 John IV wrote his defence of Pope Honorius, it was re-echoed by St. Maximus in a letter to Marinus, a priest of Cyprus. He declares that Honorius, when he confessed one will of our Lord, only meant to deny that Christ had a will of the flesh, of concupiscence, since He was made and born without sin. Maximus appeals to the writings of Abbot John Symposion, who wrote the letter for Honorius. Pyrrhus was now Sergius's successor, but on the accession of the Emperor Constans in 642 he was exiled. Maximus then sent a letter to the patrician Peter, apparently the Governor of Syria and Palestine, who had written to him concerning Pyrrhus, whom he now calls simply abbot. Pyrrhus, in his letter to Peter, had restrained him from putting forward his heretical views. Pyrrhus had declared that he was ready to satisfy Maximus as to his orthodoxy. The latter says he would have written to Peter before, "but I was afraid of being thought to transgress the holy laws, if I were to do this without knowing the will of the holy fathers; I wish therefore to write to the whole plentitude of the Catholic Church, and rule it with order according to the divine law." The new Euthymology is worse than the old heresies; Pyrrhus and his predecessor have accused Sophronius of error; they persuaded Heraclius to give his name to the Euthemist: "they have not conformed to the sense of the Apostolic see, and what is laughable, or rather lamentable, as proving their ignorance, they have not hesitated to lie against the Apostolic see itself. . . . but have claimed the great Honorius on their side. . . . What did the divine Honorius do, and after him the aged Severinus, and John who followed him? Yet further, what supplication has the blessed pope, who now sits, not made? Have not the whole East and West brought their tears, lamentations, obsequiations, deprecation, both before God in prayer and before men in their letters? If the Roman see recognizes Pyrrhus to be not only a reprobab but a heretic, it is certainly plain that everyone who anathematizes those who have rejected Pyrrhus, anathematizes the see of Rome, that is, he anathematizes the Catholic see. We hardly add that he excommunicates himself also, if indeed he be in communion with the Roman see and the Church of God. . . . It is not right that one who has been condemned and cast out by the Apostolic see of the city of Rome for his wrong opinions should be named with any kind of honour, until he be received by her, having returned to her, and to our Lord—by a pious confession and orthodox faith, by which he can receive holiness and the title of holy. . . . Let him hasten before all things to satisfy the Roman see, for if it is satisfied all will agree in calling him pious and orthodox. For he only speaks in vain who thinks he ought to persuade or entrap persons like myself, and does not satisfy, and in the Catholic see, the most holy Church of the Romans, that is, the Apostolic see, which from the incarnate Son of God Himself, and also by all holy synods, according to the holy canons and definitions, has received universal and supreme dominion, authority and power of binding and loosing over all the holy Churches of God which are in the whole world; in which dominion is the power of the celestial powers binds and looses in heaven also. For if he thinks he must satisfy others, and fails to implore the most blessed Roman pope, he is acting like a man who, when accused of murder or some other crime, does not hasten to prove his innocence to the judge appointed by the law, but only uselessly and without profit does his best to demonstrate his innocence to private individuals, who have no power to acquit him."

Pyrrhus thought he might regain his see by the help of the pope. He came to Africa, and in July, 645, a public disputation took place between him and Maximus, in the presence of the Governor of Cyrene, and a certain George in the MSS. of St. Maximus's works, as a friend and correspondent of the saint. The minutes are interesting. Pyrrhus argues that two wills must imply two Persons willing; Maximus replies that in that case there must be three wills in the Holy Trinity. He shows that the will belongs to the Nature, and distinguishes between will as a fact and will as the act of the will. Pyrrhus then admits two wills, on the account of the two natures, but adds that we should also confess one will on account of the perfect union. Maximus replies that this would lead us to confess one nature on account of the perfect union. He then cites many passages of Scripture for two wills and two operations. Pyrrhus puts forward Honorius and Vigilius. Maximus defends the former from the charge of teaching two wills, and denies that the latter ever received the letter of Mennas, the authenticity of which is assumed. He complains of the changeableness of Sergius. Lastly the famous "new theandric operation" of the Pseudo-Dionysius is discussed, and is explained and defended by St. Maximus. Pyrrhus gives in, and embarks to go to Rome, where in fact he condemned his former teaching, and was reconciled to the Church by the pope. But the revolt of Gregory, who made himself emperor in Africa, but was defeated in 647, brought Maximus into disfavour at court, and destroyed the hope of restoring Pyrrhus as
orthodox patriarch. After the Ecstasy had been withdrawn, and the Type, Tyros, substituted by the Emperor Constantine, St. Maximus was present at the great council held by St. Method at his instance in 649. He wrote from Rome (where he stayed some years): "The extremities of the earth, and all in every part of it who purely and rightly confess the Lord, look directly towards the most holy Roman Church and its confession and faith, as it were to a sun of un-failing light, awaiting from it the bright radiance of the sacred dogma of our Saviour, the gates of hell do never prevail against it, that it has the keys of a right confession and faith in Him, that it opens the true and only religion to such as approach with piety, and shuts up and locks every heretical mouth that speaks injustice against the Most High.

Maximus was dragged from Rome in 653, and died of ill treatment at Inkerman in March, 655. It was probably later in that year that an official named Gregory came to Rome to get Pope Eugene to receive the Type. He came to the cell of St. Maximus, who argued with him and denounced the Type. As the saint was recognized as the leader of the orthodox Fathers, he was sent to Constantinople in 655 (as is commonly stated, at the same time as St. Martin). He was now seventy-five years old. The acts of his trials have been preserved by Anastasius Bibliothecarius. He was accused of conspiring with the usurper Gregory, together with Pope Theodore, and it was said that he had caused the loss of the episcopal See. At least, as Anastasius, and others say, he refused to communicate with the See of Constantinople, "because they have cast out the four holy councils by the propositions made at Alexandria, by the Ecstasy and by the Type... and because the dogs which they asserted in the propositions they damned in the Ecstasy, and what they proclaimed in the Ecstasy they annulled in the Type, and on each occasion they deposed themselves. What mysteries, I ask, do they celebrate, who have condemned themselves, and have been condemned by the Romans and by the (Lateran) synod, and stripped of their sacerdotal dignity?" He disbelieved the statement made to him that the envoys of the pope had accepted the two wills on account of the union, and one will on account of the union", and pointed out that the union not being a substance could have no will. He wrote on this account to his disciple the Abbot Anastasius, who was able to send a letter to warn "the men of elder Rome firm as a rock" of the deceitful confession which the Patriarch Peter was despatching to the pope. On the day of the first trial, a council of clergy was held, and the emperor was persuaded to send Maximus to Byzia in Thrace, and his disciples, Abbot Anastasius and Anastasius the papal aposciasarius, to Perberis and Mesembria.

They suffered greatly from cold and hunger. On 24 September, 656, Theodosius, Bishop of Cesarea in Bithynia, visited Maximus by the emperor's command, accompanied by the consuls, Theodosius and Paul. The saint confounded his visitors with the authority of the Fathers, and declared that he would never accept the Type. The bishop then replied: "We declare to you in response to that if you will communicate, our master the emperor will annul the Type, he will have a synod down, had not been disowned, and that the canons of the Lateran Council must be formally accepted before he would communicate. The Byzantine bishop unblushingly urged: "The synod is invalid, since it was held without the Emperor's orders." Maximus retorts: "If it is not pious, but the order of the emperor that validates synods, let them accept the synods that were held against the Type, at Antioch, at Seleucia, and the Robber council of Ephesus." The bishop is ready to consent to two wills and two operations: but St. Maximus says he is himself but a monk and cannot receive his declaration; the bishop, and also the emperor, and the patriarch and his synod, must send a supplication to the pope. Then all arose with prayers and tears, and knelt down and prayed, and kissed the Gospels and the crucifix and the image of the Mother of God, and all embraced. But the consuls doubted: "Do you think," he said "that the emperor will make a supplication to Rome?" "Yes", said the abbot, "if he will humble himself as God has humbled Himself." The bishop gave him money and a tunic; but the tunic was seized by the Bishop of Byzia. On 8 September, the abbot was honourably sent to Rhegium, and next day two patricians arrived in state with Bishop Theodosius, and said the saint great honour if he would accept the Type and communicate with the emperor. Maximus solemnly urged to the bishop and remained at Rhegium of the day of judgement. "Whither will I go if the emperor took another view?" whispered the miserable man. The abbot was struck and spat upon. The patrician Epiphanius declared that all now accepted two wills and two operations, and that the Type was only a compromise. Maximus reiterated the Roman synods, that the pope at that time did not deny it. Next morning, 19 September, the saint was stripped of his money and even of his poor stock of clothes, and was conveyed to Saelambria, and thence to Perberis (Perbera).

Six years later, in 662, Maximus and the two Anastasi were brought to trial at Constantinople. They were condemned as heretics and with St. Sophronius. The prefect was ordered to beat them, to cut out their tongues and lap off their right hands, to exhibit them thus mutilated in every quarter of the city, and to send them to perpetual exile and imprisonment. A long letter of the Roman Anastasius tells us of their sufferings on the journey to Colchis where they were imprisoned in different forts. He tells us that St. Maximus foresaw in a vision the day of his death, and that miraculous lights appeared nightly at his tomb. The monk Anastasius had died in the preceding month; the Roman lived on until 666.

Thus St. Maximus died for orthodoxy and obedience to Rome. He has always been considered one of the chief theological writers of the Greek Church, and has obtained the honourable title of the theologian. He may be said to complete and close the series of patristic writings on the Incarnation, as they are summed up by St. John of Damascus. His style is unfortunately very obscure; but he is accurate in his thought and deeply learned in the Fathers. His exegetical works explain Holy Scripture allegorically. We have commentaries on Psalm lix, on the Lord's Prayer, and a number of explanations of different texts. These are principally intended for the use of monks, and deal much with mystical theology. More professedly mystical are his "Scholia" on Pseudo-Dionysius, his explanations of difficulties in Dionysius and St. Gregory Nazianzen and his "Ambigua" on St. Gregory. This last work was translated into Latin by Scutus Erigena at the request of Charles the Bald. The polemical writings include short treatises against the Monophytes, and a more important series against the Monothelites, beside which must be placed the letters and the epistles. Ecumenical councils have since that time shown these writings have always received great honour in Eastern monasteries. The best known is a beautiful dialogue between an abbot and a young monk on the spiritual life; there are also various collections of sentiment,
Ethical and devotional, for use in the cloister. The "Mystagogia" is an explanation of ecclesiastical symbolism, of importance for liturgical history. Three hymns, "S. Maximus," "S. Joseph," and "S. Gallus," published in Petavius' "Uranologiwm", Paris, 1630, and in P., G., XIX. Some writings exist only in MS. St. Maximus' literary labours had thus a vast range. He was essentially a monk, a contemplative, a mystic, thoroughly at home in the Platonicism of Dionysius. But he was also a keen dialectician, a scholastic theologian, a doctor of the church. His influence has been great. His main teaching may be summed up under two heads, the union of God with humanity by the Incarnation, and the union of man with God by the practice of perfection and contemplation. St. Maximus is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on 13 August, and in the Greek Menma on 27 June and 12 April. His Greek office is given by Combes (P., G., XC, 206).

A complete edition of his works was begun by the Dominican Combes. Two volumes appeared (Paris, 1675), but the third is wanting. In the reprint by Migne (P., G., XCI) there is added the "De Locis dictis" and the "Ecclesii et Gregorii", from Oehler's edition (Halle, 1687), the "Practica" and the "Thesaurus Hymnologicum". III. Anastasius Bibliothecarius has preserved some letters and other documents in Latin in his "Collectanea" (P., L., CXXIX, and Mansi, X). The "Schola" on Dionysius the Areopagite are printed with the works of the latter (P., G., IV). The ancient "Vita et certamen" (P., G., Xc, SS., 13 August, and 9 August). For literature see Honorius I and Monothelitism; Acta SS., 13 August; Wagnerman and Serres in Realencyclopaedia, with a good account of M.'s theology; Dornen, "Person of Christ" (Edinburg, 1881); Bach, "Dogmenwesen des Mittelalters", I (Vienna, 1873); Ehrhard in Kehmacher, Gesch. der byz. Lit. (Munich, 1873); Schramm, "Mundus Cosmi"; Comtesse de la Concurrence; De la documentation et de la formation de l'ecriture (Paris, 1869); Pleydenwurff, "Maximi Conf. De Deo hominumse descriptio et doctrina adnotationes et observationes". Among his discourses on the Apocalypse, the "Deseo ad Deum" is the most interesting. In the "Deseo" the author, writing in Revue internat. de théol. (1902), 257. On the authenticity of the "Rahel Apocalyptica" see H. Holl, "Die Sacra parallela des Joh. v. Damascus in Text u. Untersuch. zur Gesch. der alchristl. Lit. (Leipzig, 1897); Iadem, Fragmenta vornichtzicher Väter, ibid. (1899); Ehrhard in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1901), 394.

John Chapman.

Maximus of Turin, Saint, Bishop and theological writer, b. probably in Rhetia, about 380; d. shortly after 465. Only two dates are historically established in his life. In 451 he was at the synod of Milan where the bishops of Northern Italy accepted the celebrated letter (epistola dogmatica) of Leo I, setting forth the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation against the Nestorians (see Nestorius). In 453 (see Ambrose, "Ep. Ambr." VI, 143). Among nineteen subscribers Maximus is the eighth, and since the order was determined by age, Maximus must have then been about seventy years old. The second established date is 465, when he was at the Synod of Rome. (Mansi, VII, 959, 965 sq.) Here the subscription of Maximus follows immediately on that of Theodoret, a daughter of the Emperor of the Goths, a clever energetic woman, educated him in sentiments of devotion to the Catholic faith and of loyalty to the House of Stuart, for which his family was famous. When he was about twenty-three, Lord Nithsdale visited the French Court to do homage to King James, and there met and wooed Lady Winifred Herbert, youngest daughter of Willie, Lord of the Manor of Penrose. The marriage contract is dated 2 March, 1699. The young couple resided chiefly at Terregles, in Dumfriesshire, and here probably their five children were born. Until 1715 no special event marked their lives, but in that year Lord Nithsdale's principles led him to join the rising in favour of Prince James Stuart, and he shared in the disasters which attended the royal cause, being taken prisoner at Preston and sent to the Tower. In deep anxiety Lady Nithsdale hastened to London and there made every effort on behalf of her husband, including a personal appeal to George I, but no sort of hope was held out to her. She, therefore, with true heroism, planned and carried out his escape on the eve of his execution. Her plan was to have him suffraged where the saint was wont to pray. The clerical sudden-became so thirsty that he implored Maximus for help. A roe happened to pass which the saint caused to stop, so that the cleric could partake of its milk. This legend accounts for the fact that St. Maximus is represented in art as pointing at a roe.

Michael Ott.

Maxwell, William, fifth Earl of Nithsdale (Lord Nithsdale signed as Nithsalde) and fourteenth Lord Maxwell, b. in 1676; d. at Rome, 2 March, 1744. He succeeded his father at the early age of seven. His tutor was the poet Lord Douglas, a clever energetic woman, educated him in sentiments of devotion to the Catholic faith and of loyalty to the House of Stuart, for which his family was famous. When he was about twenty-three, Lord Nithsdale visited the French Court to do homage to King James, and there met and wooed Lady Winifred Herbert, youngest daughter of Willie, Lord of the Manor of Penrose. The marriage contract is dated 2 March, 1699. The young couple resided chiefly at Terregles, in Dumfriesshire, and here probably their five children were born. Until 1715 no special event marked their lives, but in that year Lord Nithsdale's principles led him to join the rising in favour of Prince James Stuart, and he shared in the disasters which attended the royal cause, being taken prisoner at Preston and sent to the Tower. In deep anxiety Lady Nithsdale hastened to London and there made every effort on behalf of her husband, including a personal appeal to George I, but no sort of hope was held out to her. She, therefore, with true heroism, planned and carried out his escape on the eve of his execution. Her plan was to have him suffraged where the saint was wont to pray. The clerical sudden-became so thirsty that he implored Maximus for help. A roe happened to pass which the saint caused to stop, so that the cleric could partake of its milk. This legend accounts for the fact that St. Maximus is represented in art as pointing at a roe.
The Maya Indians, the most important of the cultivated native peoples of North America, both in the degree of their civilization and in population and resources, formerly occupying a territory of about 60,000 square miles in the central part of Yucatan, Southern Mexico, together with the adjacent portion of Northern Guatemala, and still constituting the principal population of the same region outside of the larger cities. Their language, which is actually supplanting Spanish to a great extent, is still spoken by about 300,000 persons, of whom two-thirds are pure Maya, the remainder being whites and of mixed blood. The Mayan linguistic stock includes some twenty tribes, speaking closely related dialects, and (excepting the Huastec of northern Vera Cruz and south-eastern San Luis Potosi, Mexico) occupying contiguous territory in Tabasco, Chiapas, and the Yucatan peninsula, a large part of Guatemala, and smaller portions of Honduras and Salvador. The ancient builders of the ruined cities of Palenque and Copan were of the same stock. The most important tribes or nations, after the Maya proper, were the Quiché and Cakchiquel of Guatemala. All the tribes of this stock were of high culture, the Mayan civilization being the most advanced, and probably the most ancient, in ancient North America. They still number altogether about two million souls.

I. History.—The Maya proper seem to have entered Yucatan from the west. As usual with ancient nations, it is difficult in the beginning to separate myth from history, their earliest mentioned leader and deified hero, Itzamna, being considered by Brinton to be simply the sun-god common to the whole Maya stock. He is represented as having led the first migration from the Far East, beyond the ocean, along a pathway miraculously opened through the waters. The second migration, which seems to have been historic, was led from the west by Kukulcan, a miraculous priest and teacher, who became the founder of the Maya kingdom and civilization. Fairly good authorities, based upon study of the Maya calendar, place this beginning near the close of the second century of the Christian Era. Under Kukulcan the people were divided into four tribes, ruled by many kingly families: the Cocom, Tutul-xiu, Itzam, and Chébel. To the first family belonged Kukulcan himself, who established his residence at Mayapan, which he called after a nearby mountain; to the second, the Tutul-xiu held vassal rule at Uxmal, the Itzam at Chichen-Itzam, and the Chébel at Isamal. To the Chébel was appointed the hereditary high priesthood, and their city became the sacred city of the Maya. Each provincial king was obliged to spend a part of each year with the monarch at Mayapan. This condition continued to about the eleventh century, when, as the result of a successful revolt of the provincial kings, Mayapan was destroyed, and the supreme rule passed to the Tutul-xiu at Uxmal. Later on Mayapan was rebuilt and was again the capital of the nation until about the middle of the fifteenth century, when, in consequence of a general religious reaction against the reigning dynasty, it was finally destroyed, and the monarchy was split up into a number of independent petty states, of which eighteen existed on the peninsula at the arrival of the Spaniards. In consequence of this civil war a part of the Itzam emigrated south to Lake Petén, in Guatemala, where they established a kingdom despotic and strong, with their capital and sacred city on Flores Island, in the lake.

On his second voyage Columbus heard of Yucatan as a distant country of clothed men. On his fifth voyage (1503-04) he encountered, south-west of Cuba, a canoe-load of Indians with cotton clothing for barter, who said that they came from the country of Maya. In 1506 Pinzon sighted the coast, and in 1511 twenty men under Valdivia were wrecked on the shores of the sacred island of Cozumel, several being captured and sacrificed to the idols. In 1517 an expedition under Francisco de Cordova landed on the north coast, discovering well-built cities, but, after several bloody engagements with the natives, was compelled to retire. In 1518 Father Alonso de Molina, in charge of the settlement of the island, found opportunity at one landing to explore a temple, and bring off some of the sacred images and gold ornaments. In 1518 a strong expedition under Juan de Grijalva, from Cuba, landed near Cozumel and took formal possession for Spain. For Father Juan Diaz, who on this occasion celebrated Mass upon the summit of one of the temples, the honour is also claimed of having afterwards been the first to celebrate Mass in the City of Mexico. Near Cozumel, also, was rescued the young monk Aguilar, one of the two survivors of Valdivia's party, who, though nacked to the breech-cloth, still carried his Breviary in a pouch. Proceeding northwards, Grijalva made the entire circuit of the peninsula before returning, having had another desperate engagement with the Maya near Campeche. After the conquest of Mexico, in 1521, Francisco de Montejo, under commission as Governor of Yucatan, landed (1527) to effect the conquest of the country, but met with such desperate resistance that after eight years of incessant fighting every Spaniard had lost at least two lives. In the two months of the same desperate warfare, his son Francisco established the first Spanish settlement at Campeche. In the next year, in a bloody battle at Tihoo, he completely broke the power of Maya resistance, and a few months later (Jan., 1542) founded on the site of the ruined city the new capital, Mérida.
1546, however, there was a general revolt, and it was not until a year later that the conquest was assured. In the original commission to Montejo it had been expressly stipulated that missionaries should accompany all his expeditions. This, however, he had neglected to attend to, and in 1531 (or 1534), by special order, Father Jacobo de Testera and four others were sent to join the Spanish camp near Campeche. They met a kindly welcome from the Indians, who came with their children to be instructed, and thus the conquest of the country might have been effectuated by spiritual agencies but for the outrages committed by a band of Spanish outlaws, in consequence of which the priests were forced to withdraw. In 1537 five more missionaries arrived and met the same willing reception, remaining about two years in spite of the war still in progress. About 1545 a large number of missionaries were sent over from Spain. Several of these—apparently nine, all Franciscans—under the direction of Father Luis de Villalpando, were assigned to Yucatan. Landing at Campeche, the governor explained their purpose to the chiefs of St. Francis was dedicated on its present site, and translations were begun into the native language. The first baptized convert was the chief of Campeche, who learned Spanish and thereafter acted as interpreter for the priests. Here, as elsewhere, the missionaries were the champions of the rights of the Indians. In consequence of their repeated protests a royal edict was issued in 1540 prohibiting Indian slavery in the province, while promising compensation to the slaveowners. As in other cases, local opposition defeated the purpose of this law; but the agitation went on, and in 1551 another royal edict liberated 150,000 male Indian slaves, with their families, throughout Mexico. In 1557 and 1558 the Crown intervened to restrain the tyranny of the natives. Within a very short time Father Villalpando had at his mission station at Mérida over a thousand converts, including several chiefs. He himself, with Father Malchior de Benavente, then set out, barefoot, for the city of Maní, in the mountains farther south, where their success was so great that two thousand converts were soon engendering the conversion of the entire province. The progress of the missionaries was rapid. The conditions brought about another revolt in 1781, led by the chief Jacinto Canek, and ending, as usual, in the defeat of the Indians, the destruction of their chief stronghold, and the death of their leader under horrible torture.

In 1847, taking advantage of the Government’s difficulties with the United States, and urged on by their “unpeaasable hatred toward their rulers from the earliest time of the Spanish conquest”, the Maya again broke out in general rebellion, with the declared purpose of driving all the whites, half-breeds and negroes from the peninsula, in which they were so far successful that all the fugitives who escaped the wholesale massacres fled to the coastal towns where they were taken off by ships from Cuba. Arms and ammunition for the rising were freely supplied to the Indians by the British traders of Belize. In 1851 the rebel Maya
established their headquarters at Chan-Santa-Cruz in the eastern part of the peninsula. In 1853 it seemed as if a temporary understanding had been reached, but next year hostilities began again. Two expeditions against the Maya were mounted, but a few hundred stand of small arms was left behind by the Indians. In 1856, when the Mexican Colonel Acérate, with 3,000 men, occupied Chan-Santa-Cruz, but was finally compelled to retire after the loss of 1,500 men, and to abandon his wounded—who were all butchered—as well as his artillery and supplies, the town was burned and razed.

In 1858 the Indian burned and razed in every direction, nineteen flourishing towns being entirely wiped out, and the town in three districts being reduced from 97,000 to 35,000. The war of extermination continued, with savage atrocities, through 1864, when it gradually wore itself out, leaving the Indian still unsubdued and well supplied with arms and munitions of war from Belize. In 1868 it broke out again in resistance to the Juarez government. In 1871 a Mexican force again occupied Chan-Santa-Cruz, but retired without producing any permanent result.

In 1901, after long preparation, a strong Mexican force invaded the territory of the independent Maya both by land and sea. After a determined resistance, drove the defenders into the swamps. The end is not yet, however, for, even in this year of 1910, Mexican troops are in the field to put down a serious rising in the northern part of the peninsula.

II. INSTITUTIONS, ART, AND LITERATURE. — Under the ancient system the Maya Government was an hereditary absolute monarchy, with a close union of the spiritual and temporal elements, the hereditary high priest, who was also king of the sacred city of Iximul, being consulted by the monarch on all important matters, besides having the care of ritual and ceremonial. On public occasions the king appeared dressed in the robes of office, with his head and precious stones, bearing on his head a golden circlelet decorated with the beautiful guatex plumes reserved for royalty, and borne upon a capanelonquin. The provincial governors were nobles of the four royal families, and were supreme within their own governments. The rulers of towns and villages formed a local nobility which did not exercise any power, but usually acted on the advice of a council of lords and priests. The lords alone were military commanders, and each lord and inferior official had for his support the produce of a certain portion of land which was cultivated in common by the people. They received no salary, and each was responsible for the maintenance of the poor and helpless who received an allowance from their priestly house. The priests were not hereditary, but were appointed through the high priest. There was also a female priesthood, or velostal order, whose head was a princess of royal blood. The plebeians were farmers, artisans, or merchants; they paid taxes and military service, and each had his interest in the common land as well as in his private portion, which he devoted to agriculture and could not alienate. Slaves also existed, the slaves being chiefly prisoners of war and their children, the latter of whom could become freemen by putting a new piece of unoccupied ground under cultivation. Society was organized upon the clan system, with descent in the male line, the chiefs being rather custodians for the tribe than owners, and having no power to alienate the tribal lands. Game, fish, and the salt marshes were free to all, with certain portion to the lords. Taxes were paid in kind through authorized collectors. On the death of the owner, the property was divided equally among his nearest male heirs.

The more important cases were tried by a royal council presided over by the king, and lesser cases by the provincial rulers or local judges, whose importance, usually with the assistance of a council and

with an advocate for the defence. Crimes were punished with death—frequently by throwing over a precipice—enslavement, fines, or, rarely, by imprisonment. The code was merciful, and even murder could sometimes be punished by a fine. Children were subject to parents until an age to marry, which for boys was about twenty. The children of the common people were trained only in the occupation of their parents, but those of the nobility were highly educated, under the care of the priests, in writing, music, history, war, and religion. The daughters of nobles were strictly secluded, and the older boys in each village lived and slept apart in a public building. Birthdays and other anniversaries were the occasions of family feasts.

Marriage between persons of the same gens was forbidden, and those who violated this law were regarded as outcasts. Marriage within certain other degrees of relationship—such as among a brother and sister, or with a mother's sister—was also prohibited. Polygamy was unknown, but concubinage was permitted, and divorce was easy. Marriages were performed by the priests, with much ceremonial rejoicing, and preceded by a solemn confession and a baptismal rite, known as the "rebirth", without which there could be no marriage. Spanish-Christians required the consent of the chief of the district. Religious ritual was elaborate and imposing, with frequent festival occasions in honour of the gods of the winds, the rain, the cardinal points, the harvest, of birth, death, and war, with special honours to the deified national heroes Itzamna and Kukulcan. The whole country was dotted with stone-built pyramids, while certain places—as the sacred city of Iximul, the island of Cozumel—were places of pilgrimage. There was a special "feast of all the gods". The prevailing mildness of the Maya custom was in strong contrast to the bloody ritual of the Aztec. Human sacrifice was forbidden by Kukulcan, and the priests were not permitted to participate in frequent or prominent feature, excepting at Chichen-Itza, where it at least became customary, on occasion of some great national crisis, to sacrifice hundreds of voluntary victims of their own race, frequently virgins, by drowning them in one of the subterranean rock wells or cenotes, after which the bodies were drawn out and buried.

The Maya farmer cultivated corn, beans, caoca, chile, maguey, bananas, and cotton, besides giving attention to bees, from which he obtained both honey and wax. Various fermented drinks were prepared from corn, maguey, and honey. They were much given to drunkenness, which was so common as to be considered normal. Chocolate was the favourite drink of the upper classes. Caoca beans, as well as pieces of copper, were a common medium of exchange. Very little meat was eaten, except at ceremonial feasts, although the Maya were expert hunters and fishers. A small "barkless" dog was also eaten. The ordinary garment of men was a cotton breechcloth wrapped around the body, and attached to the head with a less shirt, either white or dyed in colors. The women wore a skirt belted at the waist, and plaited their hair in long tresses. Sandals were worn by both sexes. Tattooing and head-flattening were occasionally practiced, and the face and body were always painted. The Maya, then as now, were noted for personal neatness and the frequent use of both cold and hot baths. They were expert and determined warriors, using the bow and arrow, the dart with throwing-stick, the wooden sword edged with flints, the lance, aling, copper axe, shield of reeds, and protective armour of heavy quilted cotton. They understood military tactics and signaling with drum and whistle, and knew how to build barricades and dig trenches. Sometimes when we were so sacrificing to the gods, while those of ordinary rank became slaves. Their object in war
was rather to make prisoners than to kill. As the peninsula had no mines, the Maya were without iron or any metal excepting a few copper utensils and gold ornaments imported from other countries. Their tools were almost entirely of flint or other stone, even for the most intricate monumental carving. For household purposes they used clay pottery, dishes of shell, and gourds. Their pottery was of notable excellence, as well as their weaving, dyeing, and feather work. Along the coast they had wooden dugout canoes capable of holding fifty persons.

They had a voluminous literature, covering the whole range of native interests, either written, in their own peculiar “calcultur” hieroglyphic characters, in books of maguey paper or parchment which were bound in wood, or carved upon the walls of their public buildings. Twenty-seven parchment books were publicly destroyed by Bishop Landa at Maní in 1562, others elsewhere in the peninsula, others again at the storming of the Itzí capital in 1697, and almost all that have come down to us are four codices, as they are called, viz., the “Codex Troano”, published at Paris in 1689; another codex, apparently connected with the first, published at Paris in 1822; the “Codex Persiánus”, published at Paris in 1829–71; and the “Dresden Codex”, originally mistakenly published as an Aztec book, but by an Irish priest, “An Account of the Antiquities of Mexico” (London, 1830–48). Besides these pre-Spanish writings, of which there is yet no adequate interpretation, we have a number of later works written in the native language by Christianized Maya shortly after the conquest. Several of these have been brought together by Brinton in his “Maya Chronicles” (London, 1852), the series of which exceeded in elaboration that of the Aztec Zapotec, or any other of the cultured native races, has been the subject of much discussion. It was based on a series of “Katuns”, or cycles, consisting of 20 (or 24), 52, and 260 years, and by its means they carried their history down for possibly thirteen centuries, the complete register of each generation being noted on the insertion of a memorial stone in the wall of the great temples at Chichén-Itzá.

The art in which above all the Maya excelled, and through which they are best known, is architecture. The splendid ruins of temples, pyramids, and great cities—some of which were intact and occupied at the time of the Spanish conquest, and others covered with vine and embossed and adorned with cyclopean structures throughout the forests of Yucatan, have been the wonder and admiration of travellers for over half a century, since they were first brought prominently to notice by Stephens. Says Brinton: “The material was usually a hard limestone, which was polished and carved, and imbedded in a firm mortar. Such was also the character of the edifices of the Quichés and Cakchiqueles of Guatemala. In view of the fact that none of these masses knew the plumb-line or the square, the accuracy of the adjustments is remarkable. Their efforts at sculpture were equally bold. They did not hesitate to attempt statues in the round of life size and larger, and the façades of the edifices were covered with sculptured designs, and the faces of happy family life, and the features of dead kings, both high relief upon the stones. All this was accomplished without the use of metal tools, as they did not have even the bronze chisels familiar to the Aztec.”

The interior walls were also frequently covered with hieroglyphic inscriptions carved in the stone or wood, or painted upon the plaster. Among the most noted of these are the Palenque (in Chiapas), Uxmal, Chichen-Itzá, and Mayapan.

The Maya language has received much attention from missionaries and scientists from an early period. Of grammars the earliest is the “Arte y Vocabulario de la lengua de Yucatan” of Luis de Villalpando, published about 1555. Others of note are “Arte de la Lengua Maya” by Father Gabriel San Buenaventura (Mexico, 1684), and republished by the Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg in volume two of the “Mission Scientifique au Mexique” (Paris, 1870); “Arte de el Idioma Maya” by Father Pedro de Santa Rosa María Beltran, a native of Yucatan and instructor in the Maya language in the Franciscan convent of Mérida (Mexico, 1836 and 1841), and Mérida, in the “A Arte de el Idioma Maya” by Father Joaquín Ruiz, of the Franciscan convent of Mérida, also a native of Yucatan and “the most fluent of the writers in the Maya language that Yucatan has produced” (Mérida, 1844), and republished in an English translation by the Baptist missionary, Rev. John England (Belize, 1847). Each of these writers was also the author of other works in the language.

Of published dictionaries may be mentioned: first and earliest, a “Diccionario”, credited to Father Villalpando (Mexico, 1571); then “Diccionario de la Lengua Maya”, by Juan Pérez (Mérida, 1806–77); and “Dictionnaire, Grammaire et Chrestomathie de la langue Maya”, by the Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg (Paris, 1872). The most valuable dictionaries of the language are still in manuscript. Chief is the one known as the “Diccionario del Convento de Motul”, from the name of the Franciscan convent in Yucatan in which it was found; it is now in the Carter Brown library at Providence. It is beautifully written and is supposed to be a copy of an original written by a Franciscan missionary, “An Interview with a Maya priest, about the language, about 1590. "In extent the dictionary is not surpassed by that of any aboriginal language of America" (Bartlett). Other manuscript dictionaries are those of the Convent of Mérida (about 1640); of the Convent of Ticul (about 1890); and one by the Rev. Alexander Henderson, a Methodist missionary of the United States (1886–90), they are the property of the Bureau of American Ethnology. (See also Brinton, “Maya Chronicles”, and Maya titles in Pilling, “Bibliography, Proofsheets” [Washington, 1885].)

Physically, the Maya are dark, short, muscular, and broad-headed. Intellectually, they are alert, straightforward, reliable, of a cheerful disposition, and neat in their ordered habits. A war, however, with the utmost savagery, the provocation being as great on the other side. Their daily life differs little from that of the ordinary Mexican peasant, their ordinary dwellings being thatched huts, their dress the common white shirt and trousers, with sandals and straw hat, for men, and for women also of a brown bag. They still cultivate the ordinary products of the region, including sugar and henequen hemp, while the independent bands give considerable attention to hunting. While they are all now Catholics, with resident priests in all the towns, that fact in no way softens their animosity towards the conquering race. They still keep many of their ancient rites, particularly those relating to the planting and harvesting of the crops. Many of these survivals are described by Brinton in a chapter of his “Essays of an Americanist”. The best recent account (1894) of the independent Maya is that of the German traveller Sapper, who praises in the highest terms their honesty, punctuality, hospitality, and their industry. Their country is an interesting but work of the Bowditch collection. At that time the Mexican government officially recognized three independent Maya states, or tribes, in Southern and Eastern Yucatan, the most important being the hosts of the Chuncha-Cuca district, estimated at not more than 10,000 souls as against about 40,000 at the outbreak of the American War of 1847. These two groups are now numbered perhaps as many, having decreased in about the same ratio.
Mayew, Edward, b. in 1569; d. 14 Sept., 1625. He belonged to the old family of Mayew or Mayow of Winton, near Salisbury, Wiltshire, which had endured much persecution for the Faith. On 10 July, 1583, he entered, with his elder brother Henry, the English College at Reims, where he displayed copious talents, and rose to the top rank of his countrymen. After several years of exile, and being twice near death, he returned to England, and was admitted to the Gatehouse prison, Westminster, on 21 November, 1607. The old English congregation would thus have ended with Dom Buckley, had not Mayew and another secular priest, Father Robert Sadler, sought profession, thus preserving its continuity to the present day. Under these two new members the English congregation began to revive, and finally, in 1612, it was given an equal share in St. Lawrence's monastery at Dieulwart, Lorraine, henceforth the centre of the English congregation. Retiring from the English mission in 1613, Mayew took up his residence at Dieulwart, where he filled the office of prior from 1613 to 1620. The union of these three congregations, which had for some time been canvassed, and in 1617 Mayew was appointed one of the nine definitors to bring this about. That of the English and Spanish congregations was accomplished by the Apostolic Brief, "Ex incumbenti", of August, 1619, but the members of the Italian congregation refused to become united. The real foundation of the Benedictine Rule, so characteristic of Dieulwart, was in great part due to Mayew's religious earnestness and strength of character. From 1623 until his death he acted as vicar to the nuns at Cambrai. His remains lie in the parish church at St. Vedast. The most important of Mayew's works are: "Sacra Institutionis Benedictae etc. (Douai, 1604); "Tractatus de Groundes of the Olde and Newe Religion etc." (s. l., 1608); "Congregationis Anglicae Ordinis S. Benedicti Trophan" (2 vols., Reims, 1619, 1625).

James Mooney.

Mayew, Christian, Moravian astronomer, b. at Mederzenhi in Moravia, 20 Aug., 1719; d. at Heidelberg, 16 April, 1793. He entered the Society of Friends at the age of 26 Sept., 1745, and after completing his studies taught the humanities for some time at Aschaffenburg. He likewise cultivated his taste for mathematics, and later was appointed professor of mathematics and physics in the University of Heidelberg. In 1755 he was invited by the Elector Palatine Charles Theodorus, and after a few years was appointed conservator, and afterwards astronomical observatory at Mannheim. He was also at Schwetzingen, where he had also built an observatory, he carried on his observations which led to numerous memoirs, some of which were published in the "Philosophical Transactions" of London. One of his observations, recorded in the "Tables d'aberration et refraction" (Mannheim, 1775) of his assistant Messa, gave rise to much discussion. He claimed to have discovered that many of the more conspicuous stars in the southern heavens were surrounded by smaller stars, which he regarded as satellites. His contemporaries, including Herschel and Schröter, who were provided with much more powerful telescopes, failed to verify his observations. He extended their reality and replied to one of his critics, the well-known astronomer Father Höll, in a work entitled "Grundliche Vertheidigung neuer Beobachtungen von Fixsterr-planes, welche zu Mannheim auf der kurfürstl. Sternwarte endekett worden sind." (Mannheim, 1776). In the same year he published a Latin work on comets and cometary observa tions, which were made in good faith, were evidently due to an optical illusion. Mayew spent some time at Paris in the interests of his science, and visited Germany in company with Cassini. Upon the invitation of Empress Catherine of Russia, he went to St. Petersburg to observe the transit of Venus in 1769. Upon his return to a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, including those of Mannheim, Munich, London, Bologna, Göttingen, and Philadelphia. He published a number of memoirs, among which may be mentioned "Basis Palatina" (Mannheim, 1763); "Expositio de transitu Veneris" (St. Petersburg, 1769); "Pantometrum Fasciculatum, seu instrumentum nornum pro eliciendo et quaestionum distante in urbe et vicinum" (Mannheim, 1762); "Nouvelle méthode pour lever en peu de temps et à peu de frais une carte générale et exacte de toute la Russie" (St. Petersburg, 1770); "Observations de la Comète de 1781" in the "Acta Acad. Petropolit." (1782), etc. Sommervoegel, Bibl. de la Comp. de Jésus, V, 794; Delambre in Biogr. Univers., s. v. Henry M. Brock.

May Laws. See Kulturkampf.

Maynas. See Chachapoyas, Diocese of.
Mayne, Cuthbert, Blessed, martyr, b. at Youlston, near Barnstaple, Devonshire (baptized 20 March, 1543–4); d. at Launceston, Cornwall, 29 Nov., 1577. Mayne was a member of the controversial, schismatical priest, who had him educated at Barnstaple Grammar School, and he was ordained a Protestant minister at the age of eighteen or nineteen. He then went to Oxford, first to St. Albans's Hall, then to St. John's College, where he took the degree of M. A. in 1570. There he made the acquaintance of Blessed Edmund Campion, Gregory Martin, the controversialist, Humphrey Ely, Henry Shaw, Thomas Bramston, O.S.B., Henry Holland, Jonas Meredith, Roland Russell, and William Wiggs. The above list shows how strong a Catholic leaven was still working at Oxford. Late in 1570 a letter from Gregory Martin to Blessed Cuthbert fell into the Bishop of London's hands. He at once sent a pursuivant to arrest Blessed Cuthbert and others mentioned in the letter. Blessed Cuthbert was in the country, and being warned by Blessed Thomas Ford, he evaded arrest by going to Cornwall, whence he arrived at Douai in 1573. Having become reconciled to the Church, he was ordained in 1575; in Feb., 1575–6 he took the degree of S.T.B. at Douai, and was ordained in the English mission in the company of Blessed John Payne. Blessed Cuthbert took up his abode with the future confessor, Francis Tregian, of Golden, in St. Probust's parish, Cornwall. This gentleman suffered imprisonment and loss of possessions for this honour done him by our martyr. At his house our martyr was constantly entertained. Moreover, he was an intimate friend of Douai, who was knighted for the capture. He was brought to trial in September; meanwhile his imprisonment was of the harshest order. His indictment under statutes of 1 and 13 Elizabeth was under five counts: first, that he had obtained from the Roman See a "faculty", containing absolution of the queen's subjects; second, that he had helped in the escape of John Trenchard and Golden; third, that he had taught the ecclesiastical authority of the pope in Launceston Gaol; fourth, that he had brought into the kingdom an Agnus Dei and had delivered the same to Mr. Tregian; fifth, that he had said Mass.

As to the first and second counts, the martyr showed the "faculty" and "faculty" were merely a copy printed at Douai of an announcement of the Jubilee of 1575, and that its application having expired with the end of the jubilee, he certainly had not published it either at Golden or elsewhere. As to the third count, he maintained that he had said nothing definite on the subject to the three illiterate witnesses who accused him. As to the fourth, he urged that the fact that he was wearing an Agnus Dei at the time of his arrest was no evidence that he had brought it into the kingdom or delivered it to Mr. Tregian. As to the fifth count, he contended that the finding of a Missal, a chalice, and vestments in his room did not prove that he had said Mass.

Mayne, the president, found him guilty of high treason on all counts, and he was sentenced accordingly. His execution was delayed because one of the judges, Jeffries, altered his mind after sentence and sent a report to the Privy Council. They submitted the case to the whole Bench of Judges, which was divided in opinion, though the weight of authority inclined to Jeffries's view. Nevertheless, for motives of policy, the Council ordered the execution to proceed. On the night of 27 November his cell was seen by the other prisoners to be full of a strange bright light. The details of his martyrdom must be sought in the works hereinafter cited. It is enough to say that all agree that he was insensible, or almost so, when brought to the place of execution and that the martyr still exists; and portions of his skull are in various places, the largest being in the Carmelite Convent, Lanherne, Cornwall.
MAYNOOTH

posals had been considered, Maynooth was chosen, because it was considered favourable to the morals and studies of a college; also, because the Duke of Leinster, who had always been a friend of the Catholics, wished to have the new institution on his estate. The money granted by Parliament was voted for a Catholic college for the education of the Irish clergy; that was the express intention of the Government, but, as the Act was drawn in general terms, the trustees proceeded to erect a college for laymen in connexion with the ecclesiastical establishment. This college was suppressed by the Government in 1801. Another lay college was then erected in the immediate vicinity of the ecclesiastical college, and was continued up to 1817 under lay trustees. The establishment of various colleges in other parts of the country for the education of laymen made it unnecessary. Not long after the foundation of Maynooth, the whole country being convulsed by the rebellion of 1798, the general disturbance found an echo in the new institution. Of its sixty-nine students no fewer than eighteen or twenty were expelled for having taken the rebel oath.

A valuable endowment was obtained for the new college on the death of John Butler, twelfth Baron Dunboyne, who had been Bishop of Cork from 1763 to 1788. On the death of his nephew, Pierce Butler, the eleventh baron, the bishop succeeded to the title and estates. This temporal dignity, however, proved his undoing; he gave up his bishopric, abjured the Catholic Faith, and took a wife. In his last illness he repented and endeavoured to make reparation for his conduct by willing his property in Meath, valued at about £1,000 (about $5,000) a year, to the newly founded college. The will was disputed at law by the next of kin. The case of the college was pleaded by John Philpot Curran, and a compromise was effected by which about one half of the property was secured to the college. The income from the bequest became the foundation of a fund for the maintenance of a higher course of ecclesiastical studies in the case of such students as should have distinguished themselves in the ordinary course. This is still known as the "Dunboyne Establishment". After the union with Eng-

land the financial subsidy to Maynooth from the State underwent various changes and gave rise to debates of considerable acrimony in the House of Commons. In 1845, however, the government of Sir Robert Peel raised the grant from £8,500 (about $47,500) to £20,000 ($100,000) a year and placed it on the consolidated fund, where it formed part of the ordinary national debt and was free from annual discussion on the estimates. Sir Robert Peel also granted a sum of £30,000 (about $150,000) for suitable buildings; and it was then that the Gothic structure designed by Pugin, one of the handsomest college buildings in Europe, was erected. The disestablishment of the Irish Church by Mr. Gladstone in 1869, had serious financial results for Maynooth which was also disen-

St. Mary's, Maynooth College, Ireland

dowed; but a sum of about £370,000 (about $1,850,000) was given once for all to enable the college to continue its work. This sum was invested for the most part in land, and has been very ably managed by the trustees. Some of the most prominent Catholic laymen in the country, such as the Earls of Fingall and Kenmare, had acted as Trustees up to the date of the disendowment: from that time no further lay trustees were appointed.

Among the most distinguished of the past presidents of Maynooth were Hussey, Renehan, and Russell, a full account of whom is to be found in the College History by the Most Rev. Dr. Healy, Archbishop of Tuam. Dr. Hussey was the first president, and to his tact, judgment and skill the success of the original project was mainly due. Dr. Renehan was a distinguished Irish scholar, who did a great deal to rescue Irish manuscripts from destruction. Dr. Russell is chiefly known for his "Life of Cardinal Mezzofanti" and for the part he took in the conversion of Cardinal Newman. Amongst the most distinguished teachers and men of letters who shed lustre on the college during its first century were John MacHale, Paul O'Brien, Daniel Murray, Edmund O'Reilly, Nicholas Callan, Patrick Murray, Mathew Kelly, John O'Hanlon, William Jennings, James O'Kane, and Gerald Molloy. It is interesting to notice that, on the staff of the college in its early years, were four French refugees—the Rev
Peter J. Delort, the Rev. Andrew Darré, the Rev. Louis Delahogue and the Rev. Francis Anglade—all Doctors of the Sorbonne. On the original staff may also be found the name of the Rev. John C. Eustace, author of the well-known “Classical Tour in Italy”. Amongst the distinguished personages who have visited the college were Thackeray, Montalembert, Carlyle, Robert Southey, and Napoleon. The Empress of Austria, and King Edward VII. The college possesses several memorials of the Empress of Austria, who lived in the neighbourhood during her visits to Ireland. The Centenary of the foundation of the college was celebrated in 1895, on which occasion congratulations were sent from all the Catholic educational centres throughout the world. The college library contains upwards of 40,000 volumes. It possesses many rare and precious works and some very valuable manuscripts. The Aula Maxima which was opened about the year 1893 was the gift to his Alma Mater of the Right Rev. Mgr. MacMahon of the Catholic University at Washington, D. C., and previously of New York. The chapel which has just been completed is a work of rare beauty both in design and ornamentation. Maynooth has already sent out into the world upwards of 7,000 priests. Her alumni are in all lands and in almost every position that an ecclesiastical could occupy. The average number of students in recent years is about 600. The ordinary theological course is for five years. The college was burned in 1848 and re-established three years more. Students in arts and philosophy have to graduate in the National University of which Maynooth is now a “recognized College.”

Healy, Maynooth College: Its Centenary History (Dublin, 1895); Calendarium Collegii Sancti Patrici (Dublin); A Record of the Centenary Celebration ... Maynooth College (Dublin, 1895); Cornwilla Correspondence: Memoirs of Vincent Castlewarden (Dublin); Castlewarden’s Letters; Correspondence of Edmund Burke; Gladstone’s, The State in its Relation to the Church; Hogan, Maynooth College and the Lasty (Dublin).

J. F. Hogan.

Mayo, School of (Irish Magh Eo, which means, according to Colgan, the Plain of the Oaks, and, according to O’Donovan, the Plain of the Yews), was situated in the present parish of Mayo, County Mayo, almost equidistant from the towns of Claremorris and Castlebar. The founder, St. Colman, who flourished about the middle of the seventh century, was in all probability a native of the West of Ireland, and made his ecclesiastical studies at Iona during the abbacy of the renowned Seganisius. After the death of Finian, the second Bishop of Lismore, he was appointed to succeed him. His episcopate was much disturbed by a fierce renewal of the Easter Controversy. Colman vigorously advocated the old Irish custom, and cited the example of his predecessors, but all to no effect. At a synod specially summoned to meet at Whitby in 664, the Roman method of calculation triumphed, and Colman, unwilling to abandon the practice of the “Celtic Church of the Irish Church”, resolved to quit Lindsfarne forever.

In 688 he crossed the seas to his native land again, and in a remote island on the western coast called Inishbofin, he built a monastery and school. These things are clearly set out in the “Historia Ecclesiastica” of Bede, who then proceeds to describe how they led to the foundation of the school of Mayo. “Colman the Irish Bishop”, says Bede, “departed from Britain and took with him all the Irish that he had assembled in the Island of Lindsfarne, and also about thirty of the English nation who had been instructed in the monastic life... Afterwards he retired to a small island which is to the west of Ireland, and at some distance from the villages, where he built a monastery. Of the world, the Irish, Inishbofinde [island of the white cow]. Arriving there he built a monastery, and placed in it the monks he had brought with him of both nations.”

It appears, however, the Irish and English monks could not agree. “Then Colman sought to put an end to their dissensions, and travelling about at length found a place in Ireland fit to build a monastery, which in the language of the Irish is called Magh Eo (Mayo)”. Later on we are told by the same historian that this monastery became an important and flourishing institution, and even an episcopal see.

Though Colman, we may assume, lived mainly with his own countrymen at Inishbofin, we know that his principal interest in his later years was at Mayo—“Mayo of the Saxons”, as it came to be called. In the year 670, with his consent, its first canonical abbott was appointed. This was St. Gerald, the son of a northern English king, who, annoyed at the way Colman’s most cherished convictions had been slighted at Whitby, resolved to follow him to Ireland. The school remained notably in fame and learning under this youthful abbot. About 679 St. Adamnan, the illustrious biographer of St. Columba, visited Mayo and, according to some writers, ruled there for seven years after Gerald’s death. This latter statement is not, on the face of it, improbable if Gerald, as Colgan thinks, did not live after 697; but the Four Masters give the date of his death as 13 March, 726, and the “Annals of Ulster” put the event as late as 731. After Gerald’s death we have only the record of isolated facts concerning the school he ruled so wisely and loved so well, but we are often facts of considerable interest and importance. We read, for example, that the monastic buildings were “burnt and cast up” not only by the life of St. Gerald—that it was plundered by Turgesius the Dane in 818. That the monastic grounds were regarded as exceptionally holy we can gather from the entry that Domhnall, son of Torlough O’Connor, Lord of North Connacht, “the glory and the moderator and the good adviser of the Irish people” (d. 1176), was interred therein. That it housed the statue of an apostle, see long after the Synod of Kells (1152), is clear from the entry under date of 1200, recording the death of “Cele O’Duffy, Bishop of Magh Eo of the Saxons”.

Mayo, like the other ancient Irish monastic schools, suffered from the raids of native and foreigner, especially during the fourteenth century. But it survived them all, for the death under date 1478 is recorded of a bishop—“Bishop Higgins of Mayo of the Saxons”. The time at which the See of Mayo, on the ground that it contained not a cathedral but a parochial church, was annexed to Tuam, cannot with certainty be ascertained, but as far back as 1217, during the reign of Hugone de Mowbray, the see was refused to the episcopal authorities for discussion. It was probably not settled definitively for centuries after. James O’Healy, “Bishop of Mayo of the Saxons”, was put to death for the Catholic Faith at Kilmallock in 1579.


John Healy.

Mayo Indians.—An important tribe occupying some fifteen towns on Mayo and Fuerte rivers, southern Sonora and northern Sinaloa, Mexico. Their language is known as the Cahita, being the same as that spoken, with dialectic differences, by their neighbours, the Toluena and Yaqui, and belonging to the Piman branch of the great Shoshonean stock. The name Mayo is said by Ribas to be properly that of their principal river and to signify “boundary”. The known history of the tribe begins in 1532 with the naval expedition of Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, who landing at the mouth of the Fuerte went up the river and through the villages, where he built a small fortress and companions while asleep. In 1533 a land expedition under Diego de Guzman crossed through their country and penetrated to beyond the Yaqui river in the north. In 1609—10 they aided the Spaniards against the Yaqui, the two tribes being hereditary enemies,
and on the suppression of the revolt it was made a condition of the agreement that the Yaqui should live at peace with the Mayo. In 1613, at their own request, the first mission was established in their territory by the Jesuit Father Pedro Mendez, who had visited them some years before, over 3000 persons receiving baptism within fifteen days, in a population variously estimated at from nine to twenty thousand souls; and although these missions were built in as many towns of the tribe. This was the beginning of regular mission work in Sonora.

In 1740 the Mayo, hitherto friendly as a tribe, joined the Yaqui in revolt, apparently at the instance of Spanish officials jealous of missionary influence. The churches were burned, priests and settlers driven off; and although the rising was put down in the following year after hard fighting, it marked the beginning of the decline of the missions which culminated in the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767. After their departure the Indians were for some time without religious teachers, but are now served by secular priests. In 1825-7 they again joined the Yaqui, led by the famous Bandera (or Samo), in revolt against Mexican aggression, and have several times since taken occasion to show their sympathy with their fighting kinsmen. The Mayo are sedentary and industrious farmers and mine laborers, and skilful artisans in the towns. They cultivate corn, squashes, beans, tobacco, cotton, and maguey, furnish them with the mesquite inti, and make tequila. Their houses are light structures of cane and poles, thatched with palm leaves. They are all Catholic and very much Mexicanized, though they retain their language, and have many of the old Indian ideas still latent in them. Their principal town is Santa Cruz de Mayo, and they are variously estimated at from 7000 to 13,000 persons. The most important study of their language, the Cahita, is a grammar (Arte) by an anonymous Jesuit published in Mexico in 1737.

**Mayoruna Indians.** A noted and savage tribe of Pancho's stock living in the forests between the Uacayal, the Yavarì and the Mañun rivers, in north-east Peru and the adjacent portion of Bolivia. From the fact that they are naked, with yellowish skin and wear beards, a legend has grown up that they are descended from Spanish soldiers of Urua's expedition (1569), but it is probable that the difference comes from later admixture of captive blood. As a tribe they are full-blooded and typically Indian. It has been suggested that the story may have originated from a confusion of "Mariachi" with the followers of Urua and Aguirre, with Mayorunas, which seems to be from the Quichua language of Peru. Markham interprets the name as "Men of Muuyu" (Muuyu-runa), indicating an ancient residence about Moyobamba (Muyumbaba), farther to the west. One of their subtribes is known as "Barbudo" (Spanish: Bárbaro) and the other as "Chiquinqui," Musquima, Uvarina. The Mayoruna tribes were among those gathered into the missions of the Mina province (see MAINA INDIANS) in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, being represented in the missions of San Joaquin (Mayoruna proper), Nuestra Senora del Carmen (Mayoruna proper), and San Xavier (Uvarina and Ituaca). By the repeated attacks of the Portuguese slave-hunters (see MAMELUCO) between 1680 and 1710, and the revolts of the mission Indians in 1695 and 1767 the Mayoruna were driven to take refuge in their forests and are now wholly savage and particularly hostile to either whites or Indians who enter their territory, even successfully repelling a governmental expedition. At present the person they are tall and well-formed, with rather delicate features, going perfectly naked, with flowing hair cut across the forehead. Instead of bows, they use spears, clubs and bow and arrows, and are famous for the strength of the deadly curari poison with which they tip their arrows. They avoid the river banks and do their canoe work. The Mayoruna cannibalism has not been proved. (See also PANO.)

**Rodriguez, Amazones y Maraton (Madrid, 1854); HERRÁZ, Catálogo de las Lenguas (Madrid, 1860); MARKHAM, Tribes in the Valley of the Amazonas in Journ. Anth. Inst. of London, 1885; BRIGHTON, The American Race (New York, 1891).**

**James Mooney.**

**Mayotte, Nossi-Bé, and Comoro, Prefecture Apostolic of (MAYOTTE, NOSSIBÉ, ET COMORE).—** Mayotte is the farthest south and most important of the group of Comoro Islands: Mayotte (Masto), Anjouan (Ansamali), Mohilla (Moheli), and Great Comoro (Komoro, i.e., where there is first or Angazidco). These islands, with Nosso-Bé (large island) and Santa Maria (Nossi Burai, Nossi Ibrahim), form the archipelago known as "the Satellites of Madagascar." The Comoro Islands, with their craggy evergreen shores, look like the cones of submerged groves separated from the mainland by deep abysses. The
summits are not all of the same altitude; the highest point of Mayotte is not over 1800 feet, whereas the highest peak of Anjouan is about 5000 feet, while the central cone of Great Comoro, whose volcanic activity is not yet exhausted, rises to over 7000 feet. Two monsoons, consequently two seasons, alternately affect the climate of the archipelago, which is sometimes visited by cyclones. The soil of these islands is very fertile, and produces in abundance vanilla, cloves, sugar-cane, coffee, etc. The total population is about 80,000, mostly African negroes, often erroneously called Makossa (a Mozambique tribe). There are also some Sakalavas from Madagascar, mostly former slaves freed when the islands were occupied by the French. This Comoro Archipelago was for many centuries in the hands of the Moros and in hostility with the Moris. As they navigated along the African coast, the merchants of Idumea and Yemen created a special and interesting type, the Comorinos. Commingled with these Arabian half-breeds, once the sole owners of the country, there are now Bajians from Cutch and Hindus from Bombay, who carry on almost the entire commerce. There are also a few European or creole planters and officials from Réunion or Mauritius. In 1843 the French Government, called in by the sultan, took possession of Mayotte, which became, with Nossi-Bé, a post of surveillance over Madagascar. All these islands now form a French colony. In 1844, Mayotte, Nossi-Bé, and the Comoros were made an Apostolic prefecture and confided to the Fathers of the Holy Ghost. In 1898, when the same missionaries were given the ecclesiastical administration of Northern Madagascar, these smaller islands and Santa Maria were attached to the Apostolic Vicariate at Diego Suárez. Santa Maria and Nossi-Bé have resident missionaries; the other islands are visited.

The population of these islands is largely Mohammedan and therefore strongly anti-Christian; for this reason little religious progress is made. In all of the islands there are hardly three or four thousand Catholics. There are no Protestants.

Missions Catholiques (Rome, 1907).

ALEXANDER LE ROY.

MAYR, Beda, a Bavarian Benedictine philosopher, apostolic, and poet, b. 15 January, 1742, at Daisting, near Augsburg; d. 28 April, 1794, in the monastery of Heiligenkreuz in Donauerwôrth. After studying at Scheyern, Augsburg, Munich and Freiburg im Breisgau, he was sent to the monastery of Heiligenkreuz on 29 September, 1792, studied theology at the common study-house of the Bavarian Benedictines in Benediktbeuern, was ordained priest on 6 January, 1766, taught mathematics, philosophy, rhetoric, theology and canon law at his monastery, where he was also librarian and, for some time, prior. The last 28 years of his life he spent in his monastery, with the exception of four years during which he was pastor of Mündling. He was an exemplary religious and a popular preacher, but, as a philosopher, he was imbued with the subjectivist criticism of Kant and, as a theologian, he was ironic beyond measure. In a letter to Henry Braun, superintendent of the Bavarian schools, he sets forth the opinion that a unification of the Catholic and the Protestant religion is possible. Mayr published this letter without the consent of the author under the title "Der erste Schritt zur künftigen Vereinigung der katholischen und evangelischen Kirche" (Munich, 1778). In consequence Mayr was censured by the Bishop of Augsburg and temporally forbidden to publish. His chief works were: "Ueber die Bedeutung der natürlichen 'christlichen und katholischen Religion nach den Bedürfnissen unserer Zeiten" (in parts; Augsburg, 1878-91), is equally ironic and permeated with the philosophy of Kant. It was placed on the Index in 1792 and ably refuted by the ex-Jesuit Hochhiebler (Augsburg, 1790). Lindner (infra) enumerates 58 literary productions of Mayr. They include 21 dramas, four volumes of sermons (Augsburg, 1777), numerous occasional poems, and various treatises on philosophical, theological, and mathematical subjects.


MICHAEL OTT.

Mayron (de Mayronis), Francis, b. about 1280, probably at Mayronnes, Department of Basses-Alpes, he entered the Franciscan order as the neighbouring Digne (or Sistéron), he had been teaching at the University of Paris for a long time as bachelor of theology, when, on 24 May, 1323, John XXII, at the request of King Robert of Naples, commanded the chancellor of the university to confer the degree of master of theology upon him. On 27 Sept., 1317, St. Elisear de Sabran died at Paris in Francis's arms. Francis was afterwards sent to Italy, and died at Piacenza, probably 26 July, 1327. It is generally accepted that Mayron introduced the famous "Actus Sorbonicus" into the University of Paris. This occurred at a disputaion lasting from 5 a.m. to 7 p.m., in which the advocate had to defend his theses against any and all opponents who might offer to attack them, without any assistance and without either food or drink. "Sermonum et Sententiarum" appeared in Venice, in 1507-8, 1519-20, 1520, 1526, 1556, 1567. The treatises added thereto, "De formalitatis", "De primo principio", "Explanatio divinorum terminorum", are not his, but have been collected from his teachings. The "De univocione entis", edited with other writings at Ferrara before 1490, is Mayron's. His work "Conflatus", on the sentences, appeared at Treviso in 1476; Baele, 1489, 1579(?); Cologne, 1610. Distinct from the latter are the "Conflatio", Lyons, 1579; "Passeus super Universalia", "Predicamenta", etc., Bologna, 1479, Lerida, 1485, Toulouse, 1490, Venice, 1489; "Sermones de temporum quandam in Universitatem Sententiarum" two volumes, probably Brussels, 1483, and Cologne, Venice, 1491; "Sermones de Sanctis", Venice, 1493, Basle, 1498 (with fourteen dissertations); "Tractatus de Concezione B.M.V.", ed. Alva and Astorga in "Monumenta Seraphica pro Immaculata Conceptione", Louvain, 1663; "Theologicae Veritatis in St. Augustinum de Trinitate", ed. Faivre, 1470, Toulouse, 1488, Venice, 1489(?); "Veritatis ex libris St. Augustini de Trinitate", Lyons, 1520. There are many other unedited writings on the works of St. Augustine, and philosophical and theological works, which testify to the extensive knowledge and the penetrating intellect of this eminent pupil of Duns Scotus. The treatise "De celebrations Misse", is also probably by him (cf. Ad. Franz, "Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter", Freiburg, 1902, 403-5).  

RINCONI A P. Liber Conformitatis in Analect Franciscani, IV (Quaracchi, 1908), 339, 545, 544; WADING, Scrip torum et translationum literariae, Parisii, 1590, 193-5; EISEN, Bibliotheca sacra et ecclesiastica, v (Madrid, 1732), 405 sq.; GIBERT, La Faculté de Théologie à Paris, III, 323-30 (1844-5); SCHELDT, Geschichte der Theologie, i (Hamburg, 1885), 10, 32; RAOUL, Histoire de la Philosophie scolastique, II, 2 (Paris, 1860), 298 sq.; HUTTER, Nomenclator litterarum, II (Innsbruck, 1906), 429-25; CHAVRÈS, Répertoire de sources hist., II (Paris, 1907), 3271.

MICHAEL BEIL.
Mazarin, Jules, b. either at Rome or at Piscina in the Abruzzi, of a very old Sicilian family, 14 July, 1602; d. at Vincennes, 9 March, 1661. His father was major-domo to the Colonna family at Rome. One of his uncles, Giulio Mazarri (1544–1622), a Jesuit, enjoyed a great reputation in Italy, particularly at Bologna, as a preacher, and published several volumes of sacred eloquence. His youth was full of excitement: he accompanied the future Cardinal Colonna to Madrid; he was in turn a captain of pontifical troops and then a pontifical diplomat in the Valtelline War (1624) and the Mantuan War of Succession (1628–30). The truce which he negotiated (26 October, 1630) between the French, on one side, and the Spaniards and the Duke of Savoy, on the other, won for him the esteem of Richelieu, who was well pleased at his letter to Piguelo.

Mazarin continued Richelieu's policy against the House of Austria. Aided by the victories of Condé and Turenne, he succeeded in bringing the Thirty Years' War to a conclusion with the Treaties of Münster and Osnabrück (Treaty of Westphalia), which gave Alsace (without Strasbourg) to France; and in 1639 he ended the war in Spain in the Peace of Vellea, which gave to France the Rhineland and part of the Low Countries. Twice, in 1651 and 1652, he was driven out of the country by the Parliamentary Fronde and the Fronde of the Nobles, with the innumerable pamphlets (Mazarinades) which they published against him, but the final defeat of both Frondes was the victory of royal absolutism, and Mazarin thus prepared the way for Louis XIV's autocracy. Lastly, in 1658, he placed Germany, in some sort, under the young king's protection, by forming the League of the Rhine, which was destined to hold the House of Austria in check. Thus did he lay the foundation of Louis XIV's greatness. His foreign policy was, as Richelieu's had often been, indifferent to the interests of Catholicism: the Peace of Westphalia gave its solemn sanction to the legal existence of Calvinism in Germany, and, while the nuncio vainly protested, Protestant princes were rewarded with secularized bishoprics and abbeys for their political opposition to Austria. Neither did it matter much to him whether the monarchical principle was respected or not. He became, in a foreign sense, a Cromwellian. Towards the Protestants he pursued a hard-edged policy. In 1654 Cromwell opened negotiations with the Calvinists of the South of France, who, before the year, had taken up arms in Ardeche to secure certain liberties for themselves. Mazarin knew how to keep the Calvinists amused with fine words, promises, and regulated delays; for six years they believed themselves to be on the eve of recovering their privileges and in the end they obtained nothing. The cardinal well knew how to retain in the king's service valuable Protestants like Turenne and Gassion.

His personal relations with the Holy See were hardly cordial. He could not prevent Cardinal Pamphili, a friend of Spain, from being elected pope (15 Sept., 1644) as Clement X. He received in France, on the other hand, Cardinals Antonio and Francesco Barberini, nephews of the late pope, and the Bull of 21 February, 1646, fulminated against Innocent X against the cardinals, who were absenting themselves without authorization, (by the tenor of which Bull Mazarin himself was bound to go to Rome), was pronounced by Parliament "null and abusive". Mazarin obtained a decree of the Royal Council forbidding money to be remitted to Rome for expelling Bulls, there was a show of preparing an expedition against Avignon, and Innocent X, yielding to these menaces, ended by restoring their fall into the hands of the French. The Spaniards tried to injure him with Pope Urban VIII, but the influence of Cardinal Antonio Barberini and a letter from Richelieu saved him. He became canon of St. John Lateran, vice-legate at Avignon (1632), and nuncio extraordinary in France (1634). The Spaniards complained that in this last post Mazarin made it his exclusive business to support Richelieu's policy, and he was dismissed from the nunciature by Urban VIII (17 Jan., 1636). Soon after leaving the papal service, he went to Paris, placed himself at Richelieu's disposition, and was naturalized as a French subject in April, 1639. Richelieu commissioned him, late in 1640, to sign a secret treaty between France and Prince Thomas of Savoy, and caused him to be made a cardinal on 16 Dec., 1641. Shortly before Richelieu's death, Mazarin by a piece of clever management, had been able to effect the reoccupation of Sedan by French troops, and Richelieu on his deathbed (4 Dec., 1642) recommended him to the king. On the death of Louis XIII (14 May, 1642), Anne of Austria, leaving the Duc d'Orléans the shadowy title of lieutenant-general of the kingdom, gave the reality of power to Mazarin, who first pretended to be on the point of setting out for Italy, and then pretended that his acceptance of office was only provisional, until such time as the peace of Europe should be re-established.

But Mazarin, like Richelieu, was, in the event, to retain power until his death, first under the queen regent and then under the king after Louis XIV (q. v.) had attained his majority. His very humble appearance and manner, his gentle and kindly ways, had contributed to his elevation, and Anne's affection for him was the best guarantee of his continuance in office. The precise character of his relations with Anne of Austria is one of the enigmas of history. Certain letters of Anne of Austria to Mazarin, published by Cousin, and admissions made by Anne to Mme de Brénne and recorded in the Memoirs of Loménie de Brienne, prove that the queen regent was deeply attached to the cardinal. Still, "my sister played no part in it", she said to Mme de Brénne. Few historians give credence to Anne's assertion on this point, and some go so far as to accept the allegations of the Princess Palatine in her letters of 1717, 1718, and 1722, according to which Anne of Austria and Mazarin were married. M. Loiseleur, who has made a careful study of the problem, believes the Princess Palatine was mistaken; it is certain that he retained the title and insignia of a cardinal until his death; probably he was even a cardinal-priest, though he never visited Rome after his elevation to the purple and seems never to have received the hat. And in any case he held the title of Bishop of Męs from 1653 to 1658.

Tomb of Cardinal Mazarin
Coysevox, Louvre
property and dignities to Mazarin's protégés, the Bar-
berini. Following up his policy of bullying the pope, 
Mazarin was able to seize the Spanish presidios nearest to the papal fron-
tiers. Apart from this, he had no Italian policy, 
properly speaking, and his demonstrations in Italy 
had no other object than to compel Spain to keep her 
troops there, and to bring the pope to a complaisant 
attitude towards France and towards Mazarin's own 
relations. The elevation of his brother Michael Mazar-
in to the cardinalate (October, 1647) was one of his 
diplomatic victories.

Though not interested in questions of theology, 
Mazarin detested the Jansenists for the part taken by 
some of them—disavowed, however, by Antoine 
Arnauld in the Fronde, and for their support of Car-
din de Retz, who had recommended him to Louis 
XIV. July, 1653, and an assembly of bishops in May, 1655, 
over which Mazarin presided, gave executive force to 
the decrees of Innocent X against Jansenism. The 
order condemning Pascal's "Provinciales" to be burnt, 
the order for the dismissal of pupils, novices, and 
postulants from the two convents of Port-Royal, the 
laurel decoration of the Church against the "Augustinus" 
(1661), which formula all ecclesiastics had to sign—all these must be regarded 
as episodes of Mazarin's anti-Jansenist policy. On his 
dethroned he warned the king "not to tolerate the 
Jansenist sect, not even their name".

Having little by little become as powerful as God 
the "heavens and the earth" (Ps. cxli. 7), enjoying the 
revenues of twenty-seven abbeys, always ready to 
end his life by whatever means, and possessing a 
fortune equivalent to about $40,000,000 in twentieth-

In the same year (1647) the cardinal began his 
pilotage of the French fleet, and this was followed 
by Mazarin's intervention in the affairs of 
the Augustinian order, which had been opposed 
to his providential. His influence was strong enough 
to induce the pope to re-establish the order, and 
the French Augustinians were appointed 
over the English and Spanish. 

Mazarin's influence was also exercised in 
the affairs of the Church in England. He 
employed the means of the cardinalate, which 
was a source of much influence, to 
appoint his own men to high positions. 

He also took care to secure the 
support of the clergy, which was an 
important factor in the political life of 
the time. He was able to do this by offering 
the clergy various advantages, such as 
considerable sums of money and 
important positions in the Church. 

Mazarin's influence was also felt in 
the political affairs of the time. He 
was able to secure the support of 
the king and to exercise a great deal 
of control over the government. 

However, Mazarin's influence was not 
without its drawbacks. He was 
jealous of his position and sought 
to maintain it by any means 
possible. This led to his downfall, 
and he was eventually 
deposed from the position of 
prime minister. 

Mazarin's importance as a statesman 
has been widely recognized, and 
his influence has been studied by 
many historians. He is considered 
by many to be one of the most 
important figures in French 
history. 

In conclusion, Mazarin's 
influence has had a significant 
effect on the history of France, 
and his actions have had a lasting 
effect on the country. His 
impact on the political and 
religious life of the time cannot 
be underestimated, and his 
legacy continues to be felt 
in modern times.
fully dressed, the women being picturesque in shawls and gowns of their own weaving, decorated with ribbons and worked with human and animal figures, particularly that of the eagle. They have still their own calendar of thirteen months, with days bearing animal names. The second volume of Pimentel's "Cuadro" contains a sketch of the language. See also Zapotec.

_Mexico, II (San Francisco, 1880); Bauers, Heidentum und Aberglaube unter den Mixteco-Indianern in Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, XI (Berlin, 1908); BRUNTON, American Mexican Life (London, 1874); Proctor, de la libertad, de Indígenas de México (2 vols., Mexico, 1862–65); StARR, In Indian México (Chicago, 1908)._ JAMES MOONEY.

**Mazaxil.** See Avesta, Thel.

**MazenoD.** CHARLES JOSEPH EUGENE DE, Bishop of Marseilles, and Founder of the Congregation of the Bishops of Mary Immaculate, b. at Aix, in Provence, 1 August, 1782; d. at Marseilles 21 May, 1861. De Mazenod was the offspring of a noble family of southern France, and even in his tender years he showed an unmistakable evidence of a pious disposition and a high and independent spirit. Sharing the fate of most French noblemen at the time of the Revolution, he passed some years as an exile in Italy, after which he studied for the priesthood, though he was the last representative of his family. On 21 December, 1811, he was ordained priest at Amiens, whither he had gone to escape receiving orders at the hands of Cardinal Lancre, who, acting on the advice of Paris against the wishes of the pope. After some years of ecclesiastical labours at Aix, the young priest, bewailing the sad fate of religion resulting among the masses from the French Revolution, gathered together a little band of missionaries to preach in the vernacular and to instruct the rural populations of France. He commenced, 25 January, 1816, his Institute which was immediately prolific of much good among the people, and on 17 February, 1826, was solemnly approved by Leo XII under the name of Congregation of the Bishops of Mary Immaculate.

After having aided for some time his uncle, the aged Bishop of Marseilles, in the administration of his diocese, Father De Mazenod was called to Rome and, on 14 October, 1832, consecrated titular Bishop of Icousium, which title he had, in the beginning of 1837, to exchange for that of Bishop of Marseilles. His episcopate was marked by measures tending to the restoration in all its integrity of ecclesiastical discipline. De Mazenod was successively a strong supporter of the Holy See and somewhat obdurate in France by the pretensions of the Gallican Church. He favoured the moral teachings of Blessed (now Saint) Alphonse Liguori, whose theological system he was the first to introduce in France, and whose first life in French he caused to be written by one of his disciples among the Oblates. At the same time he watched with a jealous eye over the education of youth, and, in spite of the susceptibilities of the civil power, he never swerved from what he considered the path of justice. In fact, by the apostolic freedom of his public utterances he deserved to be compared to St. Ambrose. He was ever a strong supporter of papal infallibility and a devoted advocate of Mary's immaculate conception, in the solemn definition of which (1854) he took an active part. In spite of his well-known outspokenness, he was made a Peer of the French Empire, and in 1851 Pius IX gave him the pallium.

Meanwhile he continued as Superior General of the religious family he had founded and whose fortunes were concerned in the article on the Congregation of Mary Immaculate. Such was the esteem in which he was held at Rome that the pope had marked him out as one of the cardinals he was to create when death claimed him at the ripe age of almost seventy-nine.

COOKE, Sketches of the Life of Mgr. de Mazenod, Bishop of Marseilles, etc., in _Dict. Nat._ (1879); ABERLAQUE, Mgr. de Mazenod, Vie du Mgr. de Mazenod (Tournai, 1883); RICARD, Mgr. de Mazenod, Etudes de Marseilles (Paris, n. d.).

A. G. MORICE.
of the Academy of St. Thomas, and, at various times, prefect of the Congregations of the Index, of Studies, and of Rites.

TIMOTHY BROSNAN.

Mazzolini, Lodovico (also known as Mazzolino da Ferrara, Lodovico Ferrarese, and Il Ferrarese), Italian painter, b. in Ferrara in 1480; d. according to some account, in 1523, and to another, in 1530; place of death unknown. This artist is generally represented as having been a pupil of Lorenzo Costa, and as having come under the influence of Ercole Roberti, but should be more correctly described as a pupil of Panetti. Morelli called him "the Glow-worm," "der Glüh- wurm," from his brilliant gem-like colour and luminous glaucing quality, and he proved that Mazzolini was a pupil of Panetti rather than of Costa, for the form of the ear and hand in his paintings, by his landscape backgrounds with steep conical blue mountains and streaks of dazzling white, and by his scheme of colour. Comparing Lorenzo Costa with Perugino, Morelli compares Panetti with Pintorrichio, although he says as an artist the Perugian far surpassed the somewhat dry and narrow-minded artist of Ferrara, but it is perfectly clear that it was to this dry and so-called narrow-minded man that Mazzolini owed his excellent work. The architectural backgrounds of his pictures are their specially distinct feature, and notably the creamy-white marble. Attention should further be directed to the artist's unctuousness and personality, and to the power of imparting pleasure, as his gift was rather in the direction of genre than of historical painting, and to most observers there is something curiously Flemish about his work. There is a second important picture of his in Berlin, a Virgin and Child, two at the Louvre, one in Ferrara, three in the National Gallery, and three in Florence, other examples in Munich, and in various private collections. The chief work of his in England is one belonging to Lord Wimborne. He is also represented in the galleries of Turin, St. Petersburg, The Hague, and in the Capitoli at Rome, the Doria, and the Borghese.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Inventario degli Ùni dei Pittori Ferraresi (Ferrara), in MS., also the Orsetti MS. (Bologna); ORLANDI, Abbeccario Pittorico (Bologna, 1719); VARARI, Le Vie dei Pittori (Florence, 1778, 1856).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Mazzoni (Mozzoli, also Prienias), Sylvester, theologian, b. at Prierro, Piedmont, 1480; d. at Rome, 1523—sometimes confounded with Sylvester Ferrarini (d. 1526). At the age of fifteen he entered the Order of St. Dominic. Passed brilliantly through a course of studies he taught theology at Bologna, Pavia (by invitation of the senate of Venice), and in Rome, whither he was called by Julius II in 1511. In 1515 he was appointed Master of the Sacred Palace, filling that office until his death. His writings cover a vast range, including treatises on the planets, the power of the demons, history, homiletics, the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, the primacy of the popes. He is credited with being the first theologian who by his writings attacked publicly the subversive errors of Martin Luther. John Tetzel's productions against the arch-reformer are called by Eccard scattered pages (politische Blättern) forth as the champion of the Roman Pontiffs against Luther. The heresiarch replied to Mazzolini's arguments; the latter published rejoinders, and there was a regular controversy between the innovator and the defender of the ancient Faith. The necessity of promptness in attack

MBAYA

and defence will account for defects of style in some of his writings. His principal works are: "De juridice et irrefragabili veritate Romane Ecclesiae Romane Ritus Pontificis" (Rome, 1520); "Epitoma responsionis ad Lutherum" (Perugia, 1519); "Errata et argumenta M. Lutheri" (Rome, 1520); "Summa Summarum, quae Sylvestrina dictur" (Rome, 1516), reprinted forty times; an alphabetical encyclopedia of theological questions; "Rosa aurea" (Bologna, 1510) an exposition of the Gospels of the year; "In thesauris planeta rum" (Venice, 1513).

QUÉRÉ-ÉCHARD, SS. Ord. Préc., III, 55; TURIN, Romana Illustrazione dell'Ordine di S. Dominico, III, 413; CHALIER, De Sp. gr.contain...nisi et scriptis (Munster, 1862).

D. J. KENNEDY.

Maccabell, Pietro Francesco (also known as Il Morazzone, Marrazzone, and Morazone), Milanese painter, b. at Morazone near Milan, either in 1571 or 1575; d. at Piacenza in 1626. In the early part of his life, this painter resided in Rome, where he painted various altarpieces, then he passed on to Venice, and made a profound study of the work of Titian, Tintoretto, and Paolo Veronese, so entirely altering his style and improving his scheme of colour, that the pictures he painted when he came to Milan, although representing subjects similar to those he had carried out in Rome, could hardly be recognized as having come from the same hand. He was patronized by Cardinal Borromneo, and from the Duke of Savoy received the honour of knighthood and the order of St. George. In 1626 he was called to Piacenza to paint the cupola of the cathedral, but was not able to finish this work, which he commenced in a grand and vigorous style, and died, it is believed, from an accident in connection with the scaffolding, in consequence of which Guercino was called in to complete the work. The chief painting by Maccabell is that in the church of San Giovanni at Como, and represents St. Michael and the angels.

VARARI, G., Le Vite dei Pittori (Florence, 1878, 1885); ORLANDI, F., Abbeccario Pittorico (Bologna, 1719), also the Orsetti MS. (Bologna).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Mazzuola, Francesco. See Parmigiano, Il.

Mbaya Indians (Guaycuru), a predatory tribe formerly ranging on both sides of the Paraguay River, on the north and northwest Paraguay frontier, and in the adjacent portion of the Province of Matto Grosso, Brazil. They are one of a group of equestrian warlike savages tribes, closely connected with the Guarani stock, the Guaycuran, formerly roving over Northern Paraguay and the upper Chaco region, and of which the best known are the Abipon, made famous by the missionary Dobrizhoffer, the Guaycurd proper, or Mbaya, the Mocobi and the still savage and powerful Toba. The Lenguas, sometimes included under the same name, are now known to be a branch of the Chiquito of Bolivia. The name, Mbaya, given to them by the more peaceful Guarani, signifies "terrible," "bad," or "savage." The name Guaycurd, now most commonly used, is said to mean "runner." They have also been called Caballeros by the Spaniards, on account of their fine horsemanship. According to Dr. Odero they had three main divisions, viz: Eguinu-yiqui (Eguinu-yiqui) in the North, Napin-yiquil in the West, and Taqui-yiqui in the South. Iolis, another authority, gives a different list of six divisions.

The Guaycurd were accustomed to prey upon the more sedentary and industrious Guarani tribes, making sudden raids, with quick retreats into their own country, where they afterwards made their camps out of the scamps made pursuit difficult and subjection almost impossible. In 1542, Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, governor of Buenos Aires, with a detachment of Spaniards and a contingent of Guarani, inflicted upon them a signal defeat, chiefly by the terror of his field guns and horses, with both of which the Guaycurd
were still unacquainted. The acquisition of horses
soon transformed them into a race of expert and dar-
ing equestrians, and for two centuries they continued
their raids upon the Spanish settlements on the Para-
guay River and the neighbouring missions. As early
as 1610 the Jesuits unsuccessfully attempted their con-
version. About the middle of the eighteenth century
a peace was arranged, which, according to Dobrizhoff-
er, was faithfully kept by the Indians. The Jesuit
Joseph Sanches Labrador was then sent, at his own
request, to work among these Guaycurú, who had been
considered the wildest and most dangerous tribe of the
region. Having made good progress in their difficult
language, he established for them, in 1760, the mission
of Virgen de Belen (now Belen) east of the present
Concepción, Paraguay. Reversing the policy of the
missionaries of the Jesuit fathers, Dobrizhoffer,
"the rest did little else than wander over the plains",
the mission influence, however, effectually tamed their
ferocity. At the expulsion of the Jesuits, in 1767, the
Belen mission contained 260 Christian Indians, eight of
the nine bands still remaining in the forest.

In this same year was established by Father Manuel
Duran the last of the Paraguay Jesuit foundations,
the mission of San Juan Nepomuceno, on the east
bank of the river, among the Guana, or Chana, a
numerous agricultural and pedrestrian tribe of the same
territory, subject to the Mbaya. When the mission-
aries arrived in 1767, this mission contained 120
Indians. The conversion of the Guana had been under-
taken more than a century before by Father Pedro
Romero, who lost his life in 1645 at the hands of a
neighbouring wild tribe. Among the Guana, infantil-
cide, polygamy, and intoxication were unknown, and
men and women worked together in the fields. About
the close of the eighteenth century the Franciscans took
up the work begun by the Jesuits, and in the course of
the next fifty years gathered a number of the Guay-
curú and Guana into missions, which continued until
the tribes themselves declined or were assimilated.

Lieutenant Page, who commanded an expedition sent
by the United States Government to explore the Para-
guay River, gives an interesting and extended account
of his visit to one of these missions, Nossa Senhora de
Bon Conselho, near Albuquerque, Brazil, in 1853
(Page, "Report to the Secretary of the Navy", Wash-
ington, 1855). Here the Christian Guanas cultivated
vegetables for the market afforded by neighbouring
white settlements. Under the care, both temporal and
spiritual, of their father, the Franciscans, who,
only a few years earlier, had been wandering
savage, were now a remarkably neat, orderly, and
thriftily community of husbandsmen. Fronting upon
a public square, there stood the village church, the
schoolhouse, and a number of well-constructed
thatched dwellings, each dwelling having a frontage
of 20 feet, the interior partitioned with curtains and
fitted with raised platforms to serve either as tables
or as beds. Among the vegetables cultivated was a
native rice, which they harvested in canoes. Cotton,
too, was grown, spun, dyed, and woven by the women
of the settlement. The men wore trousers and
ponchos; the women, a chasmine girdled at the waist;
the boys were exercised in military tactics, and the
children in general were not only taught "the rudi-
ments of a common education, but made some progress
in music and dancing". A few of the Mbaya proper
still exist on the western bank of the Paraguay in
the neighbourhood of the town of Concepción. Other
bands known as Guaycurú roam over the adjacent dis-
trict, with 1500 souls as against an estimated 15,000 or
18,000 about a century ago. The Guana, on the
Faucari and Miranda Rivers in the same region, are
now labourers among the whites, although still
claimed as dependents by the Guaycurú.

In their primitive condition the men of the Guay-
curú went entirely naked, while the women wore only
a skirt. They trimmed their hair in a cir-
cular tuft. Girls had the head closely shaven. The
men painted their bodies, and wore rings in the lower
lip. Boys were painted black until about fourteen
years old, then red for two years, when they were
subjected to a painful ordeal, before taking their
manhood rite as was war. War was their chief business,
their weapons being the bow, club, and bone knife.
The children born of captives were sold as slaves.
Their chief tribal ceremony was in honour of the
Pleades, and was accompanied by a sham battle be-
tween the men and women, ending with a general in-
Toxication. They buried their dead in the ground,
and voluntary or involuntary victims were sacrificed when
a chief died. Polygamy was unknown, but separation
was frequent, and infanticide common. They sub-
sisted by fishing and hunting. Their villages con-
sisted each of a simple communal structure in three
large rooms, the middle of which was reserved for the
chief and head men, and for the storage of weapons.
The chief had great authority, and with his head men,
seems to have belonged to a different clan, or gens,
from the common warriors. Captives and their de-
dscendants constituted a permanent slave class. As a
people, they were tall and strongly built. Those still
remaining show the admixture of white captive blood
and are gradually assimilating to the settled popula-
tion.

James Mooney.

Meade, John. See Almida, John.

Meagher, Thomas Francis, soldier, politician, b.
at Waterford, Ireland, 3 August, 1823; accidentally
drowned in the Mississippi River, U.S. A., 1 July, 1867.

Educated in the
Jesuit colleges of
Clongowes and
Stonyhurst, he
finished his college
career in 1843 with
a reputation for
great oratorical
ability. He
volunteered for service in the army immediately after
the secession of the southern states. After the battle of
Gettysburg, he was elected a member of the
departing House of Representatives from Colorado, and
was a prominent leader in the American
Reform
Movement. He died in 1877.

Thomas Francis Meagher.
New York, where his countrymen gave him a hearty welcome. His popularity as a lecturer was immediate; he also studied law and, admitted to the bar in 1855, started a paper called the "Irish News" (12 April, 1856), in which he published his "Personal Recollections". Two years later he undertook an exploring expedition to Central America; his narrative was published in "Harper's Magazine". Soon after he broke up the cause of the Union, raised a company of zouaves, went to the front with the Sixty-Ninth New York Volunteers, and participated in the first battle of Bull Run. He then organized the famous Irish Brigade, of which he was commissioned brigadier-general, and with it participated in the operations of the Army of the Potomac before the Battle of Fair Oak (1 June, 1862), the seven days' fight before Richmond, Antietam, Fredericksburg (13 Dec., 1862), where it was almost annihilated, and Chancellorsville (1863). He then resigned his command because, he said, it was perpetrating a public deception to keep up a brigade so reduced in numbers, and which he had been refused permission to withdraw from service and recruit. A command of a military district in Tennessee was at once given him, which he resigned after a short time. At the close of the war he was made (July, 1865) Territorial Secretary of Montana. During a trip made in the course of his administration of this office he fell from a steamer into the Missouri River at night and was drowned. His body was never found.

Cavanagh, Memorial of Gen. Thomas Francis Meagher (Worcester, Mass., 1882); Conti, The Irish Brigade and Its Campaigns (New York, 1887); Savage, '68 and '69 (New York, 1856); Duffty, Young Ireland (London, 1880); Four Years of Irish Life in London (London, 1857); Murphy, History of the Irish Volunteers (New York, 1887); Irish American (New York, 1868).

THOMAS F. MEANAN.

Meath, Diocese of (Midensis), in Ireland, suffragan of Armagh. In extent it is the largest diocese in Ireland, and includes the greater part of the counties Meath, Westmeath, King's, and a small portion of the counties Longford, Dublin, and Cavan. The present Dunleary Diocese of Meath, comprising the eastern half of the diocese, was united with the diocese of Ossory in 1727. The pope in 1763 finally exchanged the bishopric of Meath for the archbishopric of Cashel. It passed to the See of Clonard, founded in the middle of the sixth century by St. Finian, "Tutor of the Saints of Erin". The see was re-established in 1172, over which Cardinal Paparo presided as legate of Eugene III, it was decided that these sees be joined together. The united see was assigned as first bishop of Meath, and appointed to the see, after the metropolitan see in Ireland. In his "Hibernia Dominica" De Burgo says that Meath is the foremost suffragan of Armagh, and has precedence even though its bishop is the youngest of the Irish prelates in order of consecration. Meath being the country of the Pale, many Englishmen were appointed bishops of Meath, among them the notorious Staples, who apostatized in the reign of Edward VI, and was deposed in 1554. Dr. Walsh, a Cistercian monk, succeeded, and more than repaired the scandal caused by his recreant predecessor. This noble confessor of the Faith bravely withstood all the threats and blandishments of Queen Elizabeth and her agents. He spent thirteen years in a dungeon in Dublin Castle, and finally died an exile at Alcalá in Spain. His name is reckoned in more than one Irish Martyrology. Like honour is paid to him by his own order, and his Cistercian biographer contends that the martyr's crown is his as truly as if he had died in torments. The succession of bishops in the See of Meath has been completely interrupted only except during a few brief interregnums in the penal days. It is a noteworthy fact that, omitting Dr. Logan's short reign of a few years, but three bishops ruled the Diocese of Meath from 1779 to 1899, Drs. Plunket, Cantwell, and Nulty. Dr. Plunket, who had been professor and superior in the Irish College of the profound theologian and ardent student, he put before his priests a high intellectual standard: at the same time he did much to overthrow landlordism and to root the people firmly in their native soil.

The population of the Diocese of Meath at the last census (1901) was 143,634, of whom 132,992 were Catholics. Since 1871 the population of the diocese has decreased 27 per cent.; during the same period the non-Catholic population decreased 35 per cent. There are 144 churches and 66 parishes, 155 secular priests and 12 regulars, 3 monastic houses of men with 17 members, and 13 convents of nuns with 134 members. St. Finian's College, an imposing structure erected in Mullingar and opened in 1908, replaces the old "building in Navan, which had held, for more than one hundred years, an honoured place among the schools of Ireland. The new college, which cost over £40,000, has accommodation for 150 students and is intended both as a seminary to prepare priests for the diocese, and to impart a sound Catholic liberal education to those intended for worldly pursuits. There is a Jesuit novitiate and college at Tullamore, and a house of Carmelites Fathers at Moate. The Franciscans of the Irish province have a monastery and preparatory school at Multyfarnham, near the cathedral town of Mullingar. The Abbey of Multyfarnham has been in Franciscan hands since pre-Reformation times, and has witnessed the good and evil fortunes of the friars in Ireland. The Franciscan Brothers have a school at Clara, and the Christian Brothers have a school at Mullingar (500 pupils) and at Clara (200 pupils). At Rochfortbridge, St. Joseph's Institute for the Deaf and Dumb is conducted by the Sisters of Mercy. The Loreto Nuns have educational houses in Navan and Mullingar, which have won
favourable recognition. The Presentation Sisters have foundations in Mullingar and Rahan, where they have charge of the primary schools, while the Sisters of Mercy have orphanages at Navan and Kells, take care of the hospitals in Tullamore, Trim, Mullingar, Drogheda, and Navan, and at the same time conduct national schools in the principal towns of the diocese.

The Diocese of Meath, often called the “royal diocese”, is rich in historic associations, pagan and Christian. In Meath was Tara “of the kings”, the palace of the Ard-righ, whither came the chiefstains and princes, the bards and brehons of Erinn. The principal cemetery of the pagan kings of Ireland was at Brugh na Bóinne. St. Patrick, the first Christian King of Ireland, who refused to be buried in pagan Brugh, awaited the last summons. Uisneach in Westmeath, Tlachtga, or the Hill of Ward, and Teltown were celebrated for their royal palaces, their solemn conventions, their pagan games, and their druidic ceremonies, and in Christian times were sanctified by the labours of St. Patrick and St. Brigid. Slane reminds us of St. Patrick’s first Holy Saturday in Ireland, when he lit the paschal fire, symbolizing the lamp of Faith which has never since been extinguished. Trim, founded by St. Jude, is the first diocese of Ireland. The first diocese of St. Patrick retains in its many ruins striking evidences of its departed glories. Kells, with its round tower, its splendid sculptured crosses, and the house of Columcille, reminds us of that “Dove of the Irish Church”, whose memory is also cherished in his beloved Derryn. Finally, Meath is the birthplace of the Venerable Hugh de Lacy, and of St. Peregrine of Armathwaite, the last victim publicly sacrificed in England for the Faith.

COGAN, Dioceze of Meath (Dublin, 1862); HEATY, Ancient Schools of Ireland (Dublin, 1900); Irish Ecclesiastical Record (June, 1900); Irish Catholic Directory (Dublin, 1910).

PATRICK E. DUFFY.

MEATH, Diocese of (MELDENIUS), comprises the entire department of Seine and Marne, suffragan of Sens until 1622, and subsequently of Paris. The Concordat of 1801 had given to the Diocese of Meaux the department of Marne, separated from it in 1821 and 1822 by the establishment of the archiepiscopal See of Reims and the episcopal See of Châlons. The present Diocese of Meaux is made up of a larger part of the former Diocese of Meaux, of the whole of the Diocese of Sens, a part of the former Diocese of Paris, and a few parishes of the former Dioceses of Troyes, Soissons and Senlis. Hildegarde, who lived in the ninth century, says in his “Life of St. Faro” (Burgundofaro), that this bishop was the twelfth since St. Denis. According to the tradition accepted by Hildegarde, St. Denis was the first Bishop of Meaux, and was succeeded by his disciple St. Saintin, who in turn was succeeded by St. Antoninus; and another saint, named Rigomer, occupied the See of Meaux at the close of the fifth century. In 876 or 877, Hinemar showed Charles the Bald a document which he claimed had been found in a vassel, containing the names of St. Antoninus and St. Saintin, disciples of St. Denis, who brought to Pope Anacletus the account of the martyrdom of St. Denis, and on their return to Gaul had successively occupied the See of Meaux. (For these traditions see PARIS.)

According to Mgr. Duchesne, the first Bishop of Meaux historically known is Medocleveus, present at two councils in 549 and 552. Of the bishops of Meaux the following may be mentioned (following Mgr. Alou's chronology): St. Faro (626-72), whose sister St. Faro founded the monastery of Faremoutiers, and who himself built at Meaux the monastery of St-Croix; St. Hildes (972-68); St. Pathus, who died about 684 before being consecrated at St. Ebrisgillus (end of the seventh century); St. August (first half of the seventh century); Durand de St-Pourpain (1326-1334), commentator on the “Book of Sentences”, known as the “resolute doctor”; Philippe de Vitry (1351-1361), friend of Petrarch and author of the “Metamorphoses d'Ovide Moralisées”; Pierre Fresnel (1380-1409), several times ambassador of Charles VI; Pierre de Vercham (1433-1438), archbishop of Paris, commission by Eugene IV, and who, when commissioned by Charles VII in 1429 to examine Joan of Arc, had declared himself convinced of the Divine mission of the Maid of Orleans; Guillaume Brignon (1516-1534), ambassador of Francis I to Leo X, and during whose episcopate the Reformation was introduced by Farel and other Reformers. The first cardinal of Meaux was an archbishop of this diocese for the revival of studies; Cardinal Antoine du Prat (1534-1535), who had an active share in the drawing up of the concordat between Francis I and Leo X; the controversial writer and historian Jean du Tillet (1564-1570); Louis de Brézé, twice bishop, first from 1584 to 1594, then from 1570 to 1589, during whose episcopate the diocese was greatly disturbed by religious wars; Dominique Séguier (1637-1659), the first French bishop to establish “ecclesiastical conferences” in his diocese; the great Bossuet (1651-1704); Cardinal de Bissy (1705-1737), celebrated for his conflict with the Jansenists; De Barel (1802-1806), later Grand Almoner of Empress Josephine and Legate of the Pope, who was the author of the famous Treatise in 1810 and 1811 in the negotiations between Napoleon and Pius VII. In 1562 most of the inhabitants of Meaux had become Protestants, and Joachim de Montcuc, sent by the king, proceeded with rigour against them. They were still sufficiently powerful in 1567 to attempt to carry off, in the vicinity of Meaux, Catherine de’ Medici and Anne of Austria, whose horse had previously failed to carry them. After St. Bartholomew’s day, Charles IX ordered the massacre of the Protestants of Meaux. At the château of Fontainebleau, built by Francis I, was held the theological conference of 4 May, 1600, between the Catholics (Cardinal du Perron, de Thou, Pitou) and the Calvinists (du Plessis Mornay, Philippe Canayze, Isaac Cauzaouen).

A number of saints are found in the history of this diocese: St. Autharius, a relative of St. Faro, who received St. Columbanus in his domain at Usy-sur-Marne, and father of Blessed Ado, who founded about 630 the two monasteries of Jouarre, and of St. Ouen, who founded the monastery of Reims in 651 and frequently consecrated Bishops of Reims; the abbot St. Fère or Fiscare, and the missionary St. Chilien, both Irishmen, contemporaries of St. Faro (first half of the seventh century); St. Aile (Agilus), monk of Luxeuil, who became in 634 the first Abbot of Rebais; St. Telchilde, died about 660, first Abbess of Jouarre; St. Aguilberte, second Abbess of Jouarre, a sister of St. Ebrisgillus (end of seventh century); St. Bathilde, wife of Clovis II, foundress of the abbey of Chelles, died in 680; St. Bertille, first Abbess of Chelles, and St. Ethèria, first Abbess of Notre-Dame of Soissons (638), both of them pupils at the abbey of Jouarre; finally, St. Vincent Madelaigne (or Mauger), founder of the abbey of Jumieges, who first established the abbey of Waldetrude, foundress of the monastery of Monza; St. Aldegonde, sister of St. Waldetrude, first Abbess of Maubeuge; St. Landry, Abbot of Soignies, claimed by some as a Bishop of Meaux; St. Adeltrude and St. Malbette, nuns of Maubeuge, the last three being children of St. Vincent Madelaigne and St. Waldetrude (seventh century).

Eugen III stayed some days at Meaux in 1147. In 1664 Blessed Eudes preached for two months at Meaux. Mme Guyon passed the first six months of 1695 at the Visitation convent of Meaux, where Bossuet had frequent conferences with her, but failed to make her abandon her peculiar views. The celebrated Fère Lonquet (1757-1845) was superior from 1812 to 1814 of the preparatory seminary of Châlons, in the
Diocese of Meaux. The Paris massacres on 2 and 3 September, 1792, at the prisons of the Carmes and the Abbaye had their counterpart at Meaux where seven priests were massacred in prison on 4 September. The Abbey of Notre-Dame de Jour is the last secular church marked a pedagogical revolution: the Latin grammars written in Latin were abandoned and French textbooks were used in the study of the dead languages. The college became national property in 1791, and was re-purchased in 1796 by a few Oratorians; in 1826 by Salinis, future Bishop of Amiens and Soissons, chaplain-general of the university; in 1840 by the Abbé Bautain; finally, in 1867, the college returned into the hands of the new Congregation of the Oratory founded by the Abbé Pétetot. In the salon of the Abbé de Salinis, at Juilly, was established in December, 1830, the Agence générale pour la défense de la liberté religieuse. Lamen neaux recalled a few years later the editor of L’Avenir. It was at Juilly in 1836, that his half-brother, Gaspard, founded the review L’Université Catholique. Among the students at Juilly in the seventeenth century were the Mariads de Berwick and de Villars; in the nineteenth, Mgr de Mérode and the famous lawyer, Berryer.

A council convoked in 845 at Meaux by Charles the Bald adopted important measures for the re-establishment of discipline in the three ecclesiastical provinces of Sens, Bourges, and Reims. Other councils were held at Meaux in 962, 1062, 1204, 1229 (ended in Paris), where the Count of Toulouse was reconciled with the Church; in 1240 a council was held in which the bishop of Meaux, Urban, communicated his grievances against Frederick II by Joannes of Palestrina, legate of Gregory IX; there was held an important council in 1623. Four councils were held at Melun, in 1216, 1225, 1232, 1300. The city of Provins was famous in the Middle Ages for its burlesque ceremonies (fête de fous, fête de l’an, fête des Innocents) held in the church of St-Martin, a fine Gothic edifice begun about 1170. The church of Champigny has a magnificent crypt dating from the thirteenth century. The principal pilgrimages of the diocese are: Notre-Dame de Lagny, dating from 1128; Notre Dame du Chêne de Preuilly, dating from the foundation of the Cistercian Abbey (1118); Notre Dame du Chêne de Cournon (already completed in the beginning of the seventeenth century; Notre Dame de Bon Secours near Fontainebleau (the pilgrimage was established in 1661 by d’Auberou, an officier of the great Condé); Notre Dame de la Cave at Champigny; Notre Dame de Pétié at Verdelot; Notre Dame de Melun at Melun; Notre Dame du Puy at Sièges; Notre Dame de Vézelay, that long been the object of a pilgrimage, greatly furthered by the Jesuits in 1670; the cloak (chape) of St Martin of which a large portion is preserved at Bussy-Saint-Martin, also attracts pilgrims.

Before the application of the Associations Law of 1901 religious communities were represented in the diocese by the Lazarets, Oratorians, Little Brothers of Mary, Fathers and Brothers of St Mary of Tinchbray, School Brothers of the Christian Doctrine. Of the congregations of women the following may be mentioned: the Celestial Sisters, a teaching and nursing order founded in 1839 (mother-house at Provins); the sisters of St. Louis, a nursing and teaching order, founded in 1844 by the Bishop of Meaux at Juilly, the Congregation of Meaux, called Carmen of the Prophecy, founded 30 August, 1860. The Benedictines of the Sacred Heart of Mary, devoted to teaching and contemplation, restored in 1837 the ancient abbey of Jour. The religious congregations had under their care: 4 crèches, 52 day nurseries, 1 orphanage for boys, 15 orphanages for girls, 14 industrial schools, 10 hospitals, 26 hostels or asylums, 19 houses for the care of the sick in their own homes, 1 house of retreat. In 1908 the Diocese of Meaux had 361,939 inhabitants, 39 parishes, 402 succursal parishes, 8 vicariates.

Mecca, the capital of Arabia and the sacred city of the Mohammedans, is situated in the district of Hijaz about 21° 30' N. latitude and 40° 20' E. longitude, some seventy miles east of the Red Sea. It lies in a sandy valley surrounded by rocky hills from two hundred to five hundred feet in height, barren and destitute of vegetation. The birthplace of Mohammed and the seat of the famous Kaaba in pre-Islamic times as the chief sanctuary of the Arabs, and visited by numerous pilgrims and devotees. The city presents an aspect more pleasing than that of the ordinary Eastern town, with comparatively wide streets and stone houses, usually of three stories, and well aired and lighted. The inhabitants, numbering about 80,000, are with few exceptions of Arabian race, and are engaged in innkeeping, but under the immediate authority of the Sultan of Turkey (Hughes, "Dictionary of Islam", q. v.). Mecca is annually visited by some 80,000 pilgrims from all over the Mohammedan world. On their way the pilgrims pass through Medina, the second sacred town of Arabia, and on approaching Mecca they undress, laying aside their shoes and a piece of cloth over the left shoulder. Then they perform the circuit of the Kaaba, kiss the Black Stone, hear the sermon on Mount Arafat, pelt Satan with stones in the valley of Mina, and conclude their pilgrimage with a great sacrificial feast. In a year or two Mecca will be reached by the Hijaz Railway, which will make the journey of about two hundred and fifty miles from Damascus. From Medina to Mecca the distance is two hundred and eighty miles, and from Mecca to Damascus about one thousand and one hundred and ten miles. The railway passes through the old caravan route, Damascus, Mezzab, Maan, Medawara, Tebuk, Madain Saleh, El-Fula, Medina, and Yathrib.

The early history of Mecca is shrouded in obscurity, although Mohammedan writers have preserved an abundance of legendary lore according to which the city dates back to Abraham who is said to have there worshipped the true God. It is also stated that after the death of Abraham, the inhabitants of Mecca, owing to the evil influence of the heathen Amalekites, fell into idolatry and paganism, and the Kaaba itself became surrounded with their idols. Hundreds of these idols were destroyed by Mohammed on his entrance into the city at the head of a Moeslem army in the eighth year of the Hejira, or A. d. 629. During the century before Mohammed we find the tribe of Qurash in undisputed possession of the Kaaba, Aishah, acknowledged guardians of the Kaaba. The leading events in Mecca at that period, such as the Abyssinian expedition against Yemen and the utter defeat of
Mechanism.—There is no constant meaning in the history of philosophy for the word Mechanism. Originally, the term meant that cosmological theory which ascribes the motion and changes of the world to some external force. In this view material things are purely passive, while according to the opposite theory (i.e., that of the Kantian school) there is one certain source of energy which account for the activity of each and for its influence on the course of events. These meanings, however, soon underwent modification. The question as to whether motion is an inherent property of bodies, or has been communicated to them by some external agency, was very often ignored; a common number of cosmologists the essential feature of Mechanism is the attempt to reduce all the qualities and activities of bodies to quantitative realities, i.e., to mass and motion. But a further modification soon followed. Living bodies, as is well known, present at first sight certain characteristic properties which have no counterpart in lifeless matter. As Mechanists we ascribe these appearances to the fact that all "vital" phenomena as physical and chemical facts; whether or not these facts are in turn reducible to mass and motion becomes a secondary question, although Mechanists are generally inclined to favour such reduction. The theory opposed to this biological mechanism is no longer Dynamism, but Vitalism or Neobehaviourism, which says that vital activities cannot be explained, and never will be, by the laws which govern lifeless matter. As Mechanists profess to furnish a complete system of the world, its extreme partisans apply it to psychological manifestations and even to social phenomena, but here it is at best only tentative and the result very questionable. Its advocates merely a complex of more than thoroughly, psychological and social facts with the general laws or leading hypotheses of biology. It is preferable, therefore, in the present state of our knowledge, to disregard these features of mechanistic doctrine, which are certainly of a provisional character. In a word then, Mechanism in its various forms shows a tendency to reduce the higher and more complex forms of life to the lower and less complex, and to carry this reduction down to the simplest attainable forms, i.e., to those quantitative realities which we call mass and motion. Psychology and sociology derive their explanation from biology; biology derives its explanation from the physical and chemical sciences, while these in turn borrow their explanation from mechanics. The science of mechanics becomes by a very simple process a particular phase of mathematical analysis, so that the ideal of Mechanism is Materialism, that is to say, the representation of all phenomena by mathematical equations. Hence it is plain that Mechanism tends to eliminate from science and from reality all "vitalistic" aspects. "Forms," and "ends." We shall first state the arguments brought forward in support of the theory, and then subject it to criticism.

I. Arguments.—(1) Modern Mechanism, which unquestionably goes back to Descartes, arose, it is said, from a legitimate reaction against the errors of deistic and rationalistic thought, and to the old theory of forms and latent qualities. Whenever a phenomenon called for explanation, it was furnished by endowing the substance with a new quality; and, as Molière jestingly puts it, "the poppy made one sleep, because it has the sleep-inducing property." Each thing was what it was by virtue of an inherent or specific form; man by the human form, a pebble by its pebble form; and each thing performed its characteristic functions by some "virtue." Thus, it is alleged, all explanations fell into tautology, and science was doomed a priori to pursue a monotonous round in complete sterility. If Mechanism did nothing more than deliver us from this absurd locked system, it could possess at least a negative value, emphasizing by its opposition the weakness of qualitative explanations.

(2) The general laws of applied logic are cited in favour of the principles of Mechanism. The scientific fact is not the initial fact of observation. The scientist is not satisfied with seeing, he must understand; and in order to understand, there is but one conceivable method of explaining the new reality; the things which are not understood must be reduced to known antecedents. The barrenness of formal and final causes is, according to the Mechanists, at once manifest. The form is what makes a thing what it is, but the fact or thing which is to be explained does not become intelligible by reason of its being what it is. Therefore, to allege a cause or form of explanation is to explain a thing by itself. The interpretations based on "ends" are not more productive of scientific results. Aside from the anthropomorphic illusions to which such interpretations are liable, the ends help us no better than the forms to avoid tautology. The form is the principle, the end the goal which it tends, the term of its development. By this action and this term can be known only through further observation; they constitute new facts which require an explanation of their own. We learn nothing from these things to the nature of the original thing; they do not tell us how or by what internal factors it is what it is. Taking the eye by declaring that it was made to see, is to show that it is an eye but nothing more. To understand the eye it is necessary to know by what internal structure, and under what sort of stimulation the organ performs its visual functions.

Hence, say the Mechanists, all ends and final causes must be banished from scientific systematizations. The unknown can be explained only by reduction to the known, the new by reduction to the anterior, the complex by reduction to the simple. Now, if we look for the only genuinely scientific explanation, we cannot stop until we reach mass and motion. Such indeed is human intelligence, that we first grasp the most general and the simplest realities, and we grasp these the beings in terms of the familiar phenomenon of life. To explain it by a vital force or principle would simply be to not explain it at all. We must, if we would understand life, reduce it to something which is not life, to something simpler and better known. We must therefore, the Mechanist asserts, reduce to relations and chemical phenomena, and our understanding of life is explained by the possibilities of this reduction. It may be that we have not explained by this method everything connected with vital phenomena, since their reduction to physical laws is as yet incomplete: but this does not justify the assumption of a latent quality; it only means that our biological knowledge is far from perfect. Chemical phenomena, and the qualities they must likewise be accounted for. Under pain of fruitless tautology, we must reduce them to that which is already known. But we find here only quantitative matter and motion, realities which may be reduced to mathematical formulæ, thus bringing us to a practically pure idea of quantity. Beyond this we cannot go, for if we had an idea of quantity, we should have an idea of the real. It apparently follows that by the very requirements of logic, Mechanism alone has an indisputable claim to a place in the realm of science. Any other system, the Mechanists claim, must necessarily
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be provisional, tautological, and therefore misleading.

(3) There is another consideration which is said to outweigh all reasoning a priori: Mechanism succeeds. Its explanations, we are told, are clear and precise to a degree unattainable in any other theory, and they satisfy the mind with a synthetic view of reality. They alone have delivered us from an intolerable pluralism in the cosmic system, secured that unity of thought which seems to be an absolute need of our mind, and brought under control phenomena which had defied all analysis and which had to be accepted as primary data. Furthermore, the doctrines of Mechanism have enabled us to anticipate observation and to make forecasts which facts in nature have actually confirmed. Herein is a guarantee which, for the Mechanists, is not to be found in all the other systems of thought.

Such, in the main, is the line of reasoning followed by the adherents of Mechanism. That it is not conclusive will appear quite clearly from the following examination into its value.

Carriès.—It cannot be denied that mechanistic ideas have played a useful and creditable part in science. This is not to say that a resolution in the realm of philosophy, it has certainly stimulated research in the scientific field. This service cannot be overlooked, even though one be convinced of the inability of Mechanism to provide us with a formula of the universe. It is none the less true, however, that Mechanism as a cosmic theory may be possible.

(1) First of all, there is in the progress of natural phenomena a fundamental fact which Mechanism is unable to account for, the irreversibility of cosmic events. All motion is reversible: when a moving object has covered the distance from A to B, we at once understand that it can go back over the path from B to A. A inanimate motion, it is not clear why events in nature should not at times retrace their march, why the fruit should not return to the flower, the flower to the bud, the tree itself to the plant and finally to the seed. True, it is shown that this reversion, even in the mechanistic hypothesis, is exceedingly improbable, but it would not be impossible. Now such reversion, in the case of certain phenomena at least, is more than improbable; it is inconceivable, for instance, that our limbs should be bruised before the fall which causes the bruise. This irreversibility of cosmic processes is undoubtedly, as the Mechanists themselves admit, the chief difficulty against their system.

Next, then, within the field of biology, the difficulties against Mechanism multiply. Granted that this doctrine has served as a guide to many successful investigators, what have they attained in the last analysis? They have not advanced one step nearer to the "formula of life." All the biological facts so far examined and understood have been brought into the category of physical-chemical activities; that was expected; but that is not life. A particular phase is isolated for examination, and the characteristic mark of life is thereby destroyed. For that which characterizes life experimentally considered, is the unity, the solidarity of all these particular activities; all converge to one common purpose, the constitution of the living being in its undeniable individuality. A reproduction of forms and ends is found in disintegrating it by analysis. The conflict with Mechanism has now been carried into the experimental field, and the last few years have yielded an ever increasing number of observations which seem to defy all mechanistic reduction. These are chiefly concerned with abnormal conditions which are brought about during life. For example, sea urchin embryos, taken when they have progressed far enough to permit the determination of the normal growth of each part, and divided into two or three segments, produce as many animals as there were artificial segments. Must not the conclusion be that there exists in each embryo an entelechy as Driesch says, using Aristotle's term—which is one in the whole organism and is entire within each part? Is not this the very contrary of Mechanism which claims to reduce everything to the movements (interwoven of course, but really independent) of the parts? It is not surprising, therefore, that the adherents of neo-Vitalism should now be numerous, and that their ranks are growing fast.

(3) But it is principally before logical and philosophical criticism, that Mechanism seems to give way completely. Those very ideas on the nature of explanation, according to which it is attempted to reduce all reality to terms of the supposed primary notions of mass and motion, would be in ever attaining the whole of reality. The present must be reduced to the past, the new to that which is already known, the complex to the more simple; but this original datum remains, that the complex and the simple are not identical, that the new fact is not the fact which was already known. If we suppose all that was maintained in the above paragraphs to be resolved by analysis to simple elements already known, we have still to explain their combination, their unity in the complex; and it is just these that have been destroyed by the explanatory analysis. Given that there is something to explain, something unknown, it is clear that there is something beyond the known and the old, and there must inevitably be some means of bringing the numerous elements, which are the species or for the individual, may in a very broad sense be called the "form." Explanations based on analysis do not discover the form, because they begin by destroying it. It may be said, in a particular but entirely acceptable sense, that the "form" explains why because, to begin with, the form is by its very nature irreducible. But from this to the denial of form is a very far cry. The scholastics of the decadent period erred in regarding forms as explanatory principles, but Mechanism distorts the reality by reducing it to its "matter," by ignoring its specific and its individual unity. For the same reason, the mechanical interpretations of the dynamic aspect of things, that is to say of cosmic evolution, prove futile. It is of course instructive in the highest degree to know what previous state of the universe accounts for the present state of things; but to look on those anterior efficient causes of things as the adequate representations of their effects, is to lose sight of the fact that the anterior causes were causes; the consequence is an absolute "statism" and a denial of all causality.

Similar observations might be made on the subject of final causes. The meaning itself of the word finality has undergone singular changes since Aristotle and the thirteenth century. Let it suffice to note that finality has its basis in the intellectual nature of an efficient cause, or in the internal tendency of a form viewed from the standpoint of activity, of dynamism. The decadent Scholastics weakened their position when they relied on forms and ends only as means of scientific explanations strictly so called, while Mechanists are clearly in error when they seek in these same scientific explanations for an account of reality to the anterior causes were causes; the consequence is an absolute "statism" and a denial of all causality.

Similar observations might be made on the subject of final causes. The meaning itself of the word finality has undergone singular changes since Aristotle and the thirteenth century. Let it suffice to note that finality has its basis in the intellectual nature of an efficient cause, or in the internal tendency of a form viewed from the standpoint of activity, of dynamism. The decadent Scholastics weakened their position when they relied on forms and ends only as means of scientific explanations strictly so called, while Mechanists are clearly in error when they seek in these same scientific explanations for an account of reality to the anterior causes were causes; the consequence is an absolute "statism" and a denial of all causality.

Conclusion.—Mechanism is a cosmological theory which holds that all phenomena in nature are reduc-
liable to simple phenomena in such a manner that the ultimate realities of the material world are mass and motion, and not signal sense; it exhibits in great clearness the material causes or pheno-
omena; indeed, this explains why its formulae may, in exceptional cases, provide a formula applicable to some fact as yet unknown. But it is impossible to re-
gard Mechanism as a real representation of our uni-
verse. It wrought its own ruin when it claimed a scope and significance which are denied it by the reality of things and the exigencies of logic.

All general treatises on philosophy give at least a few pages to Mechanism. See also: MERCIER, Psychologie, I (Louvain, 1868); MERCIER, Les Physiognomies des deux sexes (Paris, 1862);滥 and LOUVAIN (2nd ed., Louvain, 1906); FRENCH, Die grossen Weltreligionen (Freiburg, 1907); GEMELE, L’Esprit de la pensée scientifique (Lyon, 1912); VON MINSKY, Versuche über Naturphilosophie (Leipzig, 1905); DRIESSCH, Der Vitalismus als Gesch. u. als Lehre (Leipzig, 1906); and many others.

La Pensée et la Science, in Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques (Kain, Belgium, 1907);

BRUNNER, La Dégradation de l’Energie (Paris, 1908).

M. P. DE MUNNYCEN.

Mehitar (MEHTIAR, MEHITAR, MICHITAR or MOCHITAR, a word which means “Comforter”), is the name taken by Peter Manuk, founder of the religious order, who became a monk at the cen-
ter of Sebasta (Silvases) in Lesser Armenia, b. 7 Feb-
ruary, 1676, of parents reputed noble, he was left until the age of fifteen in the care of two pious nuns. There, the oldest of the cloister of the Holy Cross near Sebasta, and the same year (1801), was ordained deacon by Bishop Anahid. Shortly after, he was consecrated bishop by those who later became his monks. At this time, he left the cloister, not cutting off the habit or infringing his vows (the Eastern monk could, for a proper reason, lawfully leave the enclo-
sure) and set forth, in the company of a doctor of that city, for Etchmiadzin, the capital of Greater Armenia, persuaded that it was the centre of civiliza-
tion and the home of all the sciences. During his jour-
ney he met with European missionaries and a fellow Armenian, whose accounts of the wonders of the West changed the course of his life. Stirred with an admiration of Western culture and the desire to introduce it among his countrymen, he wan-
dered from place to place, earning a scanty living by teaching. After eighteen months he returned to Sebasta where he remained for some time, still ambiti-
ous to study Western civilization. Even then he had con-
ceived the idea of founding a religious society—
suggested, doubtless, by the well-intentioned but long
since suppressed association of the “United Brothers”—which would labour to introduce Western ideas and Westernmonoistic as the one at Ancusa. This would be a
formal union of the Armenian Church with Rome, and there would be an end of that wavering between Constantine and Rome, so injurious to the spiritual
and intellectual welfare of his country. At Sebasta, he devoted himself to the reading of the Armenian
sacred writers and the Syrian and Greek Fathers in translations, and, after a vain attempt to return to Eu-
rope from Alexandria, he was ordained priest (1696)
in his own city, and (1699) received the title and staff
of doctor (Vartabed). Then he began to preach, and
went to Constantineple with the intention of founding
an Armenian College. He continued his preaching there, generally in the church of St. George, gathered some disciples around him, and distinguished himself by his advocacy of union with the Holy See. Serious trouble ensued with a violent persecution of the Cathol-
ics by the Turks, excited by the action of Count Ferrol, minister of Louis XIV at Stamboul, who car-
ried off to Paris the anti-Catholic Patriarch of Con-
stantinople. Naturally, the fervour of Mehitar and his monks led to an attack of the Church on the Catholic Patriarch, which they combated with the Holy See. The two patriarchs, urged by a schismatic, Avedik, led the attack. Mehitar wisely dismissed his disciples and himself took refuge in a Capuchin convent under French protection. Pursued by his enemies, he es-
caped to the Morea, thence to Venetian territory, find-
ing shelter in a Jesuit house. He attributed his safety to St. Joseph, whose protector he was engaged to be on his return; and the Feast of his Nativity, he had solemnly placed himself and his society.

The Venetians kindly gave him some property at Modon (1701), where he built a church and convent, and laid the foundations of the Mechitarist Order. Clement XI gave it formal approval in 1712, and ap-
pointed Mehitar Bishop of Venice later that year; but between Venice and the Porte, and the new abbe
was in jeopardy. The abbot, leaving seventy of his monks behind, crossed over to Venice with sixteen companions with the intention of beginning a second foundation. It was well that he did so for the Vene-
tian government was deposed and the Morea was regained by the Turks. Modon was abandoned and the monks dispersed. The house renting at Ven-

ice proved too small and Mehitar exerted all his influence to obtain the gift of San Lazzaro, an island about two miles south-east of the city, not far from the Lido. His request granted, he restored the old ruined church, and a second time built a monastery for his monks. This was the present convent, now situated in the hands of the Mechitarists to the present day. At St. Lazzaro he devised many schemes for the regeneration of his country. An accusation brought against him at Rome—not a personal charge but one connected with the labours undertaken by the order—ended in 1716 in a bitter misunderstanding with the Holy See, and the personal friendship of Clement XI. He died at St. Lazzaro for thirty years, busy with his printing-
press and his literary labours, and died at the age of seventy-four, on 16 April, 1749. Since his death he is always spoken of by his children as the Abbas Pater, Abbad hairim (see Mechitarists). The most important works are the following: “Commentary on the Gospel of St. Ma-
thew” (1737); “Commentary on Ecclesiasticus” (Venice); “Armenian Grammar”; “Armenian Gram-
mar of the Vulgar Tongue”; “Armenian Dictionary” (1744, and in two volumes, Venice, 1749–69); “Ar-
menian Catechism”, both in the literary and vulgar
tongues; “A Poem on the Blessed Virgin”; “Ar-
menian Bible” (1734).

Vita dell’abbate Mehtiar (Venice, 1810); La vie du serviteur de Dieu Mehtiar, fondateur de l’ordre des moines arméniens chrétiens de Venise, ainsi que de deux siècles et les plus célèbres de la congrégation (Venice, 1901).

J. C. ALMOND.

Mechitarists. Armenian Benedictines, founded by Mechitar in 1712. In its inception the order was
looked upon merely as an attempted reform of Eastern
monachism. P. Filippo Bonanni, S.J., writes at Rome, in 1712 when the order received its approval,
of the arrival of P. Elias Martyr and P. Jaonnes Simon, two Armenian monks sent by Mechitar to Pope Clement XI to offer His Holiness the most
humble subjection of himself and convent (ut et si cum
suis religiosis humillime subjectet). There is no men-
tion, at the moment, of the Benedictine rule. The
monks, such as St. Anthony instituted in Egypt (quos
St. Antonius in Aegypto instituerat), have begun a
foundation in Modon with Mechitar (Mochtir) as
abbot.

After two years’ novitiate, they take the usual
vows, with a fourth in addition—"to give obedience to
the preceptor or master deputed by their superior to

teach them the dogmas of the Catholic Faith". Many
of them vow themselves also to missionary work in
Armenia, Persia, and Turkey, where they live on alms
and wear the habits of the Oriental Church beneath the tunic, a cross of red
cloth, on which are certain letters signifying their
desire to shed their blood for the Catholic Faith. They
promise on oath to work together in harmony so
that they may the better win the schismaticas back to
God. They elect an abbot for life, who has the power


to dismiss summarily any of his monks who should prove disorderly. They wear the beard, Oriental fashion; and have a black habit—white, cloak and hood. In the engraving attached to the description, the Mechitarist would be indistinguishable from a regular hermit of St. Augustine, except for his beard. When, however, Pope Clement XI gave them his approval, it was as monks under the rule of St. Benedict, and he appointed Mechitar the first abbot. This was an honor greater than the introduction of Western monasticism into the East. There, up to this time, a monk undertook no duties but to fill his place in the monastery. He admitted no vocation but to save his soul in the cloister. He had, in theory, at least, broken off all relations with the outside world. He had no idea of making himself useful to mankind, or of doing good while he preserved his duties, his prayers, his fasting, and the monastic obedience. He belonged to no religious order but was simply a monk. Now, as a Benedictine, he would be expected to devote himself to some useful work and take some thought of his neighbour. It is clear, from P. Bonanini's description, that Mechitar and his monks wished the same thing, and had a holy and pious conception of the monk's vocation. The adoption of the Benedictine rule, therefore, was merely a recognition of their desire to devote themselves to apostolic work among their schismatic brethren, to instruct their ignorance, exalt their devotion and bring them back into the communion of the one true Catholic and Apostolic Church. It is true that later, the monks' works the church, and they afterwards lapse into the apathy and inactivity associated in the Eastern mind with the life of the cloister. It is not quite accurate to speak of them as a Benedictine "Congregation", though it is their customary description. They are a new "Order" of monks living under the rule of St. Benedict, as distinct from the Orthodox and Greek and there the Oriental in the vestries, or Olivetans. Hence we do not find them classed among the numerous congregations of the Benedictine order.

Missionaries, writers, and educationists, devoted to the service of their Armenian brethren wherever they might be found, such were and are these Benedictines of the Eastern Church. Their subjects usually enter the convent at an early age, eight or nine years old, receive in it their elementary schooling, spend about nine years in philosophical and theological study, at the canonical age of twenty-five, if sufficiently prepared, are ordained priests by their bishop-abbot, and are then employed by him in the various enterprises of the Oriental Church, and in the conversion of the heathen, by priestly ministry to the Armenian communities settled in most of the commercial centres of Europe. With this is joined, where needed and possible, the apostolate of union with Rome. Next there is the education of the Armenian youth, and, associated with this, the preparation and publication of good and useful Armenian literature. The parent abbey is that of St. Lazzaro at Venice; next in importance is that at Vienna, founded in 1810; there is a large convent and college for lay-students at Padua, the legacy of a pious Armenian who died at Madras; in the year 1846 another rich benefactor, Samuel Morin, founded a similar establishment at Paris. Other houses are in Austria-Hungary, Russia, Persia and Turkey—fourteen in all, according to the latest statistics, with one hundred and fifty-two monks, the majority of whom are priests. Not a great development for an order two hundred years old; but its extension is necessarily restricted because of its exclusive devotion to persons and things Armenian. Armenian influence has been felt in that country, and has been not only directive in the way of holiness and true service to God and His Church, but creative of a wholesome national ambition and self-respect. Apostles of culture and progress, they may be said, with strict justice, to have preserved from degradation and neglect the language and literature of their country, and in so doing, have been the saviors of the Armenian race. Individually, the monks are distinguished by their linguistic accomplishments, and the Vienna establishment has attracted attention by the institution of a Literary Academy, which confers honorary membership without regard to race or religion.

In their one of their many undertakings their founder, Mechitar, personally showed them the way. To him they owe the initiative in the study of the Armenian writings of the fourth and fifth centuries, which has resulted in the development and adoption of a literary language, nearly as distinct from the vulgar tongue as Latin is from Italian. Thus the modern Armenian remains in touch with a distinguished and inspiring past, and has at its service a rich and important literature which otherwise would have been left, unknown or unheeded, to decay. Mechitar, with his Armenian "Imitation" and "Bible", began that series of translations of great books, which, continued unceasingly during two centuries, and ranging from the early Fa-

Missionary of the Church and the works of St. Thomas of Aquino (one of their first great Catholic authors) and the best known poets and historians of later days. At one period, in connexion with their Vienna house, there existed an association for the propagation of good books, which is said to have distributed nearly half a million volumes, and printed and published edicts and other works each year. To him also they owe the guidance of their first steps in the study of the history of learning in which they have won most distinction—and the kindred studies of the Liturgy and the religious history of their country. At S. Lazzaro he founded the printing press from which the most notable of their productions have been issued, and composed the translation of Armenian manuscripts for which their library has become famous. To the members of the order the history of the Mechitarists has been uneventful, because of the quiet, untiring, plodding along ancient, traditional paths, and the admirable fidelity to the spirit and ideals of their founder (see Mechitar).

It has been principally by means of the Mechitarists' innumerable periodicals, pious manuals, Bibles, maps, engravings, dictionaries, histories, geographies and other contributions to educational and popular literature, that they have done good service to the Armenian Church and nation. Following are the most valuable of their contributions to the common cause of religion.

First, in the 18th century, the famous Armenian translations, of some lost works of the Fathers of the Church. Among them may be noted "Letters (thirteen) of St. Ignatius of Antioch"; and a fuller and more authentic "History of the Martyrdom of St. Ignatius"; some works of St. Ephrem the Syrian, notably a sort of "Harmony of the Gospels" and a "Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul"; an exceptionally valuable edition of "Eusebius's History". The publication of these works is due to the famous Mechitarist Dom J. B. Aucher, who was assisted in the last of them by Cardinal Mai. To Aucher also we are indebted for a German translation of the "Armenian Missal" (Tubingen, 1845) and "Dom Johannis philosophi Cenomenni Armenorum Catholici (a.p., 718) Opera" (Venice, 1534). Two original historical works may also be noted: "The History of Armenia", by P. Michel Tschantcheshian (1784-8); and the "Quadro della storia letteraria di Armenia" by Mgr. Pl. Sukias Somal (Venice, 1829).

Tschantcheshian, Comprensone notizia sulla congregazione di S. Lazzaro Armeni Mechitaristi (Venice, 1819); Neumann, Essai d'une histoire de la Liturgie et de l'Art Eklemeian. Une esquisse de l'activité littéraire-typographique de la Congrégation mechitariste de Venise en direction encyclopédique de l'Église Catholique, XIV. Art. Mechitaristes. J. C. Almond.
Mechlin (Lat. Mechinia; Fr. Malines), Archbishopric of (Mechlinensis), comprises the two Belgian provinces of Antwerp and Brabant. The diocese derives its name from the Latinisation of the French Concordat of 1801. The ecclesiastical province of Mechlin is coextensive with the Belgian Kingdom (suffragan bishoprics: Turnhout, Liège, Namur, Gand, Bruges); it extended to the Rhine under Napoleon I. The city of Mechlin, prior to 1559, belonged to the deanery of the abbey and to the archdeaconry of the same name in the diocese of Cambrai. Its importance ecclesiastically was due to the ancient Chapter of Canons of the collegiate church of St. Rombaut. Paul IV, by his bull “Super universi orbis ecclesiae” (12 May, 1559) created a new hierarchy in the Netherlands composed of three metropolitan (Mechlin, Cambrai, Utrecht) and fifteen episcopal sees. The Archbishop of Mechlin was raised to the dignity of primate by the Constitutions of Pius IV in 1560 and 1561. The Christian Faith was zealously preached in the present diocese during the seventh and eighth centuries. It is known that Antwerp was visited by St. Eligius, Bishop of Tournaí (d. 690), and by St. Amand, the Apostle of Flanders and Bishop of Mastricht (d. 679). The latter was succeeded by St. Lambert (d. about 700) and St. Hubert (d. 727) are said to have visited Mechlin and Brabant. This evangelical work was followed up by the Anglo-Saxon missionaries St. Willibrord (d. 738) and St. Rumold or Rombaut (d. about 775). St. Rombaut was martyred at Mechlin, and became the city’s patron saint, and subsequently the patron saint of the Netherlands. The church of the saints of this diocese are several members of Pepin of Landen’s family, his widow St. Itta, foundress of the Abbey of Nivelles, his daughters, St. Gertrude (d. 659) and St. Begga (d. 695); the two sisters St. Gudule (d. 712) and St. Rainilde; in the ninth century St. Liborius of Mechlin and St. Guidom of Anderlecht; St. Vivian of Louvain, in the tenth century, and St. Thomas Becket, St. Dymphna, St. Gertrude of Grand Bé (d. 1170); St. Albert of Louvain, Prince Bishop of Liège and martyr (d. 1192); St. Marie d’Orignies (d. 1232); St. Lutgard (d. 1246), and Blessed Alice (d. 1250), both Cistercian nuns, the former in Aywières, the latter at la Cambre; St. Boniface of Brussels, Bishop of Lausanne (d. 1265); Blessed Jeannette of Wavrin; the Reformed Martin, endaeal, because of his mystical writings known as the “divine and admirable doctor” (d. 1381); several priests put to death by the Calvinists at Gorecum (1572); the Jesuits, St. John Berchmans of Diest, patron of student youth (d. 1621), and Venerable Leonard Leys (Leissius) of Brecht, renowned for his penitential treatises (d. 1592).

It was at the beginning of the twelfth century that Tanchelm, a native of Zealand, became known, chiefly in Antwerp, for his violent attacks on the hierarchy, and the Sacraments, especially the Holy Eucharist. He shared the pernicious errors of the Adamites, and gave an example of the worst kind of debauchery. He was excommunicated by Nicolas of Cambrai and excommunicated Jonas, one of the promoters of Catharism in Brabant. A little later numerous Beghards and Beguines fell into the errors of the sect known as the Brothers of the Free Spirit. To this sect also belonged the nun, Sister Badewije (Hedwige) or Bloemardine, who gained numerous pupils in Brussels. Her writings were refuted by Jean de Ruysbroeck. Bloemardine died about 1336, but her followers lived on, and as late as about 1410 Pierre d’Ailly, Bishop of Cambrai, was compelled to take measures against them. The Black Plague of 1349 gave rise to the processions of Flagellants. These hailed from Germany and traversed the country with the savage violence of their name has arisen. The ecclesiastical authorities were obliged to intervene on behalf of the Jews detested by the Flagellants. On the other hand, religious sentiment manifested itself in numerous monastic institutions. Affligem, the principal Benedictine abbey, dates from 1098. The people of Antwerp, whom Tanchelm had fanned to a Christian mode of life, soon arose against Brabant many Premonstratensian abbots: St. Michel at Antwerp (1124), Tongerlo (1128), le Parc near Louvain (1129), Helysimis (1130), Grimbergen (1131), Averbode (1132), Dieghem and Postel (1140). Among other abbey for men may be mentioned: the Benedictine abbey of Vlierbeek (1182); the noble abbey of St. Gertrude at Louvain, belonging to the Augustinian canons; the Cistercian abbey of Villers (1147); and of St. Bernard (1237). Some of the numerous colleges of Austin Canons are: St. Jacques sur Caudenbarg at Brussels, Hanswijk at Mechlin, Corendonck, Groenendaal, Rougecoltre and Septfontaines, all three in the forest of Soigné. In most places of consequence Augustinians, Franciscans, Carmelites and Dominicans were established. The military orders were represented at the Teutonic Commandery of Pitsenburg in Mechlin and in Beequevoort. The leading abbies for women were: Grand Bégrad and Cortenberg (Benedictines); at Turnhout, Roeschtrasselaar, Blemieux; Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekerk; the semi-monastic institution of the Beguines (q. v.), small settlements in the heart of cities or just outside city walls, is a peculiar feature of religious life in the Netherlands. They were once numerous (the number of Beguines who went forth from Mechlin to greet Charles the Bold, on the occasion of his joyful entry in 1477, was unknown), but they were successively reduced in numbers, at Mechlin, Antwerp, Louvain, Diest, Lierre, Turnhout, Hoogstraten and Herenthals. The income of the secular clergy and its improved material conditions caused the chapters of Canons to grow in number, and eventually the collegiate churches of the diocese reached a total of twenty. The instruction in theology was given by college and chapter schools. Finally Martin V, by his bull of 9 December, 1425, erected a university at Louvain.

At the close of the Middle Ages, it is well known, both faith and morals suffered a notable decay. More or less rightly, Jean Pupper de Goch (d. 1475), superior of the Thabor Convent at Mechlin, has been styled the precursor of the first Lutero in the Low Countries. The parisiens in the diocese, especially at Antwerp where his Augustinian brethren declared in his favour. Protestantism, though vigorously opposed by Charles V, was again menacing at the end of his reign, when Lutheranism gave way to Calvinism. The creation in 1589 of new sees, though an indispensable measure, placed the diocese in a very critical situation. Philip II, by removing the first Archbishop of Mechlin, Cardinal de Granvelle, deprived the Catholic and monarchical cause of its ablest champion, and thereby hastened the impending revolution. In 1566 the iconoclastic mob put to death both religious and priests, and sacked the churches and monasteries. Disorder prevailed until the Council of Trent, summoned by Pope Pius V. The people remained loyal to Catholicism and the University of Louvain proved a valiant defender, though Protestant theories exercised at the university a certain influence, particularly on Baits and Jansenius. The Archbishop of Mechlin, Jacques Boonen (1621-55), evaded the publication of the constitution “In eminentibus”, by which Urban VIII condemned the “Augustinus”; he was even temporarily suspended by Innocent X. Boonen’s submission did not put an end to the Jansenistic quarrels in the diocese. Oratorians, brought in by him, were inclined to rigorism. They opened colleges for the education of youth, and found themselves both in this field, and in the whole system of instruction, already active in anti-Protestant controversy. The partisans and the adversaries of Jansenius took sides at once with one or other of the conflicting parties. The
firmsness of the archbishops at Precipiano (1690–1711) and of Cardinal d'Allese (1715–59) repelled Jansenism, which endured however in Josephism and Febronianism. Joseph II suppressed many convents (1783), and created the General Seminary of Louvain (1786), the doctrines of which were condemned by Cardinal de Frankenberg (1759–1801). Persecution broke out afresh in the wake of the French Revolution; Catholic instruction was abolished in the churches, and pillaged, a multitude of ecclesiastics exiled, among them Cardinal de Frankenberg. The anti-Concordat schism of the Stévenistes arose under Napoleon Bonaparte. Later, King William revived the General Seminary under the name of Philosophical College, but met with as much opposition as Joseph II. The Belgian Revolt; union of 1800 to 1830; introduction in the church of French was forbidden. For the later history of Mechlin see BELGIUM. The following archbishops of Mechlin were made cardinals: Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, first archbishop (1560–83) and a remarkable statesman (q. v.); Thomas Philippe d'Allese (1716–59); Henri de Frankenberg (1759–1801); Engelbert Sierck (1852–67); Victor Arnould (q. v.); Augustin (1877–87); Pierre Lambert Goossens (1884–1906); Désiré Joseph Mercier (1906—), the chief originator of the neo-scholastic movement in Belgium.

Religious monuments: numerous edifices especially of Gothic style (Roman: St. Germain at Tirclemont, St. Gertrude at Nivelles). At Mechlin is the metropolitan church of St. Rombaut (thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), with a tower 318 feet high. There is also Notre Dame, and St. Pierre (Jesuit style). Principal other edifices: churches of Liere, Hoogstraeten, Tirclemont, Hal, Diest; and the ruins of the Abbey of Villers, the most striking monastic ruins in Belgium. The ornamentation has suffered greatly from the disorders of 1793, and particularly the organ gallery at Liere, the tabernacle at Leau, the tombs at Hoogstraeten and the stained glasses in Liere and Hoogstraeten. Of the paintings still preserved, many belong to the Antwerp School. At Mechlin there are works of Rubens in the churches of Notre Dame and St. Jean. See Antwerp, Brussels, Louvain. Pilgrimages: St. Sang at Hoogstraeten, St. Sauveur at Haekendorf (Tirclemont), Notre Dame at Maestruigh, at Hal, at Hanswyck (Mechlin). Population (1909): 24,500,680 inhabitants; 745 parishes; 51 deaneries; one theological seminary; 3 petits séminaires; 24 episcopal colleges; 108 convents for men, and 728 for women.

Mechtild is a monthly periodical founded in 1907. The "Theologia Mechilinensis" fundamental and sacramental theology, with treatises on virtues, indulgences, and reserved cases fills ten volumes; notable also are the "Scripture Commentary" of Ceulemans (nine volumes) on the Psalms and New Testament, and the work of Van der Steappen (five volumes) on Galatians. Christiana, V (Paris, 1721); Van Gent, Historia sacra et profana archiepiscopatus Mechilinensis (Le Havre, 1725); Clement, "Société de Meuse," II (1801); Godin, Malines judex et aujourd'hui (Mechlin, 1905); Foppens, Historia epiiscopatus Antverpiae (Brussels, 1717). A. Kempenaar.

Mechtild, Johann, chronicler; b. 1562 at Pfalz near Trier (Germany); d. after 1631, perhaps as late as 1653 at Trier. He is often named Pfalz after his native town where he first studied and then went to the university at Trier, conducted by the Jesuits, where the historian Christopher Brote acquired a lasting influence over him. After his ordination (about 1567), he was appointed pastor at Eltz, near Koblenz; in 1592 he became canon at Limburg and as such administered for two years the troublesome parish of Camburg. In 1604 he was appointed dean, but soon got into difficulties with his canons and finally, by request of the elector of Trier in order to restore peace, he resigned, and accepted the canonry at St. Paulinus in Trier. In Limburg as well as in Trier he studied history assiduously and carefully, and conscientiously collected documents and records, as well as inscriptions on monuments. Many of his sources are now lost therefore his works almost possess the value of originals for us. Of his writings may be mentioned: "Limburg Chronicle," the "Passio Lohenzehe," and the "Introduction in the church of Nettum." His chief work, the "Limburg Chronicle," was begun in 1610 and finished in 1612, but it was not edited until 1757 by Hornheim in his "Prodomus historiae Trevirensis," II, 1046–1166. This edition, marked by many mistakes and omissions, was published in its entirety by Knetisch in the "Publications of the Historical Commission of Nassau," VI (Wiesbaden, 1864). The revision and continuation of the old Limburg chronicle, begun by the town clerk, Tilemann, but utilizes also many other sources both printed and unprinted. His chronicle is of great value because Mechtle utilises various accounts which contain important information as to social conditions, the price of corn and wine, the cultivation of the vine, monastic conditions and wages. In treating German and early medieval history he does not rise above the level of the historians of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Both his other works are as yet unpublished; Knetisch has their contents in his edition of the chronicle X–XVI. F. E. Rascher, Die Limburger Chronik des Johannes Mech- tel (Wiesbaden, 1909), I–XXXVII.}

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Mechtilde (Matilda von Hackeborn-Wippra), Saint, Benedictine; b. in 1240 or 1241 at the ancestral castle of Helfsta, near Eisleben, Saxony; d. in the monastery of Helfsta, 19 Nov., 1298. She belonged to one of the noblest and most powerful Thuringian families, under whose dominion her father, Peter von Hackeborn, Lord of Helfsta, was a vassal of the Emperor. Gertrude of Hackeborn. Some writers have considered that Mechtilde von Hackeborn and Mechtilde von Wippra were two distinct persons, but, as the Barons of Hackeborn were also Lords of Wippra, it was customary for members of that family to take their name indifferently from either, or both of these estates. So fragile was she at birth, that the attendants, fearing she might die unchristened, hurried her off to the priest who was just then preparing to say Mass. He was a man of great sanctity, and after baptising the child, uttered these prophetic words: 'What do you fear? This child most certainly will not die, but she will become a saintly religious in whom God will work His wonders, and she will live to a good old age.' When she was seven years old, having been taken by her mother on a visit to her elder sister Gertrude, then a nun in the monastery of Rodardsdorf, she became so enamoured of the cloister that her pious parents yielded to her entreaties and, acknowledging the workings of grace, allowed her to enter the alumnage. There, being both of her mind as well as in bodi, she made remarkable progress in virtue and learning. Ten years later (1258) she followed her sister, who, now abbess, had transferred the monastery to an estate at Helfsta given her by her brothers Louis and Albert. As a nun, Mechtilde was soon distinguished for her humility, her fervour, and that extreme amiability which had characterized her from childhood and which, like piety, seemed hereditary in her race. While still very young, she became a valuable helpmate to Abbess Gertrude, who entrusted to her direction the aluminate and the choir. Mechtilde was fully equipped for her task when, in 1261, God committed to her prudent charge the business and the government of the monastery of Helfsta. This was that Gertrude who in later generations became known as St. Gertrude the Great. Gifted with a beautiful voice, Mechtilde also possessed a special talent for rendering the solemn and sacred music over which she presided as
DOMA CANTICA. All her life she held this office and trained the choir with indefatigable zeal. Indeed, Divine praise was the keynote of her life as it is of her book; in this she never tired, despite her continual and severe physical sufferings, so that in His revelations Christ was wont to call her His "nightingale". Richly endowed, naturally and supernaturally, ever gracious, she became a cause of great woe when the radiance and saintly and charming personality, there is little wonder that this cloistered virgin should strive to keep hidden her wondrous life. Souls thirsting for consolation or groping for light sought her advice; learned Dominicans consulted her on spiritual matters. At the beginning of her own mystic life it was from St. Gertrude that St. Mechtilde learned that her marvellous gifts lavished upon her were from God.

Only in her fiftieth year did St. Mechtilde learn that the two nuns in whom she had especially confided had noted down the favours granted her, and, moreover, that St. Gertrude had nearly finished a book on the subject. Much troubled at this, she, as usual, first had recourse to prayer. She had a vision of Christ holding in His hand the book of her revelations, and saying: "All this has been committed to writing by my will and inspiration; and therefore you have no cause to be troubled about it." He also told her that, as He had been so generous towards her, she must make Him a like return, and that the diffusion of these revelations would increase many in His love; moreover, He wished this book to be called "The Book of Special Grace", because it would prove such to many. When the saint understood that the book would tend to God's glory, she ceased to be troubled and even corrected the manuscript herself. Immediately after her death it was made public, and copies were rapidly multiplied, owing chiefly to the widespread influence of the Friars Preachers. Boccaccio tells how, a few years after the death of Mechtilde, the book of her revelations was brought to Florence and popularized under the title of "La Laud de donna Matelda". It is related that the Florentines were accustomed to repeat daily before their sacred images the praises learned from St. Mechtilde's book. St. Gertrude, to whose devotedness we owe the "Liber Specialis Gratiae" exclaims: "Never has there arisen one like to her in our monastery; nor, alas! I fear, will there ever arise another such!"—little dreaming that her own name would be inseparably linked with that of Mechtilde, for according even in St. Gertrude's life the name, St. Mechtilde most probably still reposes at Old Helfta though the exact spot is unknown. Her feast is kept 26 or 27 February in different congregations and monasteries of her order, by special permission of the Holy See. (For an account of the general life at Helfta and an estimate of the writings of St. Mechtilde, see GERTRUDE OF HACHEMBORN; GERTRUDE THE GREAT, SAINT.)

There is another honour, inferior certainly to that of sanctity, yet great in itself and worthy of mention here: the homage of a transcendent genius was to be laid at the feet of St. Mechtilde. Critics have long been perplexed as to one of the characters introduced by Dante in his "Purgatorio" under the name of Matelda. Speculation as to how much on each of which the process of purification is carried on, Dante, in Canto xxvii, hears a voice singing: "Vente, benedicti patris mei"; then later, in Canto xxxvii, there appears to him on the opposite bank of the mysterious stream a lady, solitary, beautiful, and gracious. To her Dante addresses himself, she is who initiates him on the road which it is his duty to traverse, and it is to her that Beatrice refers Dante in the words: "Entreat Matilda that she teach thee this." Most commentators have identified Matilda with the warrior-Cousin of Tuscany, the spiritual daughter and dauntless champion of St. Gregory VII, but all agree that beyond the name the two have little or nothing in common. She is no Amazon who, at Dante's prayer that she may draw nearer to let him understand her song, turns towards him "not otherwise than a virgin that droppeth her modest eyes". In more places than one the revelations granted to the mystics of Helfta seem in turn to have become the inspirations of the Florentine poet. All writers on Dante recognize his indebtedness to St. Augustine, the Pseudo-Philoenaus, St. Bernard, and St. Victor. These are precisely the writers whose doctrines had been most assimilated by the mystics of Helfta, and thus they would the more appeal to the sympathies of the poet. The city of Florence was among the first to welcome St. Mechtilde's book. Now Dante, like all true poets, was a child of his age, and could not but be aware that the work was so popular among his fellow-citizens. The "Purgatorio" was finished between 1314 and 1318, or 1319—just about the time when St. Mechtilde's book was popular. This interpretation is supported by the fact that St. Mechtilde in her "Book of Special Grace" (pt. i, c. iii) describes the place of purification under the same figure of a seven-turreted mountain. The coincidence of the simile and of the name, Matelda, can scarcely be accidental. For another among many points of resemblance between the two writers compare "Purgatorio", Canto xxx, where Dante is drawn by Matelda through the mysterious stream with pt. i, c. iv of the "Book of Special Graces". The serene atmosphere which seems to cling about the chaste and beautiful songstress, her virgin modesty and simple dignity, all seem to point to the recule of Helfta rather than to the stern heroine of Canossa, whose hand was thrice bestowed in marriage. Besides, in politics Dante, as an ardent Ghibelline, supported the imperial pretensions of the Empire, which was little inclined to sing the praises of the Tuscan Countess. The conclusion may therefore be hazarded that this "Donna Matelda" of the "Purgatorio" personifies St. Mechtilde as representing mystic theology.

St. MECHTILDE, Liber specialis gratiae; St. GERTRUDE, Legua divinae potentiae; Preface to Revolutionem (Gertrudiana) ed. J. J. Schwabacher, I. (Paris and Poitiers, 1875); IBIDEM, St. Gertrude (Paris, 1907); EISENBERGER, Frl. Ida. Bened. (Vienna, 1784); PASSERI, Deutsch. Mon. I (Leipzig, 1874); Revolutiones de S. Mechtilde (Paris and Poitiers, 1906).

GERTRUDE CANANOVA.

Mecthilde of the Blessed Sacrament. See ADORATION, PERPETUAL.

Mechtilde of Magdeburg, a celebrated medieval mystic, b. c. 1210; d. at the Cistercian nunery of Helfta near Eisleben, c. 1285. She experienced her first inspirations at the age of twelve, when, as herself states, she was greeted by the Holy Ghost. From that time, the greeting was repeated daily. Under this inspiration she desired to be despoiled by all without, however, desiring it, and for this purpose left her home, where she had always been loved and respected, to become a Beguine at Magdeburg in 1230. Here, under the spiritual guidance of the Dominicans, she led a life of prayer and extreme mortification. Her heavenly inspirations and ecstatic visions became more frequent and were of such a nature that they dispelled from the mind of her confessors and other persons of her order any doubt that, on her part, she had received her visions. Shortly after 1270 she joined the Cistercian nuns at Helfta, where she spent the remaining twelve years of her life, highly respected as one signally favoured by God, especially by her namesake St. Mechtilde of Hackeborn and by St. Gertrude the Great. Mechtilde left to the world a most wonderful work which she recorded by manifold inspirations and visions. According to her assertion, God ordered the title of the book to be "Vliessene dicht miner gotheit in allu die hersen die da lebent ane valsicht", i.e. "Light of my divinity, flowing into all hearts that live without guile". The work is commonly styled "Das fliessene Licht der Gottheit". She wrote her inspirations on separate
Mecklenburg, a division of the German Empire, consists of the two Grand Duchies of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Strelitz.

History.—At the beginning of the Christian era, Mecklenburg was inhabited by Germanic tribes, but as early as the second century they began to leave the district; Slavonic tribes poured in, and by about A.D. 600 they had complete possession of the land. These Slavonic tribes were principally Wends, of whom the Obotrites occupied the western parts, the Lusici, or Wilsen, the eastern. Their chief occupations were forestry, cattle-raising, hunting, and fishing. Their religion was a mixture of the Teutonic and Aryan elements, and the first Christian to convert the Mazuric tribes of Mecklenburg was Radegast Zurasici, whose sanctuary at Rethra was the centre of his worship for the whole of Mecklenburg until it was destroyed in the twelfth century, and replaced by Svantevit, the "holy oracle", whose temple was at Arkona on the Island of Rügen. After Charlemagne had brought the Saxons into subjection, the Slavonic tribes of Mecklenburg became the neighbours of the Frankish Empire, with which an active trade soon sprang up. Commerce was still further developed under the Saxon emperors (919-1024), the most important mart for the Slavs being Bardowieck.

Charlemagne's conquests in this region were lost soon after his death. Henry I of Germany (916-36) was the first to force the Slavonic territory again to pay tribute (928); he also placed it under the jurisdiction of Saxon counts. With the domination of the Germans, Christianity found ingress into the land. Bishop Adalward of Verden brought the first Obotrite prince into the Church. Otto the Great (936-973) divided Mecklenburg between the two marquises he had formed. Ecclesiastically, the land belonged partly to the Dioceses of Havelberg and Brandenburg, partly to the Diocese of Oldenburg, that was erected in 968. However, there can hardly be said to have been a systematic attempt at conversion to Christianity, for the German author it had no secure foundation. The early successes in conversion to Christianity were swept away by an insurrection of the Slavs, after the defeat of the Emperor Otto II in Calabria in 928. The Obotrites under Mishtiwoi, who had previously accepted Christianity, plundered and burned Hamburg, ravaged the whole of North Albingia (Holstein), crossed the Elbe and advanced as far as Mülden. Every trace of Christianity was destroyed. There was much strife between German and Wend in the succeeding decades. It was not until the reign of Henry II (1002-1024) that the Lusici and Obotrites became allies of the German Empire against the Polish Duke Boleslaw. Towards the end of his life Mishtiwoi turned in repentance once more to Christian religion in Mülden, and ended his days in the monastery of Bardowieck.

Archbishop Unwans of Hamburg (from 1013) laboured with energy and success; but the Saxon dukes exacted a heavy tribute, which was the chief reason why the Christian teaching protected by them was regarded with little favour, even though the Wendic rulers Udo and Ratibor became Christians. Udo's son Gottschalk faithfully supported Archbishop Adalbert of Bremen, and frequently explained Christian doctrine at church to his people. Churches and monasteries rapidly appeared. New dioceses were founded in addition to the Diocese of Oldenburg, namely, Ratzeburg under Bishop Aristo, and Mecklenburg under Bishop John, a Scot. The conversion of the entire country to Catholicity seemed assured. But the fermentation of the old antagonism to the trade to the empire and the Saxon dukes led to a heated reaction. The first victim was Gottschalk himself, in 1066. On 15 July of the same year the twenty-eight monks of the Benedictine monastery at Ratzeburg were stoned to death. The seculars, Bishop John and many other Christians were slain, and in a few months the German supremacy was withdrawn. The Wends even plundered the Christian cities of Schleswig and Hamburg, the bishop of the latter being obliged to transfer his see to Bremen. The bloody national god Radegast of Rethra became once more dominant.

Michael Ott.
Cruto, Prince of the Island of Rügen, ruled the country for nearly thirty years. Finally in 1093, Cruto having been murdered, Gottschalk's son, Henry, was able to gain his inheritance. Although a Christian, he never attempted to force Christianity upon the Wends. Indeed, his only church in his capital, Lübeck, where St. Vicelin proclaimed the word of God from 1126. Soon after Henry's death (1126) his family became extinct, and the Emperor Lothair granted the vacant territory in fief to Henry's Danish cousin, Knut Laward, Duke of Schleswig. Claims were also made by Henry's nephew Pribislaw, and by Niklot, a Wodwotere noble. These two divided the rulerless land between them when in 1131 Knut Laward was killed by his cousin Magnus. Pribislaw, however, could not maintain himself long against the German advance. He was obliged to surrender in 1142 to Count Adolf of Schauenburg, who repelled the almost desolate territory with colonists from Flanders, Holland, Westphalia, and Friesia. Niklot, on the other hand, preserved his independence until, after a protracted struggle, he was subdued by Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony. Upon agreeing to accept Christianity and to acknowledge German supremacy, Niklot was allowed to retain his possessions (1147). However, he subsequently headed a revolt, which ended with his capture and death by Henry the Lion. Pribislaw II, the ancestor of the reigning dynasty, had been baptized in the year 1167, he was established as ruler.

Hartwig of Stade, Bishop of Bremen, soon provided for the restoration of the former Wendi dioceses. In 1150 he consecrated Vicelin Bishop of Oldenburg, and Hermann Bishop of Schwerin. The Wends, however, now becoming the see of the latter. Hartwig had not waited to secure an endowment sufficient for them from the Saxon duke. Henry the Lion, therefore, was soon able to obtain for himself what otherwise only belonged to the emperor, the right of investiture for the Obotrite dioceses. This privilege was granted by the Pope in the year 1169. The new bishop, the son of Henry the Lion, who regarded Henry as one of the most trustworthy supporters of his power. At the same time Henry was empowered to found dioceses and churches in the region on the farther side of the Elbe and to endow them with imperial domains, which was what the conquered Slavonic territory was held to be. In 1154 Henry VII founded the Benedictine monastery of Dobberan, and in 1157 he consecrated the Abbot of Ebelaker. In 1167 Hartwig had appointed him as bishop of Evermod, cathedral provost of Magdeburg. A number of Christian Germans came into the region, and the Wends were brought to accept Christianity. The land was rapidly covered with churches, parishes, and monasteries. Besides the Cistercian monastery of Dobberan that Pribislaw endowed largely with lands, there were founded monasteries of Benedicites, Franciscans, Premonstratensians, of the religious orders of Knights Hospitalers, of St. Anthony, etc.

In 1170 Frederick Barbarossa raised Pribislaw to the dignity of a prince of the empire. On Pribislaw's death in 1178, however, domestic disputes broke out, and in 1180 Duke Henry Burwy II died. The Slavonic power in 1180 weakened German power in the northern part of the empire. Denmark was thus enabled to bring under its authority large portions of North Germany, Mecklenburg being obliged to recognize Danish supremacy in the reign of Henry Burwy I (1178-1227). In 1227 Henry Burwy, in conference with the Counts of Schwerin, the Archbishops of Bremen and the city of Lübeck, cast off the Danish yoke. Thereupon the influx of German colonists received a new impetus, and, in the first half of the thirteenth century, a German municipality had already developed there. After the death of Henry Burwy, the territory was divided (1229) into four principalities: Mecklenburg, Werle, Rostock, and Parchim. The two latter lines died out in 1514 and 1516 respectively; that of Werle flourished until 1436. The main branch of the Mecklenburg line was founded by John II (1226-64). One of its members, Henry the Pilgrim (1264-1302) was captured at Cairo in 1271, while on a crusade, and kept prisoner until 1297. His son, the Emperor Charles IV, granted the district of Stargard as a dowry with his wife, Beatrice of Brandenburg, and, on the Rostock line becoming extinct, forced the Danes to recognize him as the hereditary possessor of the city and territory of Rostock, then under Danish supremacy. Henry's two sons, Albert II (d. 1379) and John I (d. 1392), were made dukes and princes of the empire by the Emperor Charles IV. The partition of 1352 led to the founding of the Stargard line, which became extinct in 1471.

In 1358 Albert succeeded in obtaining the County of Schwerin by purchase; his scheme to place his eldest son, Henry III, on the Danish throne failed completely, but his second son, Albert III, was elected King of Sweden in 1363. However, soon after Albert III had succeeded his father in the government of Mecklenburg (1383), a rival claimant of the throne of Sweden appeared in the person of Queen Margaret of Denmark. In 1389 Margaret took Albert prisoner, and did not release him until, after six years of captivity, he renounced all claims to the Swedish throne. In 1409, Albert Viki, the younger of Albert's two sons, took the title of Duke of Pomerania and Warm, as cousin, Henry the Fat (1422-77), who, after the Stargard line—to which the foundation of a university at Rostock in 1418 is due—had become extinct, reigned over the whole of Mecklenburg, thus once more united under a single ruler (1417). Henry's successor, Magnus (1477-1503), was a very energetic prince. The cities had, under King Albert, grown too strong and insubordinate; Magnus directed his efforts towards bringing them under the control of the ruler and evolving a unified state out of a confused medley of districts, cities, and estates. For a time his sons, Henry V (1503-52) and Albert VII (1503-47), reigned jointly so as to maintain the country undivided. In 1536 the brothers divided their dominions, Henry becoming Duke of Schwerin and Albert Duke of Güstrow. The Reformation in Mecklenburg was entirely the work of the two joint rulers, Henry V and Albert VII. Even Protestant historians have testified that before the Reformation the country had excellent bishops, a pious clergy, and a genuinely Catholic population. Both duties were early won over to Luther's cause by the Humanist Konrad Pegel, whom Henry had called from the University of Rostock as tutor for his son Magnus, the postulated Bishop of Schwerin. The duke had permitted Pegel to go to Wittenberg, whence the latter returned an ardent adherent of Luther. Albert, indeed, soon abandoned the new doctrine and maintained the old faith in his part of the country. On the other hand, from 1524 Henry V had surrounded the new emperor's palace with a chapel of the castle at Schwerin, and protected the preachers even in his brother's domains. Henry's chief desire was to obtain the Bishopric of Schwerin. Its administrator, his son Magnus, who had married in 1543, died childless in 1550, and Henry saw to it that the chapter elected as successor his nephew Ulrich.

When after Albert's death in the year 1547 his son John Albert (1547-70) came to power, the Reformation was completely established. John Albert was first sole ruler in his father's dominions, then in 1552 he also succeeded his uncle in Schwerin, but he resigned the latter principality in 1555 to his brother Ulrich. In 1548 the joint diet at Sternberg proclaimed the Lutheran Faith to be the religion of the state, and from
1552 the monasteries were secularized, except Dobbedin, Malchow, and Ribnitz, which in 1572, in exchange for the ducal debts, were kept in existence for the unmarried daughters of the nobility, and have since continued to the present day. The administration of the few Protestant Dioceses of Schwerin and Ratzeburg was carried on by members of the ruling dynasty. The Mass, pilgrimages, vows of religion etc., were forbidden, and by a consistorial decree of 1570 the public profession of the Catholic Faith was prohibited.

After a brief reunion of the two principalities in 1610, they were again divided (1621) into Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Gustrow by John Albert's grandsons, Adolf Frederick I and John Albert II. They still retained, however, in common the diet (held now in Sternberg and now in Malchow), the University of Rostock, and the consistory. During the Thirty Years' War both dukes formed a brief alliance with King Christian IV of Denmark. For this they were placed under a ban by the Emperor Ferdinand IV in 1628, and their territories, from which they were expelled, were granted to Wallenstein in 1629 as an imperial fief. In 1631 Gustavus Adolphus restored them their lands, and in 1635, after the fall of Wallenstein, they were again recognized by the emperor. During the Thirty Years' War the oppression of both the Swedish and the imperial forces, and also from pestilence and famine. The Peace of Westphalia (1648) assigned the Dioceses of Schwerin and Ratzeburg as principalities to Schwerin, in return for which the city of Wismar and the districts of Poel and Neukloster were yielded to Sweden. Adolf Frederick II of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Schwerin by Christian Ludwig (1558-92), who, both before and after his succession, lived mainly at Paris, where he became a Catholic in 1663. This step opened Mecklenburg once more to Catholics (see below), it gave them no secure legal footing even in Schwerin, while in Mecklenburg-Gustrow the most brutal toleration of everything Catholic continued to prevail.

When Christian Ludwig I died childless in 1692, his nephew Frederick William laid claim to the succession, and was opposed by Adolf Frederick II of Strelitz, the only brother of Christian then living. After a long dispute, the Hamburg Compact was made in 1693 which divided Schwerin and Leopold. Adolf Frederick II received the Principality of Ratzeburg, and other territories; the remaining territory (by far the greater part) was given to Frederick William. As the latter selected Schwerin for his residence, and Adolf Frederick Strelitz, the two ruling houses have since always been distinguished as Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Strelitz.

In Mecklenburg-Schwerin Frederick William and his successor Charles Leopold had to contend with the estates, especially with the landed proprietors (Ritter schaft), who since the Thirty Years' War had secured the farms of most of the peasants for themselves, and by oppression had forced the peasants into seridom. With the aid of the ducal estates the peasants were driven out of the country. These applied to the Emperor Charles VI for help; after the Russians withdrew, an imperial commission with an army to execute its demands entered the country, and the duke was forced in 1719 to flee. For many years war was waged in Mecklenburg between the imperial army and the duke, who was supported by Prussia and other powers. The estates, with the exception of the estates of the reign of Charles Leopold's successor Christian Ludwig II (1747-56), finally came to an agreement in 1755; this compact, still essentially the basis of the constitution of the country, gave the estates a large share in the enactment of laws and extensive rights in the voting of supplies. By this agreement feudalism won a complete victory over the power of the prince, in contrast to most of the other divisions of Germany, where at that era the absolutism of the ruler had retained its supremacy.

Christian Ludwig II's son Frederick (1756-85) improved the primary schools, strengthened the University of Rostock, founded the Polytechnic Institute (1782), and by the Peace of Teschen obtained the Privilegium de non appellando (i.e., there could be no appeal to the imperial curte), against which the landed proprietors vehemently protested. In 1803 his nephew, Frederick Francis I (1785-1835) received the city of Wismar and the counties of Neukloster from Sweden as pledges for a loan of 1,250,000 talers (approximately $937,500); in 1803 Sweden finally relinquished its right of redemption. At the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806, the two dukes became independent sovereigns. In 1808 both princes entered the Confederation of the Rhine, but joined the Allies opposed to Napoleon in good time in 1813; in 1815 both took the title of grand duke and entered the German Confederation.

The movement of 1848 spread rapidly in both grand duchies, especially in the cities. A proclamation of 23 March, 1848, of Archduke Frederick Francis I of Mecklenburg-Schwerin (1842-83) acknowledged the necessity of a reform in the constitution, and an example was set by Dukes Frederick II of Schwerin and Christian Frederick II, the extraordinary diet (1848-9) drew up a liberal constitution, to which the Grand Duke of Schwerin swore in August, 1849, but against which the Grand Duke of Strelitz, the agnates of both houses, and also Prussia, on account of its rights of inheritance of 1442, protested. In September, 1850, a court of arbitration at the German Confederation decided in favour of the claimants, and on 14 September the Grand Duke of Schwerin annulled the new constitution and the old semi-feudal constitution came again into force. In the war of 1866 both princes sided with Prussia against Austria; on 21 August of the same year they signed the Prussian draft of the North German Confederation, and in 1867 joined this confederacy. In 1866 both states became members of the Customs Union, and in 1871 they became constituent parts of the German Empire. Since their union with the German Empire in 1871, unceasing efforts have been made for a reasonable reform of their obsolete constitution, which is no longer in accord with the new empire. So the estates, especially of the landed proprietors (Ritterschaft) who have held to their privileges with unusual obstinacy. The present Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin is Frederick Francis IV, succeeded 1897; the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz is Adolf Frederick V, succeeded 1904.

Statistics.—Mecklenburg-Schwerin has an area of about 5068 sq. miles. In 1905 it had 625,045 inhabitants, of whom 609,914 were Lutherans, 12,835 Catholics, and 1482 Jews. Mecklenburg-Strelitz has an area of about 1131 sq. miles. In 1905 it had 103,451 inhabitants, of whom 100,314 were Lutherans, 2027 Catholics, and 298 Jews. Both grand duchies are hereditary monies; from 1802 they have had a common assembly or diet made up of the landed proprietors (Ritterschaft), and the burgomasters of specified towns (Landschaft). The Ritterschaft consists of about 750 owners, whether noble or not, of about 1200 landed properties which carry with them the right to a vote in the assembly. The Landschaft is composed of the burgomasters of the cities of Rostock and Wismar, and the municipal authorities of the forty inland cities of Schwerin and the seven inland cities of Strelitz. The principality of Ratzeburg, which has an assembly of estates of its own, is not represented in the general estates, neither are the city of Neustrelitz, nor the inhabitants of the crown domain (dominium), that is, the land personally owned by the ruler, in which he is still absolute.
sovereign in making laws and levying taxes. The crown domain includes about 43 percent of the area and about 32 percent of the inhabitants. The estates have an important share in legislation and a deciding vote in questions of taxation, and in all questions pertaining to their rights; in other matters their opinion has to be obtained.

The church has a consistorial constitution. The head of the church is the sovereign, who exercises his rights in Mecklenburg-Schwerin by means of an upper consistory; in Mecklenburg-Strelitz a by consistory. Mecklenburg-Schwerin is divided into 7 superintendencies and 36 provostships or deaneries: Mecklenburg-Strelitz into 1 superintendency, and Ludwigslust 1 consistory.

The Catholic Church in both grand duchies is under the supervision of the Vicar Apostolic of the Northern Missions, the Bishop of Osminbrück. After the Reformation Catholicism was almost extinguished in Mecklenburg, and its public exercise threatened with punishment. For nearly a hundred years it could only be practised in secret. The conversion of Duke Christian Ludwig I in 1663 produced the first change of conditions. Notwithstanding the protests of his ducal brothers and the estates, he called Catholic priests into the country and granted them the castle church at Schwerin for the celebration of Mass. The right to do this was confirmed to him in 1668 by the imperial Diet. Many of the chief nobility followed, at first, the example of the ducal house. They went to the Church of their forefathers, as the hereditary Marshal Joachim Christian Hahn, of the same family as that from which the convert Ida, Countess Hahn-Hahn, came.

The Catholic Faith, notwithstanding this, did not attain a legal position, and the duke never permitted a Catholic institution. The vicar of the apostolic of the Northern Missions, Nicholas Steno, who lived in Schwerin from 1685, made every exertion to gain his consent. Consequently, when Christian Ludwig died the Catholic services ceased. The only church services now allowed were held in the private chapel of the chancellor of the next duke, Count Horn, who had become a Catholic. With the death of the count this privilege expired. It was not until 1701 that the free exercise of the Catholic religion was again permitted, this time in the chapel of the imperial ambassador von Egk. In 1702, when the ambassador left Schwerin, Duke Frederick William transferred this right to a Catholic lady, Frau von Berlin, who received the mission. She, and her successor, trusted with the mission in Schwerin; from 1709 they established themselves here permanently. Father von Stöcken (1730-43) was able to bring about that in 1731 a house was secured for the mission, and that the church service, which up to then had been private, could be a public one. He also succeeded by unwearied efforts to get the building at Schwerin, where five to seven boys could be prepared for the Collegium Nordicum at Lins in Upper Austria.

From 1764 a priest from Schwerin was able to distribute communion to the Catholic soldiers at Rostock in the hall of the exchange, and to hold Mass for Catholics who attended the market there at Fentecost. Although Christian Ludwig II had granted permission for the building of a church, Frederick, who inclined to a rigorous pietism, forbade its erection. The preparatory school at Schwerin came to an end when the Emperor Joseph II suppressed the Collegium Nordicum. Frederick Francis I, two of whose children became Catholics, gave the money to build the Catholic church at Rostock, and with its endowments, the Confession of the Rhine, Frederick had agreed to place the exercise of the Catholic religion on a legal party with that of the Lutheran, and in 1811 this was done.

From that time on the Catholics in reality enjoyed complete freedom, and in the year 1842 for the first time since the Reformation a Catholic bishop, Lübecke von Osmarbrück, was able to hold a confirmation at Schwerin. However, the conversion, from 1848 onwards, of many important men, among them von Vogelsang, von Bülow, von der Kettenburg, Professor Maassen, etc., gave an opportunity to the intolerant parties, with whom the Catholic bishops, Ludwig von Neubrandenburg, had to draw the line before they would be induced to adopt any action both estates and Government gave their aid. In 1852 extension to other localities of the Catholic services was forbidden, also the coming into Mecklenburg of priests not natives of the country; these measures were so strictly enforced that the private chaplain of Herr von der Kettenburg was taken out of the boundary by gendarmes.

In 1857 permission was given to the dead according to the Catholic ceremonial, and the right to celebrate Mass publicly were limited to Schwerin and Ludwigslust. The Government of Mecklenburg-Strelitz was still more intolerant. For many years, even in the nineteenth century, no priest was permitted to have a permanent residence in its territory; all that was conceded was that the Catholic priest at Wittstock in Brandenburg could stay at Neustrelitz one week of each month for ecclesiastical functions. This persecution of Catholics was kept up, not by the rulers, who were generally well inclined, but by the narrow-minded estates. Public opinion, even outside of Catholic Germany, repeatedly arose against this persecution, and was often expressed in sharp protest in the German Diet.

The Governments of the two duchies were finally forced by pressure from the empire to grant the Catholics a certain, yet still entirely insufficient, amount of freedom. There is however no equality as there should be to bring Mecklenburg into accord with the constitution of the empire or the state. Although an ordinance of 5 January, 1903 granted to Catholics the public exercise of their religion everywhere, nevertheless the permission of the ruler is necessary for the erection and alteration of parishes, the building of churches and chapels, appointment of priests, for the settling in the country of orders and congregations, and for the holding of processions; nor have the Catholics any legal redress if this consent is refused.

Furthermore in regard to educational matters, Catholics are not on an equality with Protestants. They must indeed contribute to the expenses of the schools, but for their purely private Catholic schools they do not receive a subsidy. Often indeed they are not allowed to use the state schools for giving instruction. There is no higher Catholic education in either grand duchy. Mecklenburg-Schwerin has two Catholic parishes, one each at Schwerin and Ludwigslust, and dependent churches at Rostock and Wismar; the priests altogether number 8. Mecklenburg-Strelitz has one parish with 2 priests. The spiritual care of the summer farm-labourers presents great difficulties. These men, who number about 20,000-22,000, are chiefly Poles, sojourn in Mecklenburg annually from March until September in order to work on the farms and estates.
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Faith, such as the Blessed Sacrament or the Divine Attributes), they are used to inculcate lessons of piety, are specially blessed to serve as badges of pious associations or to consecrate and protect the wearer, and finally are often enriched with indulgences.

In the Early Church.—It was at one time doubted whether anything in the nature of a purely devotional medal was known in the early ages of Christianity. Certain objects of this kind were described and figured by seventeenth-century writers on the Catacombs, and a few such were preserved in museums. All these, however, were regarded with much suspicion before the appearance of an epoch-making article by de Rossi in the "Bulletino di Archeologia Cristiana" for 1869, since which time the question has been practically set at rest and the authenticity of some at least of these specimens has remained undisputed. A moment’s consideration will establish the intrinsic probability of the existence of such objects. The use of amulets in pagan antiquity was widespread. The word amuletum itself occurs in Pliny, and many monuments show how talismans of this kind were worn around the neck by all classes. That the early Church should have found the abuse ineradicable and should have striven to counteract it by suggesting or tolerating some analogous practice of an innocent character, is in itself highly probable. Many parallel concessions of this kind might be quoted. The letter of Gregory the Great to St. Mellitus about the dedication of pagan temples, preserved to us by Bede (Hist. Eccl., I, xxx), supplies perhaps the most famous example. Moreover we know that the same St. Gregory sent to Theodolind, Queen of the Lombards, two phylacteries—the cases are still preserved at Monza—containing a relic of the True Cross and a sentence from the Gospels, which her child Adulovald was to wear around his neck.

This, however, and the practice of wearing "encolpia", little pectoral crosses, lent itself to abuses when pagan formalism began to gain ground among the followers of the new faith. Amulets, tokens bearing various Christian symbols, were often cast in metal for a similar purpose. In Africa (see "Bulletino di Arch. Crist.", 1891), the moulds have been found in which little crosses were cast with rings to hang them by. It follows therefore that certain coin-like objects, for which there exists good evidence of their being actually discovered in the Catacombs, must be regarded as genuine relics of the devotional practices of the early Church. Two or three of these are specially famous. One, which de Rossi attributes to the close of the fourth century, bears upon
both faces the legend SUCCESSA VIVAS, an "acclamation" which probably indicates that the medal was cast for a certain Successa to commemorate, perhaps, her dedication to God. On the tomb of St. Lawrence, while he is being roasted upon a gridiron in the presence of the Roman magistrate. The Christian character of the scene is shown by the chrisma, π the A and Ρ, and the martyr's crown. On the reverse is depicted a cancellated structure, no doubt the tomb of St. Lawrence, while a figure in one hand conducting a little child. The scene no doubt represents the consecration to God of the child as an oblate (q. v.) by his father before the shrine of the saint. A custom for which there is a good deal of early evidence. Other medals are much more simple, bearing only the chrisma with a name or perhaps a cross, often impressed with more complicated devices can only be dated with difficulty, and some are either spurious, or, as in the case particularly of some representations of the adoration of the Magi which seem to show a development of Byssus, clearly belong to a later epoch. Some of the medals or medallions reputedly Christian are stamped upon one side only, and of this class is a famous bronze medallion of very artistic execution discovered by Boldetti in the cemetery of Domitilla and now preserved in the Vatican Library. It bears two portrait types of the heads of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul, and is ascribed by de Rossi to the second century. Other medallions with the (confronted) heads of the two apostles are also known and a lively controversy largely based on these medallic materials has been carried on regarding the probability of their having preserved the tradition of an authentic likeness. (See particularly Weisliersdorf, "Christus und Apostellbilder" p. 53 sq.) Certain supposed early medals with the head of our Saviour are distinctly open to suspicion.

How far the use of such medals of devotion extended in the early Church, it is not easy to decide. One or two passages in the works of St. Zeno of Verona have suggested that a medal of this kind was common, given as a memorial of baptism, but the point is doubtful. In the life of St. Geneviève, which, despite the opinion of B. Krusch, is of early date, we read that St. Germanus of Auxerre hung around her neck a perforated bronze coin marked with the sign of the cross, in memory of her having consecrated her virginity to God (Mon. Ger. Hist. Script. Merov., III, 217). The language seems to suggest that an ordinary coin was bored for the purpose, and when we recall how many of the coins of the late empire were stamped with the chrisma or with the figure of the Saviour, it is easy to believe that the ordinary currency may often have been used for similar purposes.

DURING THE MIDDLE AGES. — Although it is probable that the traditions formed by the class of objects which we have been considering, and which were equally familiar at Rome and at Constantinople, never entirely died out, still little evidence exists of the use of medals in the Middle Ages. No traces of such objects survive remarkable either for artistic skill or for the value of the metal, and to speak positively of the date of certain objects of lead and pewter which may have been hung round the neck with a religious intent, is not always easy. But in the course of the twelfth century, if not earlier, a very general practice grew up at well-known places of pilgrimage, of casting tokens in lead, and sometimes probably in other metals, which served the pilgrim as a souvenir and stimulus to devotion and at the same time attested the fact that he had duly reached his destination. These signacula (enseignes) known in English as "pilgrims' signs" often took a medallic form and were carried in a conspicuous way upon the hat or breast. Giraldis Cambrensis referring to a journey he made to Canterbury about the year 1180, ten years after the martyrdom of St. Thomas, describes himself and his companions returning to London "cum signacula Beati Thomae collo suspensis" [with the tokens of St. Thomas hanging round their neck] (Opera, Rolls Series, I, p. 53). Again the author of Piers the Plowman writes of his imaginary pilgrim:

An hundred of ampulles on his hat seten,
Signes of syse and shelles of Galice;
And many a crouche on his cloke, and keyes of Rome,
And the verniele biforn, for men shulde knowe
And see by his signes whom he sought hadde.

The "ampulles" probably represent Canterbury, but may have been tokens of the Holy Tear of Venefic. (See also a similar incident of Byssus, for which there stands for Assisi. The "shelles of Galice", i.e. the scallop-shells of St. James of Compostella; the crouche, or cross, of the Holy Land; the keyes of St. Peter; the "verniele", or figure of the Veronica, etc. are all very familiar types, represented in most collections of such objects. The privilege of casting and selling these pilgrim's signs was a very lucrative one and became a regular source of income at most places of religious resort.

Then, as manner and custom is, signes there they bought . . .

Each man set his silver in such thing as he liked, writes a fourteenth-century satirist of one of these shrines. Moreover we find that the custom was firmly established in Rome itself, and Pope Innocent III, by a letter of 18 Jan., 1200 (Potthast, "Regesta", n. 939), grants to the canons of St. Peter's the monopoly of casting and selling those "signes of lead or pewter impressed with the image of the Apostles Peter and Paul with which those who visit their thresholds [Koina] adorn themselves for the increase of their own devotion and in testimony of the journey which they have accomplished", and the pope's language implies that this custom had existed for some time. In form and fashion these pilgrim's signs are very various and a considerable literature exists upon the subject (see especially the work of Forgesis, "Collection de Plombs historiés", 5 vols., Paris, 1864). From about the twelfth century the casting of these devotional objects continued until the close of the Middle Ages.
and even later, but in the sixteenth or seventeenth century they began to be replaced by medals properly so called in bronze or in silver, often with much greater pretensions to artistic execution. With these leaders signs should be noted the custom of casting coin-like tokens for members of the clergy. (q.v.) It was a celebration of the Boy Bishop and the Innocents. The extant specimens belong mostly to the sixteenth century, but the practice must be much older. Though there is often a burlesque element introduced, the legends and devices shown by such pieces are nearly all religious; e.g., EX GREV INIFICUM PERPETVSTI LAVAND; IN MECTA, ne vitur a se (see Vanbehde, "Plommes des Innocents," Lille, 1877). Better deserving of attention are the vast collection of jetons and méreaux which, beginning in the thirteenth century, continued to be produced all through the Middle Ages and lasted on in some places down to the French Revolution. The jetons were strictly speaking counters, i.e., they were thin pieces of metal, mostly latten, a sort of brass, stamped on both sides with some device and originally used in conjunction with a comptoir (i.e., an abacus or counting board) to perform arithmetical computations. The name comes from jeter, through the form jectoir, because they were "thrown down" upon this board (see Rondot, "Médaillieurs Français," Paris, 1864, p. 48). It became a fashion for very many persons of distinction, especially those who had anything to do with finance, to have special jetons bearing his own device, and upon some of these considerable artistic skill was lavished. These pieces served various purposes besides that for which they were originally designed, and they were often used in the Middle Ages without a ticket or printed card. As might be expected, they tended to take a religious tone. Upon nearly half the medieval jetons which survive, pious mottoes are found and often pious devices (Rouyer, "Histoire du Jeton," p. 30). Among the commonest of these mottoes, which however vary infinately, we might name AVE MARIA GRATIA PLENA; AMES DIEI IO (i.e. aimez dieu et louez le); IHESUS NATUM DEO SOIT FAIT SI; VIRGO MATER ECCLESIE ETERNAE PORTA; DOMINE DOMINUS NOSTER, etc. Often these jetons were given as presents or "pièces de plaisir" especially to persons of high consideration, and on such occasions they were often specially struck in gold or silver. One particular and very common use of jetons was that of the magnates of the Church for their cathedral offices and meetings of various kinds. In this case they often carried with them a title to certain rations or payments of money, the amount being sometimes stamped on the piece. The tokens thus used were known as jetons de présence or méreaux, and they were largely used, especially at a somewhat later date, to secure the due attention of the canons at the cathedral offices, etc. What, however, specially justifies their mention in the present place is the fact that in many cases the pious device they bore was as much or even more considered than the use to which they were put, and they seem to have discharged a function analogous to the Child-of-Mary medals, the souvenirs of the Redemption of the Host, etc. One famous example is the "méreau d'estaing" bearing stamped upon it the name of Jesus, which the famous Frère Richard, whose name is closely if not too creditably associated with the history of Blessed Joan of Arc, distributed to his followers in Paris, 1429 (see Rouyer, "Le Nom de Jesus" in Revue Belge de Numismatique et d'Archéologie). These jetons, stamped A DI, IHS, which is only another way of writing the Holy Name, were very numerous and were probably closely connected with the apostolate of St. Bernardine of Siena. Finally it is to be noted that for the purpose of largesses at royal coronations or for the Maundy, pieces were often struck which perhaps are rather to be regarded as medals than actual money (see Mase

---

Medallion of Enamel Paste and Coloured Bone

From Armstrong, "Il cimitero di Santa Agnese" (c. 1390-1451), and its first developments were all Italian. These early Renaissance medals, magnificent as they are, belong to civil life and only touch upon our immediate subject, but though not religious in intent many of them possess a strong religious colouring. Nothing more devotional could be imagined than the beautiful reverse of Pisano's medal of Malatesta Novello, where the mail-clad warrior dismounting from his horse is represented as kneeling before the crucifix. So again the large medal, in the British Museum, of Savonarola holding the crucifix, probably executed by Andrea della Robbia, portrays with rare fidelity his deep-set glowing eye, his bony cheeks, the strong nose and protruding lips" (Fabricius, "Italian Medals," p. 135), while the reverse displays the avenging sword of God and the Holy Ghost hovering over the doomed city of Florence. Wonderful again in their religious feeling are Antonio Marescotti's (c. 1453) superb medals of San Bernardino da Siena, while among the series of early papal medals we have such masterpieces as the portrait of Sixtus IV by Andrea Guasalotti (1453-95). But it was long before this new art made its influence so far widely felt as to bring metal representations of saints and shrines, of mysteries and miracles, together with emblems and devices of all kinds, in a cheap form into the hands of the people. Undoubtedly the gradual subdivision of more artistic bronze and silver medals for the rude pilgrim's signs at such great sanctuaries as Loreto or St. Peter's, did much to help on the general acceptance of medals as objects of devotion. Again the papal jubilee medals, which certainly began as early as 1475, and which from the nature of the case were carried into all parts of the world, must have helped to make the idea familiar. But this was not all. At some time during the sixteenth century the practice was adopted, possibly
following an usage long previously in vogue in the case of Agnus Deis (q. v.), of giving a papal blessing to medals and even of enriching them with indulgences. On the other hand it is noteworthy that among the benediction-forms of the Middle Ages no single example is found of a blessing for sacramentaria, a pilgrim's "insignia" were often blessed no doubt, but by this term were only meant his scrip and staff (see Frans, "Kirchlichen Benedictionen im Mittelalter", II, 271-89), not the leaden tokens spoken of above. The story runs that the use of blessed medals began with the revolt of the Gueux in Flanders, a. d. 1566. A certain medal or rather set of medals bearing on the obverse the head of Philip II with the motto EN TOUT IDELES AU ROI and on the reverse a beggar's wallet and the words JUSQUE A PORTER LA RESACE, was used by the Gueux faction as a badge. To this the Spaniards replied by striking a medal with the head of our Saviour and on the reverse the image of our Lady of Hal, and Pius V granted an indulgence to those who wore this medal in their hats (Simonis, "Art du Medailleur en Belgique", 1904, II, pp. 76-80).

From this the custom of blessing and indulgencing medals is said to have rapidly extended under the sanction of the popes. Certain it is that Sixtus V attached indulgences to some ancient coins discovered in the tomb of the builder of the Scala Santa, which coins he caused to be richly mounted and sent to persons of distinction. Thus encouraged, and stimulated further by the vogue of the jubilee and other papal medals of which we have still to speak, the use of these devotional objects spread to every part of the world. Austria and Bohemia seem to have taken the lead in the use of papal medals in Eastern Europe, and some exceptionally fine specimens were produced under the inspiration of the Italian artists whom the Emperor Maximilian invited to his court. Some of the religious medals cast by Antonio Abondio and his pupils in Vienna are of the highest order of excellence. But in the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries almost every considerable city in Catholic Europe came to have craftsmen of its own who followed the industry, and the tradition created by such Italian artists as Leone Leoni at Brussels, with men like Jongheinich and Stephen of Holland for his pupils, and John de Candida, Nicholas of Florence and Benvenuto Cellini in France, was bound to have lasting effect.

The number and variety of the religious pieces produced at a later date, as Domänig (Die deutsche Privat-Medaille, p. 29) is at pains to attest, defies all classification. Only one writer, the Benedictine L. Kuncse (in his "Systematik der Weihmünzen", Raab, 1885), seems to have seriously grappled with the task, and his success is very moderate. As an indication of the vast complexity of the subject, we may note that in the thirty-first of his fifty divisions, the section devoted to medals commemorative of churches and sanctuaries of the Blessed Virgin, he enumerates over 700 such shrines of which he has found some record—the number is probably immensely greater, while in connexion with the majority of these, suspicion may be entertained that they have at some time been struck, often, e. g. at Loreto, in an almost endless series. Under these circumstances, all that can be done is to point out a few illustrative groups rather apart from the common run of pious medals; those connected with places, confraternities, religious orders, saints, mysteries, miracles, foundations, &c., are types with which everyone is familiar.

(1) Plague medals struck and blessed as a protection against pestilence. The subjects are very various: e. g., the figure of St. Sebastian and St. Roch, and different shrines of the Blessed Virgin, often also with a view of some particular city. Round them are commonly inscribed mysterious letters analogous to those depicted on the famous medal of St. Benedict (q. v.). For example f, s, f, D. I. A. etc. These letters stand for "Crux Christi salva nos"; "Zelus domus Dei libera me"; "Crux Christi victat et regnat, per lignum crucis libera me Domine ab hac peste"; "Deus meus expelle pestem et libera me, etc." (See Beierlein, "Münze der Kaiser Siemens" of the Medailleurs in the German Register of Medals, Leipzig, 1885.)

(2) Medals commemorating Miracles of the Eucharist. There were a very large number of these struck for jubilees, centenaries, etc., in the different places where these miracles were believed to have happened, often adorned with very quaint devices. There is one, for example, commemorative of the miracle at Seefeld, upon which the story is depicted of a nobleman who demanded to receive a large host at communion like the priest's. The priest complied, but as a punishment for the nobleman's presumption the ground opens and swallows him up (see Pachinger, "Waffenmedaillen der Tirol", Vienna, 1908).

(3) Private medals. These forms a very large class, but particular specimens are often extremely scarce, for they were struck to commemorate incidents in the life of individuals, and were only distributed to friends. Baptisms, marriages, first communications, deaths formed the principal subjects. For striking these private medals. The baptismal or sponsor medals (pabris medaillen) are particularly interesting, and often contain precise details as to the hour of birth which would enable the child's horoscope to be calculated. (See Domänig, "Die deutsche Privat-Medaille", Vienna, 1893, 3, pp. 25-28.)

(4) Medals commemorating of special legends. Of this class the famous Cross of St. Ulrich of Augsburg may serve as a specimen. A cross is supposed to have been brought by an angel to St. Ulrich that he might bear it in his hands in the great battle against the Huns, a. d. 955. Freisenegger in his monograph "Die Ulrichs-kreuze" (Augsburg, 1895), enumerates 180 types of this object of devotion, sometimes in cross, sometimes in medal form, often associated with the medal of St. Benedict.

Papal medals do not immediately belong to this place, for they are not precisely devotional in purpose, but a very large number of these pieces are ultimately associated with ecclesiastical functions of various kinds, and more particularly with the closing of the Holy Door in the year of Jubilee. The series begins with the pontificate of Martin V, in 1417, and continues down to the present day. Some types professing to commemorate the acts of earlier popes, e. g. the Jubilee of Boniface VIII, are reconstructions (i. e. fabrications) of later date. Nearly all the most noteworthy actions of each pontificate for the past five hundred years have been commemorated by medals in this manner, and some of the most famous artists, such as Benvenuto Cellini, Caradoso, and others have been employed in designing them. The wonderful family of the Hamerani, who from 1605 down to about 1700 made a point of endowing many of the great churches of Italy with the greater proportion of their wealth, are an example of the material prosperity of that vast series, deserve to be specially mentioned for the uniform excellence of their work.

Other semi-devotional medals are those which have been struck by important religious associations, as for example by the Knights of Malta, by certain abbies in commemoration of their abbots, or in connexion with particular orders of knighthood. One of the most of these series of medals useful monographs have been written, as for example the work of Canon H. C. Schembri, or "The Coins and Medals of the Knights of Malta", (London, 1908). It has been said above that Agnus Deis seem to have been blessed by the popes with more solemnity than the other forms of benediction were used in connexion with the Golden Rose, the Sword and Cap, and other
objects given by the popes as presents. In the sixteenth century this practice was greatly developed. The custom grew up not only of bringing objects which had touched certain relics or shrines to the pope to be blessed, but also of the pontiff blessing rosaries, "grains", medals, etc., enriching them with indulgences and sending them, through his privileged missionaries or envoys, to be distributed to Catholics in England. On these occasions a paper of instructions was often drawn up, defining exactly the nature of these indulgences and the conditions on which they could be gained. Several papers of this kind—one in favour of Mary Queen of Scots (1576) and others for England—were prepared for the use of the clergy. Some have been preserved, emanating from Gregory XIII. One of these, by Knox in the "Douay Diaries", p. 367. The "Apostolic Indulgences" (see INDULGENCES, APOSTOLIC) attached to medals, rosaries and similar objects by all priests duly authorized, are analogous to these. They are imparted by making a simple sign of the cross, but for certain other objects, e.g. the medal of St. Benedict (q. v.), much special faculties are required, and an elaborate form of benediction is provided. Quite recently Pius X has sanctioned the use of a blessed medal to be worn in place of the brown and other scapulars. The concession was originally made for the benefit of the native Christians in the missions of the Congo. But Pius XI at the request of the French mission in the Congo was ready to grant to other priests who apply, the faculty of blessing medals which may be worn in place of the scapular (see "Le Canoniste Contemporain", Feb., 1910, p. 115).

Almost the only attempt at a systematic classification of devotional medals in general has been made by KONCHE, Systematik der Weihamägen (Raab, 1888), but the work is neither scholarly nor scientific. Much more satisfactory is the classification given by F. Fuchs in the Index muniturum of 1910, in which are the researches of FACCHINO, who has published a valuable study on "De praedestinatibus monachorum et ordinis religiosorum Medailionem of various districts. These are concerned with Bavaria (1904), Duchy of Austria (1904), Salzburg (1908), and the Tyrol (1909), with some other more general articles. Other miscellaneous works are CORNER, Numismatique Béarnaise (Rome, r. d.); IDEM, Numismatique et Iconographie maritales (Rome, r. d.); BLANCHET, Nouveau Manuel de Numismatique (Paris, 1860); a series of articles by ROUTZEL (especially in 1893-96) and by DE WITTE (especially 1900-1910) in the Revue Belge de Numismatique, especially 1902; FERKNER, Katalog der bayrischen Weihflur-Kloster- und Kirchen-Medailien (Munich, 1900); FERKNER, Catalogue des médailles pour l'office de S. Pierre (1933); this is a slender pamphlet on the classification of modern medals; KNOX, The History of Weihamägen and Weihamägen in papal and archiepiscopal Bavarian Staatshandbücher (Brum); IDEM, Medaille wie auf dem k. Wolfang (Brum, 1890); BERLINGER, Münstern der Bayerschen medaille (Munich, 1879-80)

Upon early Christian medals, see de ROMA's various articles in Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana, especially in 1869, 1870, 1871, 1887, and "Omnium Catalogum d'un inventaire du Museo et de la Bibliothèque de la Commission de la Republique de Salentino, e. v. Anouletles: BARTINGH in Dict. of Christ. Ant., e. v. Money; and HEUSER in Realencyclopädie f. christ. Alterthum, e. v. Medailien, and various articles in the Romische Quartalschrift, particularly 1896. On the papal medals see particularly BOHNEK, Numismata Pontificum Romanorum (2 v., Rome, 1869); van Veen, Numismata Pontificum Romanorum, passim (Rome, 1744).

Dealing with the general history of Medals in modern times, but which also have many notices to the students of religious medals, are FORREN, Biographisches Dictionary of Medalists (c. 1910); H. de die Deutsche Kunst und Kunsthistorischer Hinsicht (Vienna, 1907). A work magnificently illustrated; HEUSER, Les Medailles de la Renaissance (Paris, 1911); IDEM, Les Medailleurs de la Renaissance (Paris, 1914); IDEM, Les Medailleurs et Orsateurs de Monnaies en France (Paris, 1904), with admirable illustrations. Several other works have been mentioned in the course of the article.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Miraculous Medal—The devotion commonly known as that of the Miraculous Medal owes its origin to an apparition made by the daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, known in religion as Marie Catherine, to whom the Blessed Virgin Mary appeared three separate times in the year 1830, at the motherhouse of the community at Paris. The first of these apparitions occurred 15 July, the second 27 November, and the third a short time later, in December. On the second occasion, Sister Catherine records that the Blessed Virgin appeared as if standing on a globe, and bearing a globe in her hands. As if from rings set with precious stones dazzling rays of light were emitted from her fingers. These, she said, were symbols of the graces which would be bestowed on all who asked for them. Sister Catherine adds that around the figure appeared an oval frame bearing in golden letters the words: "Pray for us who have recourse to thee"; on the back appeared the letter M, surmounted by a cross, with a crossbar beneath it, and under all the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, the former surrounded by a crown of thorns, and the latter pierced by a sword. At the second and third of these visions a command was given to have the straining effort which had been revealed, and a promise of great graces was made to those who wear it when blessed. After careful investigation, M. Aladel, the spiritual director of Sister Catherine, obtained the approval of Mgr de Queelen, Archbishop of Paris, and on 30 June, 1832, the first medals were struck, and with their distribution the devotion spread rapidly. One of the most remarkable facts recorded in connection with the Miraculous Medal is the conversion of a Jew, Alphonse Ratisbonne (q. v.) of Strasburg, who had resisted the appeals of a friend to enter the Church. M. Ratisbonne consented, somewhat reluctantly, to wear the medal, and being in Rome, he entered, by chance, the church of S. Maria Immacolata, and beheld in the Blessed Virgin ex-actly as she is represented on the medal; his conversion speedily followed. This fact has received ecclesiastical sanction, and is recorded in the office of the feast of the Miraculous Medal. In 1847, M. Etienne, superior-general of the Congregation of the Mission, obtained from Pope Pius IX the privilege of instituting a confraternity under the title of the Immaculate Conception, with all the indulgences attached to a similar society established for its students at Rome by the Society of Jesus. This confraternity adopted the Miraculous Medal as its badge, and the members, known as the Children of Mary, wear it attached to a blue ribbon. On 23 July, 1894, Pope Leo XIII, after a careful examination of all the facts by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, instituted a feast, with a special Office and Mass, of the Manifestation of the Immaculate Virgin under the title of the Miraculous Medal, to be celebrated yearly on 27 November by the priests of the Congregation of the Mission. This is a double class. For ordinaries and religious communities who may ask the privilege of celebrating the festival, its rank is to be that of a double major feast. A further decree, dated 7 September, 1894, permits any priest to say the Mass proper to the feast in any chapel attached to a house of the Sisters of Charity.

JOSEPH GLASS.

Medardus, Saint, Bishop of Noyon, b. at Salency (Oise) about 456; d. in his episcopal city 8 June, about 545. His father, Nectardus, was of Frankish origin, while his mother, named Protagia, was Gallo-Roman. It is believed that St. Gildardus, Bishop of Rouen, was his brother. His youth was entirely consecrated to the practice of Christian virtues and to the study of sacred and profane letters. He often accompanied his father on business to Vermand and to Tournai, and frequented the schools, carefully avoiding all worldly dissipation. His exemplary piety and his knowledge, combined with the value of his advice to his bishop of Vermand (d. 530) to confer on him Holy Orders, and caused him to be chosen as his successor. Forcible, in spite of his objections, to accept this heavy charge, he devoted himself zealously to his new duties, and to accomplish them in greater security, since Vermand and the northern part of France in general were then generally troubled by wars and
exposed to the incursions of the barbarians, he removed his episcopal see in 531 from Vermand, a little city without defence, to Noyon, the strongest place in that region. The year following, St. Eleutherius, Bishop of Tournai, having died, St. Medardus was invited to assume the direction of that diocese also. He refused, but being urged by Clotaire himself he at last consented. This union of the two dioceses lasted until 1146, when they were again separated. Clotaire, who had paid him a last visit at Noyon, had his body transferred to the royal manor of Crouy at the gates of the city of Soissons. Over the tomb of St. Medardus was erected the celebrated Benedictine abbey which bears his name. St. Medardus was one of the most honoured bishops of his time, his memory has always been popularly venerated in the north of France, and he soon became the hero of numerous legends. The Church celebrates his feast on 8 June.


LÉON CLUGNET.

Medea, a titular see of Thrace, suffragan of Heraclea. This name and the modern name (Midieh) are derived from the ancient Salmydessos or Almydessos. Herodotus (IV, 93) says that the inhabitants yielded to Darius after some resistance; Xenophon and his companions in arms subjugated it with much difficulty (Anab., VII, 5, 12). The city is also mentioned by Sophocles (Antig., 969), by Eschylus (Prom., 726), who places it wrongly in Asia, Diodorus Siculus (XIV, 37), Strabo (VI, vi; XII, iii; 3, i; 3, 7), Ptolemy (VII, xi, etc.), who all agree in locating its harbour on the coast, and the orators had it much exposed to the winds; moreover the shore was sandy and unfavourable for navigation. Theophrastes (Chronogr., an. m. 6255) mentions it under the name Medea in the year 763. The Emperor Joanna Cantacuzenus, having taken it in 1352, was almost killed there by the Turks (Histor., IV, 10); it is also frequently mentioned in official acts (M. Miller: "Acta patriarchatus Constantinopolitanii", Vienna, 1600). Medea is mentioned as a suffragan of Heraclia towards 900 in the "Notitia" of Leo the Wise (Gelzer, "Ungedruckte... Texte der Notitiae episcopatarum", 552); it is mentioned in the same way in the "Notitia" of Manuel Comnenus about 1170 and of Michael VIII about 1270 (Parthey, "Hieronys Syneclesemus", 104, 204). Shortly after, under Andronicus II, Medea was made an autocephalous archbishopric, and towards 1330 a metropolitan see (Gelzer, op. cit., 601). In 1623 the metropolitan see of Medea and Sozopolis were united, to be again separated in 1715. A little later Medea was united with Bisya, at least among the Orthodox Greeks, and it is so still. Le Quien (Oriens christiansus, I, 1143-1146) gives the names of five Greek metropolitan bishops: Zoë, Eubel (Hierarchia catholica medii secli. I, 355) mentions two Latin titularies of the fourteenth century. To-day Medea or Midieh is a part of the sanjak of Kirk-Kéliissi in the vilayet of Adrianople; there are two thousand Greeks and some Turks.

S. VAILLÉ.

Medellin, Archdiocese of (Medellinensis), in the Republic of Colombia, Metropolitan of Antioquia and Mani- sales, in the Departments of Medellin, Antioquia, and Manises. Prior to 1877 a new civil territorial division was adopted, the limits of the archdiocese were conterminous with the former Department of Antioquia (from native words meaning the "hill or mountain of gold") which lay in the basins of the Magdalena, Cauca, and Atro rivers, had an area of over 2,195,125 acres, and was divided into ten civil provinces, Aures (capit. Sonson), Centro (cap., Medellin), Fredonia (cap., Fredonia), Nordeste (cap., Sta. Rosa), Norte (cap., Yarumal), Occidente (cap., Antioquia), Oriente (cap., Maranilla), Sopetrán (cap., Sotetran), Sur (cap., Manises), Urrao (cap., Frontino). The territory of the archdiocese is comprised in the Andes region; means of communication are poor, owing to the mountainous nature of the country; a railway, however, is being built from Puerto Berrio to Medellin. The Catholic religion is universally professed, but the exercise of all cults not contrary to Christian morality is permitted. The language is Spanish, and the inhabitants are descend- ants of the Spanish conquistadores, of the mestizos and negroes. There is no race antagonism, chiefly because of the influence and teaching of the Catholic religion. The Indians of the Cauca valley were originally cannibals.

Education is gratuitous and as far as possible compulsory; there are 400 primary schools with 35,000 pupils, besides many schools conducted by religious. During the civil disturbances of the past, many of the monasteries were confiscated, and are still used as public buildings; but the relations between Church and State were amicably settled by the Concordat of 1857.

Previous to 1804, the region was within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Bogotá. On 31
August, 1804, the See of Antioquia was erected, and on 4 February, 1868, the title of the diocese was removed from Antioquia to the growing town of Medellin. On 29 Jan., 1873, the See of Antioquia (Antioquensis) was re-established, and on 11 April, 1900, a portion of the Diocese of Medellin went to constitute the newly erected See of Manizales (Manizalensis). As the civil districts are now constituted, the Department of Antioquia embraces an area of 11,517 square miles with a population of 160,000; that of Medellin an area of 12,137 with a population of 275,000; that of Manizales an area of 4,439 with a population of 242,000 (The Statesman's Year-Book, 1910). There were about 5000 savage Indians scattered in these regions.

Medellin on the River Porce, 147 miles from Bogotá, and 4600 feet above sea-level, is the capital of the Department of Medellin. In 1910 it had a population of 60,000. It was named in 1575 after the Count of Medellin in Spain, but did not begin to prosper until the gold and silver mines were discovered in the neighbourhood early in the nineteenth century. It has 7 churches, 2 chapels, and a pro-cathedral; a new cathedral is being constructed in the Plaza de Bolivar. Among important institutions in the town are a seminary, a university, the College of St. Ignatius, under the Jesuite (founded by Father Friere in the eighteenth century), the University College of St. John, under the Christian Brothers. The Presentation Nuns conduct schools for girls; the Sisters of Charity have charge of a hospital; and the Discaled Carmelites have a convent. Among the periodicals published in Medellin are "Registro Oficial," "Cronica Judicial," "El Preceptor," "El Elector," and "La Consigna."

The See of Antioquia was raised to the rank on 24 Feb., 1902. The archdiocese has 363,710 inhabitants, 110 priests, 15 regulars, 75 churches and chapels, 141 Catholic schools, in which 16,035 pupils are being educated. The present archbishop is Mgr. Em. José de Cayezzo y Cuero, born in Bogotá, 16 Nov., 1850; chosen Bishop of Pasto, 11 Feb., 1892; transferred to Popayan, 2 Dec., 1895; made archbishop 14 Dec., 1901; and transferred to Medellin 14 Dec., 1905, to succeed Mgr. Pardo Vergara, the first Archbishop of Medellin.

Antioquia on the Cauca was founded by Jorge Robledo in 1542; until 1826 it was the capital of the Department of Antioquia. Its population is estimated at 1,000,000. The first written literature in the region was published at Antioquia under the auspices of Bishop Gomes Friar, of Popayan, and on 5 Feb., 1727, a royal charter was granted to the college, and the fathers were given charge of the church of St. Barbara. A few years later they opened a second college at Buga. Among the more important buildings of the city are the cathedral, the bishop's house, the Jesuit college, and a hospital. On account of malaria the seminary has been removed from Antioquia to San Pedro.

The diocese has a population of 211,315; 75 priests; 80 churches and chapels. The present bishop is Mgr. Em. Ant. Lopez de Mesa, born at Rio Negro in the Diocese of Medellin, 22 March, 1849, and succeeded Mgr. Rueda as Bishop of Antioquia, 2 June, 1902.

Manizales is about 100 miles from Bogotá and 7000 feet above sea-level. Founded in 1848 it has developed rapidly owing to the gold mining operations in the neighbourhood; population in 1905, 20,000. There it suffered severely from earthquakes in 1875 and 1878.

The Diocese of Manizales was created 11 April, 1900, from territory formerly belonging to the archdioceses of Popayan and Medellin. The cathedral is dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. The present and first bishop is Mgr. Gregory Hoyos, born at Vachos, 1 Dec. 1849; appointed 11 May, 1901.
disappear from the inscriptions, and in their place we find references to the kings of Anshan. The capital of the kingdom was Ecbatana (the Agamatanu of the Babylonian inscriptions) the building of which is attributed by the author of the Book of Judith (i, 1) to "Arphaxad, king of the Medes," and it is called Amadana in an inscription of Tiglath-Pileser I, its origin would go back to the twelfth century B.C. At variance with this, however, is the Greek tradition represented by Herodotus, who ascribes the origin of Ecbatana to Deioke (the Daiukku of the Assyrian inscriptions, about 710 B.c.), who is described as the first great ruler of the Median empire. The "building of the city" is, of course, a rather elastic expression which may well have been used to designate the activities of monarchs who enlarged or fortified the already existing stronghold; and it is scarcely necessary to recall that most of these ancient records, though containing elements of truth, are to a certain extent artificial. At all events, it is with the reign of Deioke that the Median empire emerges into the full light of history, and henceforward the Greek sources serve to check or corroborate the information derived from the native monuments.

According to the somewhat questionable account of Herodotus, Deioke reigned from 700 to 647 B.C. and was succeeded by Phraortes (646-625), but of the latter no mention is made in the inscriptions thus far discovered. His successor Cyaxares (624-585), after breaking the Scythian power, formed an alliance with the Babylonians, who were endeavouring to regain their long lost dominion over Assyria. In league with his father, King of Babylon, he captured and destroyed Nineveh (606 B.C.) and conquered all the northern portion of Mesopotamia. Enriched by the spoils of the great Assyrian capital, Cyaxares pushed his conquering armies westward, and soon the dominion of the Medes extended from the confines of Elam to the river Halys in Asia Minor. Astyages (584-550 B.C.) reigned over this vast empire, which maintained the friendly relations with Babylon, and when Nabonidus succeeded to the throne of the latter kingdom, the Medes and Babylonians were at war.

In the meantime a great internal movement was preparing the way for a change in the destinies of the empire. It was due to the rising influence of another branch of the Medes, the Saka, who are sometimes known as the transition from the Median to the Persian rule. At this distance both terms are rather vague and indefinite, but there is no doubt as to the advent of a new dynasty, of which by far the most conspicuous ruler is Cyrus, who first appears as King of Anshan, and who is later mentioned as King of Persia. Doubtless in the earlier part of his reign he was but a vassal king dependent on the Median monarch, but in 549 B.C. he vanquished Astyages and made himself master of the vast empire then comprising the kingdoms of Anshan, Persia, and Media. He is known to Oriental history as a great and brilliant conqueror, and his fame in this respect is confirmed by the many legends associated with his name by Greek and Roman writers. His power soon became a menace to all western Asia, and in order to withstand it a coalition was formed into which entered Nabonidus, King of Babylonia, Amasis, King of Egypt, and Croesus, King of Lydia. But even this formidable alliance was unable to check the progress of the Persians, who, after having subjugated the whole of the Median empire, led his forces into Asia Minor. Croesus was defeated and taken prisoner in 546, and within a year the entire peninsula of Asia Minor was divided into satrapies, and annexed to the new Persian empire. The west being fully subdued, Cyrus led his victorious armies against Babylonia. Belahazar, the son of the still reigning Nabonidus, was sent as general in chief to defend the country, but he was defeated at Opis. After this disaster the invading forces met with little or no resistance, and Cyrus entered Babylon, where he was received as a deliverer, in 539 B.C. The following year he issued the famous decree permitting the Hebrew captives to return to Palestine and rebuild the temple (I Esd., i). It is interesting to note in this connexion that he is often alluded to in Isaiah (xl-xlviii, passim), where according to the obvious literal meaning he is spoken of as the Lord's anointed. With the accession of the Achemenian dynasty the history of Media becomes absorbed into that of Persia (q. v.), which will be treated in a separate article.


JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Mediator (Christ as Mediator).—The subject will be treated under the following heads: (1) Definition of the word mediator; (2) Christ the Mediator; (3) Christ's qualifications; (4) Performance; (5) Results.

(1) MEDIATOR DEFINED.—A mediator is one who brings estranged parties to an amicable agreement. In New Testament theology the term invariably implies that the estranged being is God and that what is appropriated to Christ, the One Mediator. When special friends of God—angels, saints, holy men—pledge our cause before God, they mediate "with Christ"; but their mediation is only secondary and is better called intercession (q. v.). Moses, however, is the proper mediator of the Old Testament (Gal., iii, 19-20).

(2) CHRIST THE MEDIATOR.—St. Paul writes to Timothy (I Tim., ii, 3-6) . . . "God our Saviour, Who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus: Who gave himself a redemption for all, a testimony in due times."

The object of the mediatorialship is here pointed out as the salvation of mankind, and the imparting of truth about God. The mediator is named: Christ Jesus; His qualification for the office is implied in His being described as man, and the performance of it is ascribed to God the Father. The mediatorialship is the truth. All this originates in the Divine Will of "God our Saviour, Who will have all men to be saved". Christ's mediatorialship, therefore, occupies the central position in the economy of salvation: all human souls are both for time and eternity dependent on Christ Jesus for their whole supernatural life. "Who [God the Father] hath delivered up us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love, In whom we have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins; Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature . . . all things were created by him and in him. And he is before all, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the firstborn of the dead; that in all things he may hold the primacy: Because in him, it hath well pleased the Father, that all fulness should dwell; And through him to reconcile all things unto himself, making peace through the blood of his cross, both as to the things that are on earth, and the things that are in heaven". (Col., i, 13-20).

(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—The perfection of a mediator is measured by his influence with the parties he has to reconcile, and this power flows from his connexion with both: the highest possible perfection would be reached if the mediator were substantially one with both parties. A mother, for instance, is the best mediator between her husband and her son. But the matrimonial union of "two in one flesh", and the
union of mother and child are inferior in perfection to the 
hypostatic union of the Son of God with human nature. 
Husband, mother, son, are three persons; Jesus Christ, God and man, is only one person, identical 
with God, identical with man. Moreover, the 
hypostatic union makes Him the Head of mankind, 
and, in this capacity, a mediator. It is the hu-
mankind origin Christ is a member of the human family, a 
partner of our flesh and blood (Heb. ii, 11-15); by 
reason of His Divine Personality, He is "the image 
and likeness of God" to a degree unapproached by 
either man or angel. The Incarnation establishing 
between the First-born and His brethren a real kin-
ship, or affinity, Christ becomes the Head of the 
human family, and the human family acquires a claim to 
participate in the supernatural privileges of their Head. 
"Because we are members of his body, of his 
flesh, and of his bones." (Eph. v, 30.) Such was the 
expressed will of God: "But when the fulness of the time 
was come, God sent his Son, made of a woman . . . . 
that we might receive the adoption of sons." (Gal. iv, 
4-5; also Rom., viii, 29.) The man Christ Jesus, 
therefore, who was designed by God to mediate be-
tween Him and mankind, and whose mediatorial 
was not accidental and delegated, but inherent in His 
very being, was endowed with all the attributes re-
quired in a perfect mediator.

Christ, the mediator necessarily proceeds from 
His human nature as principium quae operandis; 
yet it obtains its mediating efficacy from the Divine 
nature, i.e. from the dignity of the acting person. Its 
first object, as commonly stated, is the remission 
of sin and the granting of grace, whereby the friendship 
between God and man is restored. This object is at-
tained by the works of the Incarnate. Christ becomes the Head, a mediator to God by and through Christ. Christ, however, is 
mediator on the side of God as well as on the side of 
man: He reveals to man Divine truth and Divine 
commands; He distributes the Divine gifts of grace 
and rules the world. St. Paul sums up this two-sided 
mediation in the words: " . . . consider the apostle 
and high priest of our confession, Jesus" (Heb., iii, 
1); Jesus is the Apostle sent by God to us, the 
high priest leading us to God.

(4) Performance.—How do we benefit by Christ's 
mediation? Christ is more than an enlightening 
teacher and a bright example of holiness; He destroys 
sin and restores grace. Our salvation is not due ex-
clusively to Christ's human nature; it is due to the 
Gloriﬁed state in heaven; Christ administers in 
heaven the fruits of His work on earth (Heb., vii, 25). 
Scripture compels us to regard the work of the Media-
tor as an efﬁcient cause of our salvation: His merits 
and satisfaction, as being those of our representative, 
have obtained for us salvation from God. The oldest 
extension of the dogma in the Church formularies is 
in the Nicene Creed: "cruciﬁed also for us", "Victor-
ious satisfaction", a term now in vogue, is not found 
expressly in the Church formularies, and is not an 
adequate expression of Christ's mediation. For His 
mediation partly replaces, partly completes, partly 
renders possible and effective the saving work of 
man himself; it makes the latter more effective and 
it merits, the saving work of God. It begins with 
obtaining the goodwill of God towards man, with 
appeasing the offended God by interceding for man. 
This intercession, however, differs from a mere asking 
in this, that Christ's work has merited what is asked for: 
salvation is its rightful equivalent. Further: to effect 
man's salvation is possible only by one person. In the 
act of mediation Christ acts for himself and for 
Himself the sins of mankind and make satisfaction for 
them to God. But though His atonement gives God 
more honour than sin gives dishonour, it is but a step 
towards the most essential part of Christ's saving 
work—the friendship of God which it merits for man. 
Taken together, the expiation of sin and the meritings 
of Divine friendship are the end of a real sacrifi, i.e. 
of "an action performed in order to give God the 
honour due to Him alone, and so to gain the Divine 
favour" (St. Thomas, III, Q. xlviii, a. 3). Peculiar 
to Christ's sacrifice are the infinite holiness of the 
Sacrificer and the infinite value of the Victim, which 
give the sacrifice an infinite value as expiation and as 
messiah. Moreover, it is by His Divinity, His 
human origin Christ is a member of the human family, a 
partner of our flesh and blood (Heb. ii, 11-15); by 
reason of His Divine Personality, He is "the image 
and likeness of God" to a degree unapproached by 
either man or angel. The Incarnation establishing 
between the First-born and His brethren a real kin-
ship, or affinity, Christ becomes the Head of the 
human family, and the human family acquires a claim to 
participate in the supernatural privileges of their Head. 
"Because we are members of his body, of his 
flesh, and of his bones." (Eph. v, 30.) Such was the 
expressed will of God: "But when the fulness of the time 
was come, God sent his Son, made of a woman . . . . 
that we might receive the adoption of sons." (Gal. iv, 
4-5; also Rom., viii, 29.) The man Christ Jesus, 
therefore, who was designed by God to mediate be-
tween Him and mankind, and whose mediatorial 
was not accidental and delegated, but inherent in His 
very being, was endowed with all the attributes re-
quired in a perfect mediator.

Consult any treatise on the Incarnation, e.g. WILHELM 
HUMPHREY, The One Mediator (London). J. WILHELM.

Mediceus (de Medici), Hieronymus, illustratus as 
as a scholastic of acumen and penetration, b. at Camerino 
in Umbria, 1569, whence the surname de Medicis 
originates. He was educated with the nuns at Camerino 
but went to Paris, 1586. He first distinguished himself as 
as a professor of philosophy and theology in various houses of 
the Province of Lombardy, whence he was advanced to 
as a professorship in the more important theological school 
at Bologna. He was approved by the general chapter 
of his Order held at Paris, 1611, and raised to the 
mastership and doctorate. He was then performing 
the duties of general censor for the tribunal of the Inquisi-
tion established at Mantua, for which reason he is said 
eventually to have secured the transfer of his affiliation 
to the convent of that place (1618). His laborious 
and fruitful career closed in 1622. It had been 
marked by a studious application to the doctrines of 
St. Thomas. Just as a young man he had been 
endeavoured his intellectual ability, he completed the first 
part of the invaluable "Summa theologica S. Thomas 
Aquiniatis doctoris angelici formalis explicatio". In 
this work he puts into syllogistic form the whole 
Summa. Aiming primarily at the enlightenment of 
beginners, he contributes notably to the instruction of 
those more advanced. The first part was not published 
until the first section of the second part was 
ready (Venice), 1614. Three years later followed the 
second section, but it was not until 1622 that the third 
part appeared at Salo, instead of Venice. The 
Supplement preceded the third part by a year (Venice, 
1621); it was not published at Mantua in 1623. Other 
more correct editions have followed even as late as (Venice) 
1582-1866. It is to Jacobus Quatius that credit is due 
for having improved the original in accuracy. He 
reproduced the work in five tomes, folio (Paris), in 1657. 
The chief advantage to be derived from the arrange-
ment of St. Thomas in syllogistic form is a quickness 
of grasp with an easiness of assimilation not otherwise 
possible. The method of division he has adopted has 
been made which, although raising the value of the 
work as a manual, are outside the scope of the original. 
They serve as appendices to each question and, under 
the caption "Utilitas pro Ecclesia S. Dei", furnish the 
student with practical applications of the original 
material in view of dogmas subsequently developed or 
contemporary heresy.
master of Florence and her dominions, and, while continuing and developing the foreign and domestic policy of his grandfather, he greatly extended the Medicean influence throughout Italy. His skilful diplomacy was directed to maintaining the peace of the peninsula, and keeping the five chief states under the face of the growing danger of an invasion from beyond the Alps. Guicciardini writes of him that it would not have been possible for Florence to have had a better or a more pleasant tyrant, and certainly the world has seen no more splendid a patron of artists and scholars. The poets, Pulci and Poliziano, the philosopher and mystic, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, and a whole galaxy of great artists, such as Botticelli and Ghirlandaio, abed glory over his reign.

Posterity has agreed to call Lorenzo "the Magnificent", but this, in part, a misunderstanding of the Italian title "magno", which was given to all the members of his family. Indeed, during the fifteenth century, applied to most persons of importance in Italy to whom the higher title of "Excellence" did not pertain. Lorenzo sums up the finest culture of the early Renaissance in his own person. Unlike many of the humanists of his epoch, he thoroughly appreciated the great values of the classics of the two preceding centuries; in his youth he wrote a famous epistle on the subject to Federigo of Aragon, which accompanied a collection of early Italian lyrics. His own poems in the vernacular rank very high in the literature of the fifteenth century. They are remarkably varied in style and subject, and the Petrarchan canzoni and sonnets, with a prose commentary in imitation of the "Vita Nuova", to the semiparody of Dante entitled "I Beoni". His canzoni a ballo, the popular dancing songs of the Florentines, have the true lyrical note. Especially admirable are his compositions in oltre rima: the "Caccia col Falcone", with its keen feeling for nature; the "Ambra", a mythological fable of the Florentine countryside; and the "Nencia da Barberino", an idyllic picture of rustic lovers. His "Altecrazioni", six cantos in terza rima, discusses the nature of truth and lies, and closes in an impressive prayer to God, somewhat Platonic in tone. To purely religious poetry belong his "Laude", and a presentation of Giovanni e san Paolo", with a curiously modern appreciation of the Emperor Julian. In striking contrast to these are his carnival-songs, canzil cascades, so immoral as to lend colour to the accusation that he strove to undermine the morality of the Florentines in order the more easily to enslave them.

At the close of his life, Lorenzo was brought into con-
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dict with Savonarola, but the legend of the latter refus- ing him absolution on his deathbed unless he re- stored liberty to Florence is now generally rejected by historians. By his wife, Clarice Orsini, Lorenzo had three sons: Piero, Giuliano, and Giovanni, of whom the third rose to the papacy as Leo X. Although a man of immoral life, his relations with his family show him under a favourable aspect, and, in a letter from one of the ladies of the Mantuan court, a charming account is given of him, on his way to the congress of Cremona in 1483, Lorenzo visited the Gonzaga children and sat among them in their nursery.

Piero di Lorenzo, Lorenzo's eldest son, b. 1471, d. 1503, a licentious youth with none of his father's ability, proved a most incompetent ruler, and, on the French invasion of 1494, he was expelled from Florence by the people, led by the patriotic Piero Capponi. After several fruitless attempts to recover his position, he was drowned at the battle of the Garigliano while serving in the French army. On the restoration of the Medici in 1512, his son Lorenzo was made ruler of Florence. With him, in 1519, the legitimate male descent of Cosimo the Elder came to an end. By his wife, Madeleine de la Tour d'Auvergne, he was the father of Caterina de' Medici, afterwards Queen of France.

The Medici were again expelled from Florence, and the republic once more established, in 1527. But in 1530, after the famous siege, the city was compelled to surrender to the imperial forces, and Charles V made Alessandro de' Medici, an illegitimate son of the younger Lorenzo, hereditary head of the Florentine government. All republican forms and offices were swept away, and Alessandro ruled as duke until, in 1537, he was assassinated by his kinsman, Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco de' Medici, who fled to Venice without attempting either to assert his own claims to the succession or to restore the republican régime.

Cosimo de' Medici, usually known as Cosimo I, b. 1519, d. 1574, was the descendant of a brother of Cosimo the Elder and representative of the younger Medici line. He was the son of Giovanni delle Bande Nere, the great soldier, and Maria Salviati. On the murder of Alessandro, he came into Florence, and was formally recognized as head of the government both by the citizens and by the emperor. At the outset, with the aid of imperials, he was able to suppress the efforts of the republicans, who were led by Baccio Valori and Filippo Strozzi. Various constitutional checks were at first put upon him, but these he soon discarded, and openly used the title of Duke of Florence. Although ruthless and implacable, he proved himself the ablest Italian ruler of the sixteenth century, and not without a permanent form to the government of Florence; finally developing the shapeless remains of the fallen republic into a modern monarchical state. He thoroughly reorganized the laws and administration, created a small but efficient fleet to defend the shores of Tuscany, and raised a national army out of the old Florentine militia. He married a Spanish wife, the noble and virtuous Eleonora di Toledo, and in foreign affairs leaned to a large extent upon Spain, by which power, however, he was prevented from accepting the crown of Corsica. His great desire of absorbing the neighbouring republics of Lucca and Siena into his dominions was fulfilled only in the case of the latter state; he conquered Siena in 1555, and in 1557 received it in vassalage from the King of Spain.

Tradition has invested Cosimo's name with a series of horrible domestic crimes and tragedies, all of which have been completely disproved by recent research. After the death of Eleonora di Toledo in 1562, he appears to have abandoned himself to vice. A few years later he married his mistress, Camilla Martelli. In 1574 he was crowned in Rome by Pope Pius V as Duke of Tuscan, thereby taking place among the sovereigns of Europe. The title was confirmed to his son and successor, Francis I, in 1575, by the Emperor Maximilian II. Cosimo's descendants reigned as Grand Dukes of Tuscany in an unbroken line until 1737, when, on the death of Gian Gastone de' Medici, the Medici dominions passed to the House of Bourbon.
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EDMUND G. GARDNER.

Medici, Maria de', Queen of France; b. at Florence, 26 April, 1573; d. at Cologne, 3 July, 1642. She was a daughter of the Grand Duke Francis I of Tuscany and the Archduchess Joan of Austria, and married Henry IV of France, 5 October, 1600. In March, 1610, Henry IV, who was preparing to lead an expedition against Germany, again visited France and, at the request of the republicans, appointed Maria de' Medici regent, with a council of fifteen; yielding to her insistence, he also caused her to be crowned queen on 13 May, 1610. Two hours after the assassination of Henry IV (14 May, 1610), the Duc d'Epernon went to the Parliament and had Maria de' Medici declared regent, the little Louis XIII being not yet nine years of age. Henry IV, who, had he lived, would have striven more and more to secure alliances with Protestant powers, was replaced by a Catholic policy, aiming at a Spanish alliance. The first act in this direction was the betrothal of Louis XIII to the Infanta Anna (afterwards known as Anne of Austria), and of Elisabeth of France to the Infant Philip (1613), with agitation among the princes and the Protestants. The States-General, convoked by the queen regent in 1614, as a
concession to the princes, was the last attempt under the old monarchy to associate representatives of the national government, and the attempt succeeded ill. Finally, defying the susceptibilities of Condé and the Protestants, Louis XIII married the Infanta Anna on 28 November, 1615, and the revolt of the princes, following on the arrest of Condé (1 Sept., 1616), was the cause of the queen regent's summoning Richelieu (q. v.), Bishop of Luçon, to her council, as minister of war. Public opinion, outraged by the influence which Maria allowed her lady-in-waiting, Leonora Galigai, and Leonora's Florentine husband, Concini, Maréchal d'Ancre, to obtain over her; Concini was assassinated, 24 April, 1617, and thenceforward the influence of Albert de Luynes, a favourite of the young king, predominated. Maria de' Medici had to leave Paris, 2 May, 1617, and it was through the intervention of Richelieu that she was allowed to establish her household at Blois.

The regency of Maria de' Medici is interesting from the point of view of religious history, because of the Gallican agitation which marked it. After the condemnation by the Parliament of Paris of Bellarmine's treatise on the temporal power of the pope (1610), Edmond Richer, syndic of the faculty of theology, developed, in his "Libellus de Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate", the theory that the government of the Church should be aristocratical, not monarchical. Maria de' Medici decidedly opposed Richer, and, when he had been condemned by an assembly of bishops held at Sens under the presidency of Cardinal du Perron, she had him deposed, and a new syndic elected (1612). When Harlay had resigned the presidency of the Parliament, she refused to appoint in his place de Thou, a Gallican, and appointed instead Nicolas de Verdun, an Ultramontane. In the States-General of 1614, the Third Estate, through its spokesman, Miron, made a protestation of Gallican principles, and tried, with the support of the Protestant Condé, to introduce into its cahier an article on the power of kings, which aimed at the Ultramontanes; Maria de' Medici ended the business by ordering this article to be taken out of the cahier, and fortiifying any further discussion of the question. Another interesting event of this regency was the Assembly of Saumur (1611), in which the Protestants, anxious to preserve and develop the political privileges given them by the Edict of Nantes, set about organizing all over France a vast network of provincial assemblies to watch over the interests of Protestantism, and assemblies de cercles, combining several provinces, which would be able to impose their will on the State. It was thus that, through the initiative of Henri de Rohan, Sully's son-in-law, there began to form within the French State a sort of separate Protestant party, to which Richelieu was to put an end.

After 1617, Maria de' Medici lived, with many vicissitudes, in full of intrigue, which she sometimes carried to conspiracy. Escaping from Blois, 22 Feb., 1619, she made her way into Angoulême, and obtained from Luynes the government of Anjou, which became a rallying-point for malcontents. The troops who supported her met those of the king at Les Ponts de Cé and were beaten (August, 1620). On the death of Luynes (15 December, 1621), she regained some influence; she caused Richelieu to be admitted to the council (1624), and was even entrusted with the regency during the war in Italy. But as Richelieu's hostility to Spain became more marked, she sought his dismissal. Allying herself with Gaston d'Orléans, she once—"the Day of the Dupes", 12 November, 1630—thought herself successful, but was aroused by the influence of the cardinal. She was mistaken. Banished to Compiegne, in February, 1631, she vainly endeavoured to obtain admission to the stronghold of La Capelle, whence she might have dictated terms to the king. At last she went into exile, to wait for the triumph of Gaston d'Orléans: but Gaston was beaten, and Maria de' Medici was no more a queen in France. From 1631 to 1638 she spent her time in the Low Countries, sending across the French frontier manifestos which no one read. After that, taking refuge in England (1639-44), with her daughter Marie, she, as a Catholic an object of suspicion to the Protestants of that country. Last of all, she betook herself to Germany, where she died, a helpless onlooker at the triumph of the foreign policy and Church policy which was the exact opposite of what she had followed during her regency. The haughty queen, whose luxury and splendour had been blazoned in Rubens' immense canvases, possessed of a dignity at the time of her death.
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GEORGES GOTAU.

Medicine, History of.—The history of medical science, considered as a part of the general history of civilization, should logically begin in Mesopotamia, where tradition and philological investigation have placed the cradle of the human race. But, in a condensed article such as this, there are important reasons which dictate the choice of another starting point. Modern medical science rests upon Greek foundation, and whatever other civilized peoples may have accomplished in this field lies outside our inquiry. It is certain that the Greeks brought much with them from their original home, and also that they learned a great deal from their intercourse with other civilized countries, especially Egypt and India; but the Greek medical mind was in fashion a fashion that its origin can rarely be recognized.

MYTHICAL, HOMERIC, AND PRE-HIPPOCRATIC TIMES.

—Greek medical science, like that of all civilized peo-
amples, shows in the beginning a purely theurgical character. Apollo is regarded as the founder of medical science, and, in popular Homer, his son Æsculapius, Homer's 'Therapeutes', is represented as the deity whose office it is to bring about man's restoration to health by means of healing oracles. His oldest place of worship was at Tricca in Thessaly. The temples of Æsculapius, of which those at Epi-
daurus and Cos are the best known, were situated in a healthy neighbourhood. The sick pilgrims went thither, that, after a long preparation of prayers, fasting and ablutions, they might, through the mediation of the priest, receive in their dreams the healing oracles. This kind of medical science already shows a rational basis, for the priest interpreted the dreams and prescribed a suitable treatment, in most cases purely dietetic. Important records of sickness were made and, as it were, written down in the temples. Side by side with the priestly caste, and perhaps out of it, there arose the order of temple physicians, who, as supposed descendants of the god Æsculapius, were known as the Asclepiades, and formed a kind of guild or corporation. This separation of offices must have occurred at an early time, for, even in Homer, we find the priestess of Æsculapius, Mashaon and Podalirius. In the vegetable drugs of Egyptian origin early recognized in Homer we recognize the early influence of the country of the Pharaohs upon Greek medical science. The schools of the philosophers likewise exerted no small influence upon its development, medical problems being discussed in the circle of the renowned Alexanders of Crotona, Parmenides of Elae, Heraclitus of Ephesus (sixth century B.C.), Empedocles of Agrigentum, and Anaxagoras of Clazomenae (fifth century B.C.). The earliest medical schools were at Cyrene in Northern Africa, Crotona, Chnidus, and Cos. From Cnidus came Euryphon and also Oesander. The latter was a pupil of Cleopatra, wife of the army of Cyrus and, after the battle of Cunaxa (401 B.C.), to Artaxerxes Memnon. Of greater interest is the medical school adjoining the shrine of Æsculapius at Cos, from it arose the man who first placed medicine upon a scientific basis, and whose name is even to-day well known to all physicians, Hippocrates.

Hippocrates and the So-called Corpus Hippocraticum. Tradition knows seven physicians named Hippocrates, of whom the second is regarded as the most famous. Of his life we know but little. He was born at Cos in 460 or 450 B.C., and died at Larissa about 379. How great his fame was during his lifetime is shown by the fact that Plato compares him with the ancient civilized and the 'Great' or 'the Divine'. The historical kernel is probably as follows: a famous physician of this name from Cos flourished in the days of Pericles, and subsequently many things, which his ancestors or his descendants or his school accomplished, were attributed to him as the hero of medical science. The same was true of his writings. What is now known under the title of 'Hippocratic Opera' represents the work, not of an individual, but of several persons of different periods and of different schools. It has thus become customary to designate the writings ascribed to Hippocrates by the general title of the 'Hippocratic Collection' (Corpus Hippocraticum), and to divide them according to their origin into the works of the schools of Chnidus and of Cos, and those of the Sophists. How difficult it is, however, to determine their genuineness is shown by the fact that even in the third century before Christ the Alexandrian librarians, who for the first time collected the anonymous scrolls scattered through Hellas, could not reach agreement upon the motion of the writing of these medical science it is of little consequence who composed the works of the school of Cos, for they are all more or less permeated by the spirit of one great master. The secret of his immortality rests on the fact that he pointed out the means whereby medicine became a science. His first rule was the observation of individual patients, a principle of principles were gradually derived from experience, and these, uniform, arranged, led by induction to a knowledge of the nature of the disease, its course, and its treatment. This is the origin of the famous 'Aphorisms', short rules drawn from experience, and at times conclusions drawn from the same source. They form the most valuable part of the Collection. The school of Cos and its adherents, the Hippocrates, looked upon medical science from a purely practical standpoint; they regarded it as the art of healing the sick, and therefore laid most stress on prophylactic and treatment by abstracts of nature through dietetic means, while the whole school of Cnidus prided itself upon its scientific diagnosis and, in harmony with the E. and adopted a varied medicinal treatment. The method which the school of Cos established more than 2000 years ago has proved to be the only correct one, and thus Hippocratic medical science established its reputation, Boerhaave at Leyden and subsequently with Gerhard van Swieten at Vienna. In his endeavour to attain the truth the earnest investigator often reaches an impassable barrier. There is nothing more tempting than to seek an outlet by means of reflection and investigation. Such a misfortune may easily become fatal to the physiologist, but a certain system, carried upon the results of speculative investigation, carries the germ of death within itself. The Dogmatic School. In their endeavour to complete the doctrine of their great master the successors of the Hippocrates fell victims to the snares of metaphysics. In spite of the qualifications bestowed, a so-called dogmatic school some fruitful investigation. Diciles Caryxius advanced the knowledge of anatomy, and tried to fathom the causal connexion between symptom and disease, in which endeavours he was imitated by Praxagoras of Cos, who established the diagnostic importance of the pulse. Unfortunately, there already began with Aristotle (384-22 B.C.) that tendency — later rendered so fatal through Galen's teaching — to regard organic structure and function not in accordance with facts but from the teleological standpoint. The Alexandrian Period. The desire to give to medicine a scientific basis found rich nourishment in the scientific civilization at Alexandria. Herophilus of Chalcedon (about 300 B.C. and Erasistratus of Iulis (about 330-240 B.C.) are mentioned in this connexion. As anatomists, they were the first systematic investigators, and, following Hippocrates, they tried to complete clinical experience by exact methods. This tendency was opposed by the empiricists, whose services lay solely in the field of drugs and toxicology. Erasistratus as well as Philinus, the empiricists attacked the doctrine of humors (humoral pathology), which developed out of the Hippocratic tendency. The former alone was a serious opponent, since, as an anatomist, he looked for the seat of the disease in the solid parts, rather than in the four fundamental humors (blood, mucus, black and yellow gall) and their different mixtures. The Methodizers. One of the opponents of humoral pathology was Asclepiades of Prusa in Bithynia (about 124 B.C.). He tried to utilize in medicine the atomistic theory of Epicurus and Heraclides of Pontus. He taught that health and disease depend upon the condition of the fine capillaries or pores, which, endowed with sensation, pass through the entire body. With Themison as their leader, the followers of Asclepiades simplified his doctrine by supposing disease to be only a contraction or relaxation,
and later only a mixed condition (partly contracted, partly relaxed) of the pores. This simple and convenient explanation of all diseases without regard to some natural and correct physiology, taken with its allied system of physical dietic therapeutic, explains why this doctrine enjoyed so long a life, and why the works of the methodist, Celius Aurelianus of Sicca in Numidia (beginning of fifth century A.D.), were diligently studied down to the seventh century.

Galen.—Departure from the Hippocratic observation of nature and physiology, to form numerous mutually opposing sects. A man of great industry and comprehensive knowledge, Galen of Pergamum (about A.D. 130-201), tried to rescue medical science from this labyrinth. He chose the path of eclecticism, on which he built his (as he thought) infallible system. Whatever sense-perception and clinical observation left obscure, he tried to partake of its systematic treatment. That this system of teaching could hold medicine in bondage until modern times shows the genius of the master, who understood how to cover up the gaps by brilliancy of style. Galen took the entire anatomical knowledge of his time, and out of it produced a work the substance of which was for centuries regarded as infallible. The anatomy was founded, not upon the dissection of mammals, especially of monkeys, and, like his physiology, was under teleological influence. His presentation of things lacks dispassionateness. Instead of explaining the functions of the organs on the basis of their structure, Galen chose the reverse method. His anatomy and physiology were the result of preconceived ideas, and the re-examination of these fields must necessarily have shaken his entire scheme of teaching. Galen expressed the greatest respect for Hippocrates, published his most important works with explanatory notes, but never entered into the spirit of the school of Cos, although he adopted many of its doctrines. Galen is the last point of transition, and the birth of modern medical science. In his vanity he thought he had completed all investigation, and that his successors had only to accept without effort what he had discovered. As will be shown in the following paragraph, his advice was, unfortunately for science, followed literally.

Pedanius Dioscorides from Anazarbe, who lived in the time of Nero and Vespasian, may be interpreted here as the most important pharmaceutical writer of ancient times. He simplified greatly the pharmacopeia, which had then assumed unwieldy dimensions, and freed it from ridiculous, superstitious remedies. Our modern pharmacology is based on his work, Távros, first written in Greek, and translated into Latin and Arabic.

Cornelius Celsus (about 25-30 B.C. - 45-50 A.D.) is the only Roman who worked with distinction in the medical field; but it is doubtful whether he was a physician. His work, De re medica libri viii, which is written in classical Latin, and for which he used seventy-two works lost to posterity, gives a survey of medical science from Hippocrates to imperial times. Very famous is his description of the operation of lithotomy. Celsus was altogether forgotten until the fifteenth century, when Pope Nicholas V (1447-55) is said to have discovered a manuscript of his works.

Byzantine Period.—In Byzantine times medicine shows but little originality, and is of small importance in the history of medical development. The works handed down to us are all compilations, but as they frequently contain excerpts from lost works, they are of some historical value. The notable writers of this period are: Oribasius (325-403), physician in ordinary to Julian the Apostate; and Actius of Amida, a Christian physician under Justinian (527-66). A liturgical dignity than the episcopate was shown by Alexander of Trolls (522-605), and Paulus Ëgineita of the first half of the seventh century, of whose seven books, the sixth, dealing with surgery, was greatly valued in Arabian medicine. Paulus lived at Alexandria, and was one of the last to come from its once famous school, which became extinct after the capture of the city by Omar in 640. At the time of the beginning of the eighth century there was no further development of medicine, not because it was especially productive, but because it preserved Greek medical science with that of its most important representative, Galen. It was, however, strongly influenced by oriental elements of later times. The adherents of the heretic Nestorius, who in 431 settled in Edessa, were the teachers of the Arab physicians. After their expulsion, these Nestorians settled in Khonismpasor in 489, and there founded a medical school. After the conquest of Persia by the Arabs in 650, Greek culture was held in great esteem, and learned Nestorian, Jewish, and even Indian physicians worked diligently as translators of Greek writings. In Arabic medicine the large extent of the translation of important physicians in the first period of Greek-Arabian medicine—the period of dependence and of translations—comes first the Nestorian family Bachtischus of Syria, which flourished until the eleventh century; Abu Zakariya Yahia ben Maseweih (d. 875), known as Joannes Damascenus; Mesue the Elder, a Christian, who lived in Alexandria, was a surgeon, and an independent work, and supervised the translation of Greek authors; Abu Yusuf Jacob ben Ishak ben el-Subbah el-Kindi (Alkindus, 813-73), who wrote a work about compound drugs; and the Nestorian Abu Zeid Ibin al-Ibn ben Soliman ben Ejjuh Ibn el-Ibbi (Joannitus, 809-875), a teacher in Baghdad and Dairs, who translated the works of Dioscorides, whose work "Isagoge in artem parvam Galeni" ("early translated into Latin, was much read in the Middle Ages. Wide activity and independent observation—based, however, wholly upon the doctrine of Galen—were shown by Abu Bekr Muhammad ben Zakariya er-Razi (Rhazes, about 850-923), whose chief work, however, "El-Hawi fi'Tib" ("Continues") is a rather unsystematic compilation. In the Middle Ages his "Kea alibi Almamurii" ("Liber medicinalis Almansoris") was well known and had many commentators. The most valuable of the thirty-six productions of Rhazes which have come down to us is "De variol et morbillis" in a book based upon the work of Galen. It is also to mention the medicinal writer Abu Jakub Ishak ben Soleiman el-Ismaili (Isaac Judeus, 830-932), an Egyptian Jew; the Persian, Ali ben el-Abbas Ala ed-Din el-Madshachi (Ali Abbas, d. 994), author of "El-Maliki" ("Regalis dispositio, Pantegnum"). Abu Dahafer Ahmed ben Ibrahim ben Abu Chalid Ibn el-Dahsaz (d. 1060) wrote about the causes of the plague in Egypt. A work on pharmacoe was written by the physician in ordinary to the Spanish Caliph Hisham II (976-1013), Abu Daut Soleiman ben Hasan Ibn Dabdichoehl.

Of the surgical authors, Abul-Kasim Chalafr ben Abd el-Zahawi el-Zahar near Cordova (Abul-kasem, about 912-1015) alone deserves mention, and he depends absolutely on Paulus Ëgineita. While he received scant attention at home, since surgery was little cultivated by the Arabs, his work, written in a clear and perspicuous style, became known in the West through the Latin translation by Gerardus of Cremona (1187), and was extensively used even in later days. Many cabalistic writings were also written with the Persian Abu Ali el-Hosein ben Abdallah Ibn Sina (Avicenna, 980-1037), who based his system entirely upon the teaching of Galen and tried in various ways to supplement the latter. His chief work.
“El-Kantin” (Canon Medicine), written in a brilliant style and treating all branches of medical science, soon supplanted in the West the works of the Greeks and, until the time of Ibn Rushd (Averroes, 1126–98), of Cordova, was regarded as the most important textbook for physicians; but in Arabic Spain his fame was small. One of his chief rivals was Abu-Merwan Abd al-Malik ben Abul-Ala Zohr ben Abd al-Malik Ibn Zohr (Avensoar, 1113–62) from the neighbourhood of Seville. His friend, the philosopher and physician Abul-Welid Muhammed ben Ahmed Ibn Rosbd el-Malik (Averroes, 1126–98), of Cordova, is regarded as the complement of Avensoa. His book was also popular in the West and bears the title “Kitab el-Kolijat” (Colliget). With the decline of Arabic rule began the decay of medicine. In the Orient this decline began after the fall of Bagdad in 1256, and in Spain after the capture of Cordova in 1236, the decay becoming complete after the loss of Granada in 1492. The predominance of Arabic medicine, which lasted scarcely three centuries, seriously delayed the development of our science. A brief survey of this period shows that the Arabs went in a slavish reverence before the works of Aristotle and Galen without examining them critically. Not one Greek physician obtained such a hold on the Arabs as Galen, whose system, perfect in form, pleased them just as that of Aristotle pleased them in philosophy. Nowhere did dialectics play a greater part in medicine than among the later followers in the West. Independent investigation in the fields of exact science, anatomy, and physiology was forbidden by the laws of the Koran. Symptomatology (semiotics) at the bedside, especially prognosis based on a pulse, the state of the urine, were developed by them with an equally exaggerated and fruitless subtlety. Much, and perhaps the only credit due to them is in the field of pharmacetics. We are indebted to them for a whole series ofsimples and drugs, the properties of oriental and Indian origin, previously unknown, and also for the polypharmacy of later times. Until the discovery of America the Venetian drug-trade was controlled by Arabian dealers.

Christianity’s Share in the Development of Medical Science.—As long as the cruel persecution of Christians which were taking place in the Roman Empire, it was impossible for Christians to take direct part in the development of medical science. But provision had been made for medical aid within the community, because the priest, like the rabbi of small Jewish communities in the late Middle Ages, was also a physician. This is clear from the history of the two brothers, Sts. Constantine and Dalmatian, who experienced medicine in Syria and were martyred under Diocletian. The exercise of practical charity under the direction of deacons of the churches gave rise to systematic nursing and hospitals. In recent times it has, indeed, been alleged that the existence of hospitals among the Buddhists, even in the third century before Christ, and their existence in ancient Mexico at the time of discovery is demonstrable, and that hospitals had their origin in general philanthropy; but nobody denies that the nursing of the sick, especially during epidemics, had never before been so widespread, so well organized, so self-sacrificing as in the early Christian communities. Christianity tended the sick and devised and executed extensively the care of destitute children (foundlings, orphans), of the feeble and infirm, of those out of work, and of pilgrims. The era of persecution ended, we find large alms-houses and hospitals like that of St. Basil in Cæsarea (370), those of the Roman Lady Fabiola in Rome and Ostia (400), that of St. Samson adjoining the church of St. Sophia in Constantinople in the sixth century, and the hospital of the Most Holy Name at Rome (512), and others. In 1198 Pope Innocent III rebuilt the pilgrims’ shelter, which had been founded in 726 by a British king, but had been repeatedly destroyed by fire. He turned it into a refuge for travellers and a hospital, and entrusted it to the Brothers of the Holy Ghost established by Guy de Montpellier. Mention must also be made here of the religious orders of knights and the houses for lepers of later times. The great hospitals of the Arabs in Dschondisapor and Bagdad were built after Christian models. The celebrated ecclesiastical writer Tertullian (born A.D. 160) possessed a wide knowledge of medicine, which, following the custom of his time, he calls a “sister of philosophy.” Clement of Alexandria, about the middle of the century, lays down valuable hygienic laws in his “Pedagogus.” Lactantius in the fourth century speaks in his work “De Opificio Dei” about the structure of the human body. One of the most learned priests of his time, St. Isidore of Seville (d. 636), treated medicine in the fourth book of his “Origines S. Etymologian.” St. Benedict of Nursia (480) made it a duty for the brothers of his order to study the sciences, and among them medicine, as aids to the exercise of hospitality. Olaus Murus gave his mine to the later followers in the West. Independent investigation in the fields of exact science, anatomy, and physiology was forbidden by the laws of the Koran. Symptomatology (semiotics) at the bedside, especially prognosis based on a pulse, the state of the urine, were developed by them with an equally exaggerated and fruitless subtlety. Much, and perhaps the only credit due to them is in the field of pharmacetics. We are indebted to them for a whole series of simples and drugs, the properties of oriental and Indian origin, previously unknown, and also for the polypharmacy of later times. Until the discovery of America the Venetian drug-trade was controlled by Arabian dealers.

How diligently medicine was studied in the monasteries is shown by the numerous manuscripts (many still unedited) in the old cathedral libraries, and by the large number of medical writers who were attached to the monasteries and are now to be found in the national libraries of various countries. Priests who possessed a knowledge of medicine served as physicians-in-ordinary to princes as late as the fifteenth century, although they were forbidden to practise surgery by the Fourth Synod of the Lateran (1213). Thus, Master Gerhard, parish-priest in Fribourg, founded the Hospital of the Holy Ghost at Vienna (1211), was physician-in-ordinary to Duke Leopold VI of Austria, and Sigismund Albicu, who afterward became Archbishop of Prague (1411), held the same office at the court of King Wenzel of Bohemia (1391–1411). From this time, we constantly meet with priests possessing a knowledge of medicine and writing on medical subjects. The popes, the most important patrons of all the sciences, were friendly also to the development of medicine. That they ever at any time forbade the practice of anatomical investigation is a fable. Pope Boniface VIII in 1299–1300 forbade the practice then prevalent of boiling the corpses of noble persons who had died abroad, in order that their bodies might more conveniently be transported to the distant ancestral tomb. This prohibitory rule had reference only to cases of death in Christian countries, while in the
Orient (e.g. during the Crusades) the usage seems to have been tacitly allowed to continue. In scholastic works, however, Moslems were considered inferiors. Having voluntarily undertaken the education of the young in all branches of learning, the monasteries were aided in their endeavours by both Church and State. The foundation of state schools is the work of Charlemagne (768–814), whose activity, especially in the Germanic countries, was stimulated by the decree of the Synod of Trier (788), that each monastery and each cathedral chapter should institute a school. According to the Capitulary of Charlemagne at Diedenhofen (Thionville) in 806, medicine was commonly taught in these schools. At the diocesan school in Reims, we find Gerbert d’Aurillac, later Pope Sylvester II (999–1003), long active as a teacher of medicine. Simultaneously with the rise of monasteries there sprang up higher municipal schools, as for instance the Burge- schule at St. Stephen’s in Vienna (about 1237). Out of the secular and religious schools, the curriculum of which institutions comprised the entire learning of the times, the first universities developed themselves, partly under imperial and partly under papal protection, according as they sprang from the lay and the cathedral schools, respectively.

School of Salerno.—This is regarded as the oldest medical school of the West. Salerno on the Tyrrhe- nian Sea, originally probably a Doric colony, was from the sixth to the eleventh century under the rule of the Lombards, and from 1075 to 1150 under that of the Norman kings. It was the beginning of the Kingdom of Naples and Sicily. The origin of the school is obscure, but, contrary to former belief, it was not a re- ligious foundation, though very many priests were engaged there as teachers of medicine. Women and even Jews were admitted to these studies. Salerno was destined to cultivate for a long time Greek medical science in undiminished purity, until the twelfth century. Then, as a fall away from the all-powerful Arab influence. One of its oldest physicians was Alphubhanus, later (1058–85) Archbishop of Salerno. With him worked the Lombard Gariopontus (d. 1050), whose “Passionarius” is based upon Hippocrates, Galen, and Celsius Aurelianus. Contemporary with him was the female physician Trotula, who worked also in the literary field, and who is said to have been the wife of the physician Joannes Platearius. Perhaps the best known literary work of this school is the anonymous “Regimen sanitatis Salernitanum”, a didactic poem consisting of 364 stanzas, which has been translated into all modern languages. It is said to have been dedicated to Prince Robert, son of William the Conqueror, and is thus entitled from Salerno in 1101. An important change in the intellectual tendency of the “Civitas Hippocratica”, as this school called itself, was brought about by the physician Constantine of Carthage (Constantinus Africanus), a man learned in the Oriental languages and a teacher of medicine at Salerno, who died in 1037, a monk of Monte Cassino. While hitherto the best works of Greek antiquity had been known only in mediocre Latin translations, Constantine in the solitude of Monte Cassino began to translate from the Arabic Greek authors (e.g. the “Aphorisms” of Hippocrates and the “Ars parva” of Galen), as well as such Arabic writers as were accessible to him (Isak, Ali Abbas). As late as the thirteenth century, the influence of these Arabic texts was felt. To the twelfth century, when Arabian polypharmacy was introduced, belong Nicolaus Prepositus (about 1140), whose “Antidotarium”, a collection of compounded pharmaceutical formulae, became a model for later works of this kind, and Matthias Platearius, chap- tery on the above-named “Antidotarium” (Glosses) and a work about simple drugs (Circum instans). Similar productions appeared from the hand of an otherwise unknown Magister Salernitanus. Maurus, following Arabian sources, wrote on uroscopy. Here must be also mentioned Petrus Musandinus (De cibis et medicinis) and Simon of Montpellier, who worked on the theory of the blood. Conversus of Corbeil (Egidius Corbélianus), who later became a canon and the physician-in-ordinary to Philip Augustus of France (1180–1223), and who even at this day began to complain about the decay of the school.

Its first misfortune dates from the death of King Roger III (1193), when the army of King Henry VI conquered the three republics. Then the University of Naples by Frederick II in 1224, the preponder- ance of Arabian influence, and the rise of the Mont- pellier school, all exerted so unfavourable an influence that by the fourteenth century Salerno was well-nigh forgotten. Salerno is the oldest school having a curriculum prescribed by the state. In 1140, King Roger II ordered a state examination for the first time. The University of Salerno was before this, and Frederick II in 1240 prescribed five years of study besides a year of practical experience. When we consider the proximitry of Northern Africa, that the neighboring Sicily had been under Saracenic rule from the ninth to the eleventh century, and that the Norman kings, and to a far greater degree Frederick II, gave powerful protection to Arabian art and science, it seems wonderful that this oasis of Greco-Roman culture endured so long. Down to the twelfth century this school was ruled by a purely Hippocratic spirit, especially in practical medicine, by its diagnosis and by the treatment of acute diseases dietetically. Arabian influence makes itself felt first in all in therapeutics, a fact which it is explained by the fact that in the eleventh and twelfth century the Arabian drug-dealers used to land. Local condi- tions (resulting from the Crusades) explain how sur- gery, especially the treatment of wounds received in war, was diligently cultivated. In Rogerius we find a Salernitan surgeon armed with independent experi- ence, but showing, nevertheless, reminiscences of Abulhusain. His “Practica Chirurgica” dates from the year 1180. Although Salerno finally succumbed to Arabian influences, this school did not hand down to us a knowledge of the best Arabic authors.

Spain as the Transmitter of Arabian Medicine.—Its focus was the city of Toledo, which was taken by the Moors in 1085, and which fell to the Christians under Alphonse VII. Here Archbishop Ramund (1130–50) founded an institution for translations, in which Jewish schol- ars were the chief workers. Here lived Gerard of Cremona (1114–87), properly Carmona, near Seville, the translator of Rhazes and Avicenna. A later trans- lator of Rhazes (about 1279) was the Jew Farsad ben Salem (Faragius), who was educated at Salerno.

The Scholastic Period.—When in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries all the Aristotelian works gradually became known, one of the results was the development of scholasticism, that logically arranged systematic treatment and explanation of rational truths based upon the Aristotelian speculative method. Even though this tendency led to the growth of many experiences in medicine and confirmed the predomin- ance of Galen’s system, also largely based upon specula- tion, it is wrong to hold Scholasticism responsible for the mistakes which its disciples made in consequence of their faulty apprehension of the system, because scholasticism, far from excluding the observation of nature, directly promotes it. In the thirteenth century it is the fact that the most important scholastic of the thirteenth century, Albertus Magnus, was likewise the most important physicist of his time. He thus imi- tated his model, Aristotle, in both directions. The
famous scholastic Roger Bacon (1214–94), an English Franciscan, lays chief stress in his theory of cognition upon experience as far as the natural sciences are concerned, with even greater emphasis than Albertus Magnus.

Albertus Magnus (Albert Count of Bollstädt, 1193–1280) was a Dominican. For medical science his works are about animals, plants, and minerals alone concern us. Formerly a work called “De secretis nullius” was wrongly attributed to him. Albertus’s most eminent service to medicine was in pointing out the way to an independent observation of nature. The following books were to a certain degree based upon the writings of Albertus: the encyclopedic works on natural history of the Franciscan Bartholomaeus Anglicus (about 1260), of Thomas of Cantimpré (1204–80), canon of Cambral, of Vincent of Beauvais (d. 1264), the “Bonum Naturae” by Kunrad von Menenberg (1307–74), canon of Ratisbon, and the natural history of Meinau composed towards the end of the thirteenth century at the Monastery of Meinau on the Lake of Constance. In the medical schools the influence of scholasticism made itself felt, but this influence was always far greater than that of the scholastic physician, the philosopher at the bedside, with his copious works of needy contents, with his endless game of question and answer, must not, however, be misjudged; he preserved interest in the observation of nature, which is as freely conceded, a skilful practitioner, although he laid excessive stress upon formalism, and medicine in his hands made no special progress.

Bologna was the principal home of scholastic medicine, and, as early as the twelfth century, a medical school existed there. The most famous physician there was Thaddeus Alderotti (Th. Florentinus, 1215–95), who even at that time gave practical clinical instruction and enjoyed great fame. Among his pupils were the four Varignana, Dino and Tommaso di Garbo, and Pietro Torrijano Rustichelli—later a Chartusian monk—all well-known exponents of the writings of Galen. Indirect disciples were Pietro di Tusigiana (d. 1410), who first described the baths at Bormio, and Bavarius de Bavariis (d. about 1480), who in 1426 was the first Pope Nicholas V.

Bologna and the Study of Anatomy.—Bologna has gained incomparable glory from the fact that Mondino de Liucei (about 1275–1326), the reviver of anatomy, taught there. Then, for the first time since the Alexandrian period (nearly 1500 years), he dissected a human corpse, and wrote a treatise on anatomy based upon his own observations, which, for nearly two and a half centuries, remained the official textbook of the universities. Although Mondino’s work, which appeared in 1316, contains many defects and errors, it nevertheless marked an advance and incited men to further investigation.

Padua, the famous rival of Bologna, received a university in 1222 from Frederick II. Just as the University of Leipzig originated in consequence of the migration of students and professors from the University of Prague in 1409, so Padua came into existence through a secession from Bologna. Bologna was soon surpassed by the daughter institution, and, from the foundation of the University of Vienna in 1365 until the middle of the eighteenth century, Padua remained a shining model for the medical school of Bologna. The first teacher of pharmacy was Pietro d’Abano (Petrus Aponensis, 1250—about 1320), known as the “great Lombard”—an honorary title received during his residence at the University of Paris. On account of his too liberalistic opinions and his derision of Christian teaching in his “Conciliorum Index,” in his chief medical work, he was accused of being a heretic. From this period also date the “Aggregator Brixiansis” of Guglielmus Corvi (1250–1326), a work in even greater demand in later times, and the “Consilia” of Gentile da Foligno (d. 1348), who, in 1341, performed the first anatomical dissection in Padua. The fame of the school of Padua was greatly advanced by the family of physicians, the Santa Sophia, which about 1292 emigrated from Constantinople, and whose most famous members were Marsilio (d. 1405) and Galeazzo (d. 1427). The latter, one of the first teachers in Vienna (about 1398–1407), and later professor at Padua, wrote in Vienna a pharmacopoeia which indicates absolutely independent observation; in the field of botany, his antithesis and contemporary was Giacomo dalla Torre of Forli (Jacobus Foroliviiensis, d. 1413), professor at Padua, known for his commentary on the “Ars parva” of Galen. Giacomo de Dondi (1298–1359), author of the “Aggregator Brixiansis,” tried to dig a salt from the thermal waters of Abano, near Padua. As anatomist and practitioner we must mention Bartholomaeus de Montagnana (d. 1460), and the grandfather of the unfortunate Savonarola, Giovanni Battista de’ Montefeltro (1390–1462), author of the “Practica Major,” who worked along the same lines.

Montpellier.—The earliest information about the medical school of this place dates from the twelfth century. Like Salerno, Montpellier developed great independence as far as the other schools were concerned, and laid the greatest stress upon practical medicine. With the decay of Salerno, Montpellier gained in importance. The chief representative of this school is the Spirid, Arnold de Villeneuve (about 1135–1235), about 1312). His greatest merit is that, inclining more towards the Hippocratic school, he did not follow unconditionally the teachings of Galen and Avicenna, but relied upon his own observation and experience, while employing in therapeutics a more dietetic treatment as opposed to Arabian tenets. To him we are indebted for the systematic use of hemorrhage, and for his great merit is his popularizing of alchemy, to the study of which he was very much devoted. Other Montpellier representatives of purely practical medicine are Bernard of Gordon (d. 1314; “Lilium medicinae”, 1305), a Scotchman educated in Salerno; Gerardus de Solo (about 1320; “Introductorium juvenum”); Johannes de Salerno (d. 1328); and the fourteenth century; “Clarificatorium juvenum”; and the Portuguese Valerius de Taranta (“Philonium pharmaceuticum et chirurgicum”, 1418). The medical school of Paris, founded in 1180, remained far behind Montpellier in regard to the practice of medicine.

Surgery in the Age of Scholasticism.—Surgery exhibited during this period in many respects a more independent development than practical medicine, especially in Bologna. The founder of the school there was Hugo Borgognoni of Lucca (d. about 1258). A more important figure was his son Teoforico, chaplain, penitentiary, and physician-in-ordinary to Pope Innocent IV, later Bishop of Cervia. In his “Surgery”, completed in 1266, he narrates the results of the treatment of wounds, fractures, and dislocations. Guilielmo Saliscito from Piacenza (Guil. Placentinus), first of Bologna, then at Verona, where he
completed his surgery in 1275, shows great individuality and a keen diagnostic eye. Similarly his pupil Lanfranchi strongly recommended the reunion of surgery and internal medicine. Lanfranchi, banished in 1250 from his native city, Milan, transplanted Italian surgery to Paris. There the surgery and physicians of the faculty, had, since 1260, been formed into a corporation, the Collège de St. Cosme (since 1713 Académie de Chirurgie), to which Lanfranchi was admitted. His “Chirurgia magna” (Ars completa), finished in 1296, is full of casuistic notes and shows the author as an equally careful and lucky operator. The first important French surgeon is Henri de Mondeville (1260-1320), originally a teacher of anatomy at Montpellier, whose treatise, although for the most part a compilation, does not lack originality and perspicuity. The culminating point in French surgery at this period is marked by the appearance of Guy de Chauliac (Chauliac, d. about 1370). He completed his studies at Bologna, Montpellier, and Paris; later he entered the ecclesiastical state (canon of Reims, 1358), and was physician-in-ordinary to popes Clement VI, Innocent VI, and Urban V. From him we have a description of the terrible plague which he witnessed in 1348 at Avignon. His “Chirurgia magna” treated the subject with a completeness never previously attained, and the author, in spite of his high rank of a first-class authority. Among contemporary surgeons in other civilised countries we must mention John Arderne (d. about 1399), an Englishman, who studied at Montpellier and lived subsequently in London, famous for his skill in operating for anal fistulae, and Jehan Ypman of the Netherlands (d. about 1420) who lived in Paris. Besides these, there were a number of itinerant practitioners who offered their services as experts, as specializing usually in certain operations, for their fees could not be compared with the salaries of physicians. The latter’s “Canon,” written in clear language and covering the entire field of medicine, became the gospel of physicians. The literature of these times is rich in writings but very poor in thought; for people were content when the long-winded commentaries gave them a better understanding of the texts, which they deemed infallible. A good many things were incomprehensible, first of all the names of diseases and drugs, which translators rendered incorrectly. A comparative investigation of the Greek authors was practically impossible, as both their works and a knowledge of the Greek language had disappeared from among the Romance nations. Thus it was quite natural, and be written which were learned foreign words and their meanings. The “Synonyma Medicinae” (Clavis sanationis) by the physician Simon of Genoa (Januensis, 1270-1303) and the “Pandectae medicinae” of Matthaeus Sylvaticus (d. 1342), both of which were alphabetically arranged, were much in vogue. Woe to the physicians who dared doubt the authority of the texts! Only men of strong mind could successfully carry out such a dangerous undertaking. The influence of scholasticism in medicine was manifold. It encouraged the observation of nature at the bedside and logical thinking, but it also stimulated the love of disputation, wherein the main object was to force a possibly independent view of the underlying logic of the ruling system, and thus avoid all imputation of medical heresy. Signs of improvement are first noticed in anatomy (Mondino) and subsequently in surgery, which is based upon it.

The impulse to follow a new path came, however, from without, first of all from a study of the Greek language, and, like the physicians of the faculty, had, since 1260, been formed into a corporation, the Collège de St. Cosme (since 1713 Académie de Chirurgie), to which Lanfranchi was admitted. His “Chirurgia magna” (Ars completa), finished in 1296, is full of casuistic notes and shows the author as an equally careful and lucky operator. The first important French surgeon is Henri de Mondeville (1260-1320), originally a teacher of anatomy at Montpellier, whose treatise, although for the most part a compilation, does not lack originality and perspicuity. The culminating point in French surgery at this period is marked by the appearance of Guy de Chauliac (Chauliac, d. about 1370). He completed his studies at Bologna, Montpellier, and Paris; later he entered the ecclesiastical state (canon of Reims, 1358), and was physician-in-ordinary to popes Clement VI, Innocent VI, and Urban V. From him we have a description of the terrible plague which he witnessed in 1348 at Avignon. His “Chirurgia magna” treated the subject with a completeness never previously attained, and the author, in spite of his high rank of a first-class authority. Among contemporary surgeons in other civilised countries we must mention John Arderne (d. about 1399), an Englishman, who studied at Montpellier and lived subsequently in London, famous for his skill in operating for anal fistulae, and Jehan Ypman of the Netherlands (d. about 1420) who lived in Paris. Besides these, there were a number of itinerant practitioners who offered their services as experts; as, specializing usually in certain operations (hernia- and lithotomy), they often possessed great skill, and their advice and assistance were sought by people of the upper classes.

The Black Death of the Fourteenth Century...
Concerning this terrible period we have reports from the jurist of Placentia, Gabriel de Mussia; from Can- tonous and Nicophas about the epidemic in Constantinople; from Boccaccio and Petrarch (Florence), from the physician Dionysius Colla of Belluno (Italy), the Belgian Simon of Covino (Montpellier), Guy de Chaumine (Avignon), and also from some Spanish physicians. Less voluminous accounts are to be found in the chronicles of the different countries. Europe has since been repeatedly visited by the plague, which has, however, never been so violent nor extended so widely. The last great epidemics occurred in Central Europe in 1679 and 1713.

**HUMANISM AND MEDICAL SCIENCE IN THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES.**—The terror of the Plague, and the infection which it brought with it, showed the powerlessness of current medicine, undoubtedly helped to effect a gradual change. The greatest influence, however, was exerted by the humanistic tendency which had found many adherents, especially among physicians. The desire after general cultivation in the natural sciences was substantially promoted by the great voyages of discovery made towards the end of the fifteenth century. It is worthy of mention that, at a time when the gifted Christopher Columbus was still ridiculed as a dreamer by the learned, the Florentine astronomer and physician Vespucci and the house-physician of the Franciscan monastery of Santa Maria de Tabala, Garcia Fernandes, both heartily encouraged him and gave him material aid. The scientific endeavours for the reform of medicine are characterised by the activity of the translators, by the critical treatment and explanation of old authors, and by independent investigation especially in the field of botany. Concerning translations, those which had reference to the Hippocratic writings were of prime importance. Among the translators and commentators of these works we find Nicola Leoncino of Vicenza (1428-1524), the Spaniard Franciscus Valesius (end of the sixteenth century), the Frenchman Jacques Houiller (Holleri, 1498-1562), Johann Hagenbus of Saxony (Cornarz, 1550-58), the two Paris professors, Jean de Gorris Gomme and Pierre Ruzzenyi (1527-30), and Anthius Fossius (1528-9), a physician of Meta. As investigators of Pline there are Ermolaio Barbaro (1454-93), later Patriarch of Aquileia, and Filippo Veroaldo (1453-1505). Students of other authors were Giovanni Manardo of Ferrara (1482-1536; Galen, 1555), Achilleus (1463-1512) and Jacopo Berengario da Carpi (about 1470-1530). Anatomy made special progress because of the artists. Thus Raphael Sanzio (1488-1520) already makes use of the human skeleton when making his sketches, so as to give his figures the proper posture. We possess numerous anatomical dissections and sketches by Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519); they were intended partly for an anatomy planned by Marcantonio della Torre (Turrianaus, 1473-1506), and partly for a work of his own. The great Michelangelo (1475-1564) left sketches of the muscles, and in 1495, in the monastery of Santo Spirito at Florence, made studies for a picture of the Crucified with cadavers as models.—As a sign of how much the physicians endeavoured to advance the study of anatomy, we may recall that the priest Gabriel de Zerbi for a time taught anatomy in Rome (towards the end of the fifteen century), that Paul III (1534-49) appointed the surgeon Alfonso Ferri to teach this subject at the Sapienza in 1535, that the physician-in-ordinary of Julius III (1550-57) Giovanni Battista Chimenti disposed of his anatomical studies by discovering the valves in the veins; that Paul IV (1555-9) called to Rome the famous Readol Colombo, the teacher of Michelangelo, and that Colombo's sons dedicated their father's work, "De re anatomica," to Pope Pius IV (1559-65). Foremost among the universities stood Padua, the stronghold of medical science, and the light which disclosed the weaknesses of Galen's system. In Padua, where Bartolomeo Montagna (d. 1460) performed no less than fourteen dissections, there existed since 1446 an anatomical theatre which...
in 1490 was rebuilt under Alessandro Benedetti (1460–1525). Of the anatomists who worked outside of Italy we may mention Guido Guidi (Vidius Vidius) of Florence (d. 1569), until 1531 professor at Paris; his successor François Jacques Dubois (Sylvius, d. 1551), and Günther von Andernach (1457–1574), professor at Louvain. The two latter were the teachers of the great form of anatomy. The perfection of Vesalius (v. v.), studied at Louvain, Montpellier, and Paris, and then became imperial field-surgeon. His eagerness to learn went so far that he stole corpses from the gallows to work on at night in his room. He soon became convinced of the weakness and falsity of the anatomy of Galen. His anatomical demonstrations on the human body, however, which he performed at public squares and cities which attracted attention, soon earned him a call to Padua where he had recently graduated and where, with some interruptions, he taught from 1539 to 1546. His chief work, "De corporis humani fabrical libri vii," which appeared at Basle in 1543, brought him great fame, but likewise aroused violent hostility, especially on the part of his former teacher, Sylvius. The supreme service of Vesalius is that he for the first time, with information derived from the direct study of the dead body, attacked with keen criticism the hitherto unassailable Galen, and thus brought out his overthrow, for soon after this serious weaknesses in other parts of Galen's medical science were also dis covered and firmly attacked by the founders of the anatomy and of the technique of modern dissection. Unfortunately, he himself destroyed a part of his manuscripts on learning that his enemies intended to submit his work to ecclesiastical censure. While engaged on a pilgrimage, he received word in Jerusalem of his re appointment as professor in Padua, but he was ship wrecked in Zant and died there in great need on 15 October, 1565.

The authority of Galen was, however, still so deep rooted among physicians that Vesalius found opponents even among his own more intimate pupils. Nevertheless, the path which he had pointed out was further explored and anatomy enriched by new discoveries. His immediate successors as teacher in Padua were, in 1546, Realdo Colombo (d. 1569), later professor in Rome, the discoverer of the lesser circulation of the blood (pulmonary circulation), d. 1569; from 1551 the versatile Gabriele Fallopio (1523–62), an admirer of Vesalius, who among other things described the organ of Fallopio, Fallopian tube; Franciscus Fabricius (Fabrizio, Fabrizio) Aquapendente (Fabrizio, Aquapendente, 1537–1619), who worked in the field of embryology and studied carefully the valves in the veins, and finally Giulio Casserio (1561–1619), who published a series of anatomical charts. A similar undertaking was planned by Bartolommeo Eustachi at the Sapienza in Rome, but he died before the completion of his work in 1574. Pope Clement XVI (1700–21) caused his physician-in-ordinary, Giovanni Maria Lancisi, to print the rediscovered copperplates and to supply them with an explanatory text. Adrian van den Spieghel of Brussels (Spiegellus, 1578–1625) worked on the anatomy of the liver and of the nervous system. In comparison with the excellent productions of Italy, the anatomy in Germanic countries appears slight. It was considered sufficient at the universities, if a surgeon now and then dissected a corpse, while a physician explained the functions of the different organs. The only lawful exceptions were two physicians who rendered services both to anatomy and botany—Felix Platter (1530–1607), at Basle, and Johann Bauhinus (1560–1624), the discoverer of the valve in the cecum named after him (Bauhin's valve).

The Opponents of Galen and the Arabs.—Violent attacks upon ancient medicine, but also found expression in the general upheaval and discovery of new countries, caused by Humanists, by the opening up of new sources of knowledge, by the dissemination of education through the invention of printing, and by the schism of the Church brought about by Luther. Authority, both ecclesiastical and civil, had been considerably weakened. The investigations of Vesalius probably dealt the most serious blow to the teaching of Galen, but it was neither the first nor the only one; nor had it been before Vesalius had attacked the theories of Galen and the Arabs, although not quite so energetically as the anatomists attacked them. The chief representatives of these times down to the end of the sixteenth century can be classed respectively into anti-Galenists or anti-Arabists and positive Hippocrates. The climax of this revolution was reached when the appearance of the Frenchman, André Vésale, Menestrier, and his adherents, although the Italian schools remained uninfluenced by this. The physician and philosopher, Geronimo Cardano of Milan (1501–76), attacked principally Galen's explanation of the origin of catarrhs of the brain, and also the validity of the therapeutical principle, Contraria contraria curant. Simler was the tendency shown by Bernardino Telesio of Piacenza (1508–88), Giovanni Argenterio of Piedmont (1513–72), and the chancellor of Montpellier, Laurent Joubert (1529–83), while Jean Fernel (1485–1558), made an attempt to modernise the system of Galen in accordance with the results of anatomical investigation. A lively exchange of opinions on the controversies on bleeding, which was begun by the Paris physician Pierre Brissot (1478–1522). Brissot assailed the Arabian doctrine that inflammatory diseases, especially pleurisy, should be treated by bleeding on the side opposite to the seat of inflammation, and favored the Hippocratic doctrine of bleeding as near as possible to it. The controversy was decided in favor of the Hippocrates, who did not discard the doctrines of Galen as long as they agreed with Hippocritean views, but rejected the principles of Galen as modified by the Arabs. This is clearly shown by the importance attached to the state of the pulse and of the urine, upon which the Arabs laid much more stress than the Greeks. Of the great number of positive Hippocrates let us call attention to the above-mentioned de Monte, who introduced clinical instruction in Padua; to his successors Vellore Trincavella (1496–1568), Albertino Bottini (d. about 1596), Marco degli Oddi (d. 1598), Giovanni Manardo (1492–1539), Prospero Alpini (1491–1554), Giovanni Casola (1510–about 1580), and Luis Mercado (1520–1606); to the Frenchman Guillaume Bailleau (Ballonius, 1538–1616); to the Netherlands, Peter Foreest (1522–97) and Jan van Heurme (1543–1601), who will be mentioned subsequently; Franz Emerich (1496–1560), the organizer of clinical instruction at Vienna; Johann Straut of Graz, and the Viennese physician and Johann Schenez von Graftenberg (1530–98). Epidemiological works were written by Antonio Brassavola (1500–55) on syphilis; Girolamo Fracastoro (1483–1553) on peste chial fever and syphilis; Girolamo Donzelli (d. 1558), and Alessandro Massaria (1510–98) on plague; Jan van den Kasteele (about 1529) on the English sweating sickness; and Thomas Jordanus (1540–55), on purple of peste chial fever.

Theophratus Paracelsus. His Adherents and Opponents.—Theophratus Bombast of Hohenheim (Paracelsus), the son of a physician, was born near Einsiedeln, Switzerland, in 1493. In 1506 he went to the University of Basle; from Trithemius he learned alchemy, and from his father, chemistry; and he became a member of the religious houses at Schwaz (Tyrol), and he visited the principal universities of Italy and France. In 1526 he became town physician of Basle, and could as such give lectures. His first appearance is characteristic of him. He publicly burned the works of Avicenna and Galen and showed respect only to the "Aphorisms of Hippocrates. He was the first to give lectures in the Ger-
MAN LANGUAGE. But, as early as 1528, he was compelled, on account of the hostility he evoked, to leave Seville. After spending some years in Italy, he travelled through various countries working constantly at his numerous writings, until death overtook him at Salzburg in 1514. Paracelsus, like a blazing meteor, rose and disappeared; he shared the fate of those who have a violent desire to destroy the old without having any substitute to offer. Passing over his philosophic views, which were based upon Platonic and Pythagorean precepts, we find in his writings, among other things, a theory of the causes of disease (etiology), the introduction of chemical therapeutics, and his insistence on the uselessness of mineral waters and native vegetable drugs. He exaggerates indeed the value of experience. His classification and diagnosis of diseases was clear and accurate, and he passed on to the future the vital principles of physiology being wholly neglected. He thought that for each disease there should exist a specific remedy, and that to discover this is the chief object of medical art. With him diagnosis hung upon the success of this or that remedy, and because of this he aimed the diseases according to their specific remedies. He repudiated the idea of nature; the remedies were given to him by the Italians, and he also found numerous friends among the traveling physicians and surgeons. His settings met with the most hostile reception from the Paris faculty. Although the further progress of anatomy and physiology indicated clearly to physicians the right path, we meet them in the eighteen and nineteenth centuries with the attention they had to start directly from Paracelsus: Samuel Friedrich Hahnemann (1755–843), the originator of homoeopathy, and Johann Gottfried Rademacher (1772–1850), advocate of empiricism.

SURGERY IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY: AMBROISE PARÉ. The first fruits of the progress in anatomy were enjoyed by surgery, especially since most Italian anatomists were practical surgeons. After the introduction of fire-arms in war, the treatment of gunshot wounds was especially studied. While surgery had always enjoyed a high rank in Italy and France, in the sixteenth century it became important, especially in Austria and Germany. The first surgeons were well known; the first was Ambroise Paré (1510–90), the Frenchman who is known for his surgical skills and his teachings. He was the first to employ the ligature in the case of arterial hemorrhage. Next to him in importance stands Pierre Fracé (1580), known as the perfecter of the operation of amputation of the limbs. His method was used by the army of the Turks in the battle of Lepanto (1571) to improve the ancient plastic operations. In the sixteenth century the Cesarean operation (section cesareae, laparotomy) was performed on living persons.

DISCOVERY OF THE CIRCULATION OF THE BLOOD: WILLIAM HARVEY AND HIS TIME. Galen’s theory, according to which the heart is the seat of heat, and that contained air, the blood being generated in the liver, had long been regarded as improbable, but in spite of every effort no one had as yet discovered the truth about circulation. The solution of this problem, which brought about a complete fall of Galen’s system and a revolution in physiology, came from the English physician William Harvey (1578–1657), a pupil of Fabricius ab Aquapendente. Harvey’s discovery published in 1628, that the heart is the centre of the circulation of the blood and that all blood must return to the heart, at first received scant notice; but even directly opposed by Galen’s adherents; but further investigation soon made truth victorious. Harvey found the duct thoracicus and its opening into the circulation by Jean Pacquet (1622–74) and Johann van Horne (1621–70), and of the lymphatic vessels by Olaus Rudbeck (1650–1702) and Carolus Bartolinus (1616–80).

A new field of investigation was opened by the invention of the microscope, by which Marcello Malpighi (1628–94) discovered the smaller blood-vessels and the blood corpuscles. From Harvey’s time starts a series of the most important physiologists and physiologists, among them the Englishmen Thomas Wharton (1614–73; glands) and Thomas Willis (1621–75; brain); the Dutchers Peter Faas (1564–1617), his pupil Niels Petersen Tulp (1593–1675), both teachers of anatomy at Leiden; and Antony van Leeuwenhoek (1632–1723) and Johann Swammerdam (1647–80), microscopists; Reiner de Graaf (1641–73; ovary); Nikolaus Steno of Copenhagen (1638–86), and the Germans, Moriz Hofmann (1621–98) and George Wirsung, who investigated the pancreas.

IATROPHYSICISTS AND IATROCHEMISTS. The doctrine of the circulation is based on a large extent on the laws of physics. Consequently among a number of physicians, influenced by the works of Alfonso Borelli (1632–79) on animal motion, there was a marked effort to explain all physical processes according to the laws of physics (iatrophysicists). Opposed to them was a party, which, influenced by the progress in chemistry, sought to make use of it for explaining medical facts (iatrochemists). This tendency goes back to Paracelsus and his adherent Johann Baptist von Helmont (1578–1644). Helmont, who was an important chemist (the discoverer of carbonic acid), recognized the importance of anatomy, and desert for his work in therapeutics, although his failure to acquire the needs of his time prevented his doctrine from influencing the development of medicine. Iatrophysics was cultivated mainly in Italy and England; iatrochemistry in the Netherlands and Germany. The chief adherent of iatrochemistry in Italy was Giorgio Baglivi (d. 1707), professor at the Sapienza in Rome; in practical medicine, however, he held mainly to Hippocratic principles, while the Englishman, Archibald Pitcairn (1652–1713), tried to follow iatrochemistry to its utmost consequences.

Owing to the greater progress made in physics, iatrochemistry has now come to stay, and it is the service of the chief representative Frans de le Boë Sylvius (1614–72), who in 1658 became professor of practical medicine at Leyden. At the school there, founded in 1575, Jan van Heurne had
already tried to establish a clinic after the Paduan model, but it was not till 1637 that his son Otto was able to carry out his scheme. The immediate successors of the latter, Albert Kyper (d. 1658), and Ewald Schrevelius (1576–1646), continued this institution in the Hippocratic spirit. Before Sylvius began to teach there, the Leyden clinic had already gained a wide influence all over Europe. Of the first assistants of Harvey, Sylvius, depending in part on Paracelsus and Helmont, sought to explain physiological processes by suggesting fermentation (molecular motion of matter) and "vital spirits" as moving forces. Through "effervescence" acid and alkaline juices are formed, and through their abnormal mixture hyper- or hypochlorous (alcoholic fevers) are produced.

This simple doctrine, supported by the clinical activity of Sylvius, found numerous adherents especially in Germany; but it made just as many opponents among the iatrophysics, who were able to refute in part these untenable hypotheses. The two theories are, however, not absolutely opposed to each other, for both physics and chemistry offer the means necessary for an explanation of physiological processes, and may form the basis for the construction of an exact medical science. At this time, however, physics and chemistry (especially the latter) were still too little developed for this purpose, and therefore the endeavour to create a system was much more apparent than real.

Sylvius and his followers (such as Johann Baptista Borsieri (Burserius de Califeld, 1725–85), professor at Pavia; James Keill (1673–1718); Richard Mead (1673–1754); John Freind (1675–1728, smallpox); John Pringle (1707–82) and John Huxham (1694–1768), investigators in epidemiology; John Fothergill (1712–80); diaphoresis and inflammation of the lungs; or it might be learned by an important school in Göttingen as van Swieten had done in Vienna. The first members of the Göttingen school were: Paul Gottlieb Werholf (1699–1767; intermittent fever) and Johann Georg Zimmermann (1728–95).

ANATOMY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.—During this period normal and pathological anatomy were more cultivated than microscopy. The greater number of investigators that we have to consider won fame in the field of surgery. Starting from the school of Leyden the following anatomists deserve mention: Govert Bidloo (1649–1713) and Bernhard Sigmund Albinus (1697–1770; anatomicalcharts); in Amsterdam the brothers Van Swieten (1729–33, larynx mucoses); and in London the temporary professor of anatomy at Oxford, John Hunter (1723–83) both known also as surgeons; finally in Germany, the anatomist, surgeon, and botanist, Lorenz Heister (1653–1738), Johann Friedrich Meckel (1724–74; nerves); Johann Gottfried Zinn (1727–59; eye); Johann Nathanael Lieberkühn (1701–85; intestine); Heinrich August Reissberg (1739–1806; larynx), and Samuel Thomas Sömmering (1755–1830). Abnormal anatomical changes in organs had been recorded since the time of Vesalius, but these were for the most part merely incidental observations, and nobody had tried to trace systematically the connexion between them and the diseases. Only in the last thirty years has the survey of the achievements of the earlier centuries is offered in Theophil Bonet's "Sepulchretum anatomici" (1709). As the scientific founder of pathological anatomy we must mention Giovanni Battista Morgagni (1682–1771), professor at Padua, whose famous work, "De sedibus et causis morborum" (1761), usually contains, besides the results of post-mortem examinations, a corresponding history of the disease. This field was cultivated in France especially by Joseph Lieutaud (1703–80) and Viec d'Asy (1748–94), and in Leyden by Eduard Sandfort (1742–1814). Germany had an important investigator in the days before Morgagni, viz., Johann Jakob Wefer in Schaffhausen (1630–80). In Vienna, autopsies on patients who died in the clinic were first regularly made by Anton de Haen. For a strictly systematic treatment of the whole field we are indebted to the London physician, Matthew Baillie (1761–1823), who published the first pictorial work on pathological anatomy.

SURGERY IN THE EIGHTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES.—Surgical attempts of the seventeenth century are: Cesare Magatti (1579–about 1648), professor in Ferrara and later a Capuchin monk, who simplified the treatment of wounds; Marc' Aurelio Severino (1580–1658; treatment of abscesses, resection of ribs); the already mentioned anatomist, Fabrizio ab Aquapendente (re-introduction of tracheotomy,
improvement of herniotomy; Antonio Ciucci (about 1650; re-introduction of lithotripsy); in France, Bartholomeu Savidr (1650-1702; digital compression of arteries), Jacques Beaulieu (1651-1714), a traveling surgeon and later a hermit (Frère Jacques), who improved the method of lateral lithotomy, and helped people for a “God-bless-you”; in Amsterdam, Abraham Cyprianus (about 1695; lithotomy). The most important German surgeon was Wilhelm Fabry of Hilden (Fabricius Hildanus, 1580-1634; simplified treatment of wounds, amputation); next to him Johann Schultes (Schultetus, 1595-1646), author of “Arma mentarium chirurgicum”, and Matthias Gottfried Purmann (1648-1721; field surgery). Of English surgeons Richard Wiseman, (about 1652; amputation, compression of aneurisms), John Woodall (about 1613), and Lowdham (about 1679) are the most eminent.

In the eighteenth century surgery was essentially stimulated by the numerous wars; in France also through the establishment of an academy in 1731 by Georges Maréchal (1658-1736) and François Gigot de la Peyronie (1678-1747). Of Frenchmen we must also name Jean Louis Petit (1644-1750), the inventor of the screw tourniquet, Henri François le Dran (1685-1770; lithotomy, lacerations of scalp), Pierre Joseph Boucher (1715-93; amputation); Toyssaint Bordenave (1728-82; amputation), Antoine Louis (1723-92; operation for abscess, lithotomy, simplification of instruments), Pierre Joseph Desault (1744-93, founder of the Paris surgical clinic, ligature of vessels, treatment of aneurism, dislocations, fractures), François Chastard (1740-93; amputation), and finally the monk and lithotomist Frère Côme (Jean de St. Cosme, Baseliae, 1703-81), the inventor of the lithotome-caché. The founder of modern English surgery is William Cheselden (1688-1752; lateral lithotomy); Samuel Sharp (about 1700-78) wrote a text-book; William Bromfield (1712-92), invented an artery-retractor and the double gorgeret; and Percival Pott (1713-88) established the doctrine of arthroacae (malum poti). The most eminent and versatile surgeon is the already-mentioned John Hunter (treatment of aneurism, theory of the syphilitic ulcer, operation for gout). Surgery was on a much lower plane in the German-Italian. For the better training of the Prussian military surgeons and on the proposal of Surgeon-General Ernst Konrad Holtzendorff (1688-1751), there was founded in Berlin a Collegius medico-chirurgicum in 1714; later in 1726 the Charité school, and in 1795 the Prussian medical academy. Surgeons made great progress through Johann Zacharias Platner (1694-1747) at Leipzig; Johann Ulrich Bilguer (1720-96) and Christian Ludwig Murssina (1744-1833) at Berlin; Karl Kaspar Siebold (1736-1807) at Würzburg, and especially through August Gottlob Richter (1742-1812) at Göttingen (surgical library). A school for military surgeons was founded at Vienna in 1775 at the suggestion of Anton Störek (1731-1803); ten years later which was established the Josephinum academy, under the direction of the army Surgeon-in-chief Johann Alexander von Brambilla (1728-1800).

Study of Physiology: Albrecht von Haller and His Time. - The great discoveries in the field of gross and minute (microscopic) anatomy naturally impelled the surgeons to investigate the-resistances of the tissues, but the results of the efforts of both histrophysicists and interochemists were far from satisfactory, since scientific aid was sadly lacking. Physiology for the first time received systematic treatment at the hands of the versatile scholar, Albrecht von Haller of Bern (1708-77), professor in Göttingen, from 1737 to 1777. Haller, a pupil of Albinus and Boerhave, was the first to recognize the importance of experiments on animals. We are indebted to him for the best description of the vascular system and for studies in hemodynamics, in which field, however, the English clergyman, Stephen Hales (d. 1761), had already broken the soil. He correctly guessed the mechanism of respiration without being able to investigate its physiological importance (exchange of gases), since Joseph Priestley did not discover oxygen until 1774. He disproved the view that there was air between the lungs and the pleura by a simple experiment on animals. Haller became best known through the discovery of irritability and sensibility. When external stimuli are applied to tissues, especially muscles, the latter react either by contracting and moving (irritability), or by experiencing a sensation or sense of pain (sensibility), or at times by both. Sensibility disappears when the corresponding nerve is cut, while irritability persists indepen dent of the nerves and even continues some time after death. This theory met with great opposition, especially among the practical physicians (Anton de Haen), who did not, however, take the trouble to re-echo the experiments on animals. Even though Haller knew neither the central cause of the two phenomena, nor the correct structure of the tissues, he nevertheless stands to his eternal credit that he was the first to point out the facts and open up new roads for physiology. Haller's investigations were generously welcomed, especially in Italy by Abbate Lazzaro Spallanzani (1729-99), the first scientific opponent of spontaneous generation. His experiments along the lines of artificial fertilization of frogs' eggs, and concerning digestion are famous. Felice Fontana (1730-1805), repeating the experiments concerning irritability, reached the same results as Haller. William Henson (1729-74) studied the qualities of the blood (coagulation). The most important German physiologist after Haller is Kaspar Friedrich Wolff (1735-94), known for his investigations in the field of evolution and for pointing out the fact that both animals and plants are composed of the same elements, which he called little "bubbles" or "globules". Joseph Priestley's discovery of "dephlogisticated air" (1774), as oxygen was then called, was of the highest importance in the development of the theory of respiration, of the process of tissue-decomposition, of formation of the blood, and of metabolic phenomena.

Medical Systems in the Eighteenth Century. - The three great discoveries in the second half of the century (oxygen, galvanism, and irritability), contrary to what one might expect, led scientists astray, and gave rise to systems whose foundations were of a purely hypothetical nature. Especially interesting are the so-called "pathological" theories, which, to the extent with irritability. William Cullen (1712-90), accepting irritability as his starting-point, supposed a "tonus" or fluid inherent in the nerves (Newton's ether), whose stronger or weaker motions produce either a spasm or atony. In addition "weakness" of the brain and "vital power" played a great part in his explanation of diseases. Cullen (about 1735-88), modified this doctrine by explaining that all living creatures possess excitability, located in
the nerves and muscles, which are excited to activity by external and internal influences (stimuli). Diseases occur according to increase or diminution of the stimuli, corresponding to phenomena causing increased excitability (sthenia) and weak stimuli diminish excitation (asthenia). Death is caused either by an increase of excitability with a lack of stimuli, or by exhaustion of excitability from too strong stimuli. Brown's theory was little noticed in England and France, but in Germany it was highly lauded. Theophilus Girmanus (1760–1800) and Christian Gottlob Kratzer (1771–1842) spread its fame. Out of this Brunonianism Johann Andreas Röschaub (1768–1835) developed the so-called theory of excitability which was so energetically opposed by Alexander von Humboldt and Christian Wilhelm Hufeland (1762–1838). Giovanni Razzoli (1792–1837), building also on Brown's theory, developed and exemplified the doctrine of excitability, strong stimuli, namely that there are influences which directly diminish excitement (contra-stimuli) or remove existing stimuli (indirect contra-stimuli); he, therefore, distinguishes two groups of diseases—diathesis of the stimulus and that of the contra-stimulus.

The work of systematizers, the Vitalists, basing their views upon Stahl's doctrine of the soul (Animism) and Haller's irritability, consider vital energy to be the foundation of all organic processes. The chief representatives of Vitalism, a system developed especially in France and later predominant in Germany, are: Théophile Bordeu (1722–70), Paul Jean Baptiste Joseph Jacquelot (1773–1800) and Christian Gottfried Pelletier (1730–1826), Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840), and Johann Christian Reil (1759–1813). But, while these physicians adhered to Hippocratic in practice and (e. g. Reil) were eminently active in developing anatomy and physiology, the same may not be said of the three Germans, Mesmer, Hahnemann, and Radehoffer, the last of whom is little known. The doctrine of animal magnetism (Mesmerism), established by Friedrich Anton Mesmer (1734–1815), is connected with Vitalism in so far as Mesmer presupposes a magnetic power to exist in the body, and accordingly tries, at first by means of magnets and later by touching and stroking the body, to effect an interchange of forces, a transfusion or cure. Mesmer, through his manipulations very likely induced real hypnotic sleep in many cases. His doctrine, however, which at first met with a sharp rebuff and was subsequently characterized in many circles as a fraud, was degraded by his immediate followers to somnambulism and clairvoyance, and in later times it became almost entirely discredited. As noted above, it is to-day completely discredited. Starting from the doctrine of nostrums of Paracelsus, he names the diseases according to the effective drug (e. g. nux-vomica strychnia, liver disease), and classifies diseases as universal and organic in accordance with universal and organic drugs. His therapeutic was a purely empirical one, un influenced by pathology or clinical diagnosis.

Some Special Branches of Medicine at the End of the Eighteenth Century.—Obstetrics.—Down to the sixteenth century obstetrics was almost exclusively in the hands of midwives, who were trained for it as for a trade. Only in rare cases was a surgeon called in. But with the advent of the mid eighteenth century and the rise of the practitioner, obstetrics has passed into the hands of quacks. Nevertheless, mesmerism forms a basis for hypnotism, which in 1841 was established by James Braid.

Homeopathy, founded by Samuel Friedrich Christian Hahnemann, seems to have the promise of a long lease of life. Hahnemann regards disease as a disturbance of vital energy. The latter itself has no power to heal, for a cure can take place only when a similar severer disease simultaneously occurs. The best way to produce such a disease is to give highly diluted drugs which are capable of producing a similar set of symptoms. The rest of this "drug-disease" is destroyed by the vital energy, which is possible only when the doses are small. As chief principle, therefore, Hahnemann sets up the doctrine that like cures like. Since he denies the possibility of investigating the nature of disease, and completely disregards pathological anatomy, it is necessary to know all simple drugs which produce a set of symptoms similar to those of the existing disease. With his pupils Hahnemann concerns himself with the task of finding simple drugs, but the result of this gigantic piece of work could not be absolutely objective, since it is based upon the purely subjective feeling of the experimentalists. Never before had a physician built a system upon so many purely arbitrary hypotheses as Hahnemann. Paracelsus also had declared war upon the old medicine, and had attributed little value to anatomical and physiological causes, and which, however, was still in its initial period of development; but, with his reverence for Hippocrates, he nevertheless ranks higher than Hahnemann, who is the representative of empiricism and the desirer of all the positive successes which medicine had previously attained. Hahnemann's most able pupils did not follow their master blindly, but investigated his method, and as that which under the most favourable circumstances it may be, viz., a purely therapeutic method that does not disregard clinical science. To this rational standpoint, together with eclecticism, homoeopathy owes its long life and wide dissemination. One service of physicians of this school is that they studied prescriptions, and appreciatively studied side effects, but nevertheless valuable vegetable drugs. Hahnemann's pupil, Lux, extended homoeopathy to therapeutics, which in modern times celebrated its renaissance in organotherapy. Widely removed from scientific progress was the "empirical medical doctrine of Paracelsus and Goebe;" Goebe Radehoffer (1730–1800), which is to-day completely discredited. Starting from the doctrine of nostrums of Paracelsus, he names the diseases according to the effective drug (e. g. nux-vomica strychnia, liver disease), and classifies diseases as universal and organic in accordance with universal and organic drugs. His therapeutic was a purely empirical one, uninfluenced by pathology or clinical diagnosis.
famous German midwife, published in 1690 a textbook based upon wide experience (Chur-Brandenburgische Hoff-Wehe-Mutter).

In the first half of the seventeenth century Hugh Chamberlen invented the obstetrical forceps, selling it to Dutch physicians about 1688. Jean Palfyn of Ghent (1650–1730) constructed independently a similar instrument (Main de Palfyn), which he submitted to the Paris Academy about 1723. After various improvements by Lorenz Heister, Dussé, and Grégoire, the forceps passed into general practice. The most important accoucheurs of the eighteenth century were: in France, André Levret (1705–1780; inclination of the pelvis, forceps, combined examination), François Irig on de Vaucanson (1737–72; mechanism of delivery), Jean Louis Baudeloque (1746–1810; pelvimetry), opponent of artificial premature delivery and symphysioteomy; in England, Fielding Ould (1710–89; mechanism of delivery, perforation), William Smellie (1697–1763; mechanism of delivery, use of forceps, pelvimetry), William Hunter (1718–93), opponent of the forceps and the Cesarean operation, Thomas Denman (1733–1815), the first to recommend artificial premature delivery, and William Osborn (1732–1805), opponent of symphysioteomy and of the Cesarean section. The well-founded and in former times many accoucheurs entertained concerning the Cesarean operation, led to so-called symphysioteomy (Jean René Siegualt, 1768), which by widening the pelvis would permit delivery of the fetus. This operation, which met with vigorous opposition in England, is now forgotten. The introduction of scientific obstetrics in Germanic countries was comparatively late. Special schools for midwives were instituted, in 1728 at Strasburg (Johann Jakob Fried, 1689–1769), in 1751 at Berlin (Johann Friedrich Meckel, 1724–74) and Göttingen (Johann Georg Röder, d. 1763), and in 1754 at Vienna (Johann Nep. Crantz, 1758; Valentin von Lebmacher, 1797; Raphael Steidele, 1816). While the Parisian midwives belonged to the Collège de S. Charité, the others received no medical training, those in Germany could receive only private instruction. Examination by physicians is mentioned at Ratzeben since 1555 and at Vienna since 1642.

Ophthalmology gained importance much later than obstetrics. In addition to inflammation of the eye and operations on the eyelid, the Hippocratic writings mention amblyopia, nystagmus, and glaucoma. Celsius describes an operation for cataract (sclerocitonyxis). Galen gives us the beginnings of physiological optics. The slight ophthalmological knowledge of the Greeks was borrowed by the Arabs, but their lack of anatomical knowledge prevented all progress. No improvement set in until after the rise of anatomy under Vesalius. Formerly, cataract was almost completely in the hands of travelling physicians (cataract operators), but henceforth surgeons with a fixed abode (e.g. Ambroise Paré, Jacques Guillemeau) began to turn their attention to it. In Germany Georg Bartisch (about 1535–1606), "Court eye specialist" at Dresden, wrote the first monograph on cataract; it was highly valued even in later days. Among other things he mentioned spectacles for cataract, squint, eye-glasses, and, among operations, is the first to describe extirpation of the pupil. The invention of convex spectacles is by some attributed to the Dominican Alexander da Spina (d. 1313), by others to Salvino degli Armati of Florence (d. 1317).

Concave glasses did not appear until the sixteenth century.

The foundations for further progress in ophthalmology were laid by the anatomists and physiologists of the seventeenth century. In the first group let us mention the works of Friedrich Ruysh (choroid), van Leeuwenhoek (lens), Heinrich Meibom (1678–1740; glands of the eyelids), and Stenon (lachrymal apparatus). Investigations of physiologists were of great importance, especially those of the two astronomers, Johann Keplcr (1571–1630) and the Jesuit Christoph Scheiner (1575–1659), concerning accommodation, refraction of light, and the retinal image; René Descartes (1596–1650; comparison of the eye with the camera obscura, accommodation) and Edmond Becquerel (d. 1684; blind spot, choroid); Isaac Newton (1642–1727; dispersion of light and origin of colours).

In the eighteenth century, besides anatomy and physiology, the practical side of ophthalmology was also cultivated. Among anatomists were Winthrop, Petit, Zinn, Demours (cornea and sclerotic); Buzzi and Sömmering (retina); La Hire, J. H. Camper, and Reil (lens). The theory of the sensibility of the retina to light, established by Haller, was further developed by Porterfield and Thomas Young (1773–1829). The latter also described astigmatism and colour-blindness, and the operation to correct accommodation depended upon a change in the shape of the lens. Boerhave was the first to give clinical lectures on ophthalmology. From him we have the exact definition of myopia and presbyopia. Gray cataract (cataracta vetusta) was first operated on by the lens by François Quarré and Remi Lasnier, a view which was corroborated by the anatomist, Werner Rolink (1590–1673). François Pourfour du Petit (1644–1741), Lorenz Heister, and others also worked on cataract. Jacques Daviel (1696–1782) performed the first operation for extraction of a cataract in 1745. Of other practitioners we must mention: Brissieu (theory of glaucoma), William Cheselden (1668–1752; artificial pupil), Baron Wenzel the elder (1780; iridectomy), Charles de St. Yves (ablatio retinae, aesthesia, staphyloma, strabismus, J. G. von Lindau (1729–99), operation to correct oblique vision, cataract). Dominique Anel (catetherism of the lachrymal fistula, 1713), G. E. Stahl, Boerhave, Jonathan Wathen, Lorenz Heister, Johann Zacharias Blatner (1691–1747), and August Gottlob Richter (studies on the lachrymal fistula).

Pharmacuetics, Mineral Waters, Cold Water Cures.—Pharmacy had remained the most backward of all the branches of medicine, for it was longest under the influence of the Arabs. A large part of the drugs came from the Orient to Venice and Flemish harbours. Besides simple drugs there were also a great many compound remedies. But, in the latter class, there was great confusion resulting from many adulterations, and from the fact that not only did individual authors give different compositions for the same remedy, but also under the same name an entirely different preparation was understood by different authors. The most famous panacea, which dated from Roman imperial times and was used as late as the eighteenth century, was the. mixture of numerous ingredients, among them being the flesh of vipers. This composition originally came from the Orient, but was made later at Venice, Augsburg, and Vienna. To get some order into the treasury of drugs and to enable apothecaries to compound their remedies, the college of physicians in Florence...
published a pharmacopoeia (Ricetopario) in 1498. The oldest work of this kind in Germany was written by Valerius Cordus, a Nuremberg physician (Dispensatorium, 1546); then followed the Dispensatorium of Adolph Oertern in 1564, written at the request of the city of Augsburg, the Dispensatorium of Cologne in 1565, and finally in 1572 a similar work in Vienna, which, however, was not printed. Not until 1618 did Vienna receive a dispensatorium prepared from that of Augsburg, which had become a model for all Germany.

The Oriental trade in drugs was greatly facilitated by the discovery of the sea route to the East Indies. Uninfluenced by exotic remedies of scholastic medicine, popular medicine offered poor people, in addition to repulsive and superstitious remedies, a series of valuable remedies derived from native plants and minerals. A long-known and popular remedy for syphilis was mercury, introduced into scientific therapeutics by Paracelsus. To his adherents we are indebted for the use of preparations of antimony and arsenic, a popular remedy for skin diseases since ancient times. The first-mentioned preparations gave rise to a violent struggle on the part of the Paris faculty, which opposed every form of progress. Guaiac wood, regarded as a specific remedy for syphilis, was brought from America in such quantities as to be necessary. The subsequent important drugs introduced in the seventeenth century were ipecacuanha and Peruvian bark. The latter, coming from Peru, became known in Europe between 1630 and 1640. No remedy has had such a beneficial effect, but none has met with such opposition on the part of many physicians as this, because its method of violent (not sublimated) purgation (intestinal evacuation) was a direct contradiction of Galenic doctrine. Peruvian bark was introduced generally into therapeutics only after a long struggle, principally because important men like Sydenham advocated it. The latter as well as the Leyden school under Boerhave discontinued to a large extent the old Ayurvedic method of purgation (ipecacuanha) for a corresponding dietetic treatment. Besides the improvement in lead preparations by Thomas Gouland (1750; aqua Goulardi), we may mention the pharmacological investigations of cornelion, aconite, stramonium, etc., by Anton Störek (1731–1803), in Vienna. Bahnemans’s services in investigating native medicinals are outstanding.

The impulse to study mineral springs was in modern times given by Paracelsus. The majority of the modern European watering places of world-wide fame were already known to the Romans, but their curative properties were too little valued during the Middle Ages. Petrus de Tussigmanna wrote, about 1336, concerning the famous thermal of Bormio; Giacomo de Dondi in 1340 about Abano; the Vienna physician, Wolfgang Windberger (Anemorius), in 1511, about the sulphur springs at Baden near Vienna; Paracelsus about Pfaffen, St. Moritz in the Engadine, Teplice. Karlsbad in Bohemia was much frequented towards the close of the sixteenth century, as were Vichy and Puteoli. Harzburg, which provided the existence of carbonic acid and of fixed alcalies, wrote about Spa. Highly meritorious also was the work in this field of Johann Philip Seip (Pyrmont) and of Friedrich Hoffmann, who wrote about Spa, Selters, Schwabach, and Karlsbad, and taught the preparation of Seidlitz salt (Bitterseife), artificial Karlsbad, and of artificial mineral waters.

Cold-water cures were introduced in ancient Rome for the first time by Asclepiades, but they were soon forgotten. In sporadic cases cold water was employed therapeutically in later times, e.g. by Rhazes for smallpox, by Edward Baynard in 1555 against the plague, by John Floyer (1640–1734) for mania, and by several waters was noted systematically until the eighteenth century. The brothers Johann Sigismund and Johann Gottfried, and their father Sigismund Hahn (1662–1742), who in 1737 made extensive experiments during an epidemic of pocky fever in Breslau, may be regarded as the founders of the cold water cure. The work of John Sigismund (Usterricht von der Kaffee und van der Kaffee, the best known, and laid the foundation of modern hydrotherapeutics. Towards the end of the eighteenth century Johann Dietrich Brandis obtained good results in the treatment of febrile diseases by means of tepid lotions. The subsequent development of hydrotherapeutics was largely influenced by the results obtained by William Withering (1755–1819), and James Currie (1756–1805) in the epidemics of pocky fever in the years 1787–92.

Vaccination. Edward Jenner.—Even in the oldest peoples people seem to have possessed an efficient preservative against one of the most destructive epidemics, smallpox (variola). From remote antiquity the Brahmins of Hindustan are said to have transferred the smallpox poison (secretion of the pustules) to healthy persons by incising the skin with the object of protecting them against further infection by causing a local illness. In China people stopped up their noses with the inoculations of smallpox. A peculiar transfer with a needle (inoculation) was in use among the English and other people since antiquity. The method became generally known in Constantinople towards the end of the seventeenth century, and was introduced into England by Lady Wortley Montague, wife of the English ambassador, who had had her own son successfully vaccinated in 1717. Despite the loud approval of the court and aristocracy, inoculation met with obstinate resistance. The death of BOHN, the surgeon, Carelessness, quackery, and its ill-repute caused the method to be forgotten, until in 1746 Bishop Isaac Madox of Worcester, by popular teaching and the establishment of institutions for inoculation, once more proclaimed its value. Among physicians who favoured inoculation were Richard Mead (1673–1754), who in 1729 inoculated Robespierre, and Thomas Dinsdale (1767), Théodore Tronchin (1709–1781), and Haller. In Austria it was introduced by van Swieten, at whose suggestion Maria Theresa, in 1768, called to Vienna the famous naturalist Jan Ingen-Housz (1730–99), in spite of the opposition of the clinical professor de Haen. In the meantime another century was passed. Blasius Muller sought in vain to be devoted to cattle-raising it was observed that those who came in contact with cows suffering from smallpox frequently fell sick and had pustules on their fingers, but such persons were immune against the human smallpox. This incited the physician Edward Jenner (1749–1823) to further experimentation, which he continued for twenty years. On 14 May, 1796, Jenner performed his first inoculation with the lymph of cowpox (vaccination), an experiment of world-wide importance. Jenner’s discovery was everywhere received with enthusiastic approval. The first vaccinations on the continent were performed at Vienna by Jean de Caro in 1795, and by his contemporaries Alois Careno and Johann Steiner (1791) and Friedrich Hoffmann, who wrote about Spa, Selters, Schwabach, and Karlsbad, and taught the preparation of Seidlitz salt (Bitterseife), artificial Karlsbad, and of artificial mineral waters.

Medicine in the Nineteenth Century.—The powerful political position of France in the first thirty years of the nineteenth century finds medicine in an especially high state of development in that country. After this period followed the golden period of the Vienna school and, in a wider sense, of German medicine. The work of medical men systematically to aid the welfare of all civilized nations; yet all will regard Rudolf Virchow unqualifiedly as the chief worker.
to encroach upon the domain of the special articles, let us summarize in a few brief words the most important achievements of recent times: in anatomy, theory of tissues—Bichat; in pathological anatomy and pathology cellular, pathology—Virchow; in physiology—Johannes Müller; in practical medicine, asepsis—Lebœuf, Skoda; in surgery, treatment of wounds—Joseph Lister; narcosis—Jackson, Simpson; obstetrics, cause of puerperal fever—Semmelweis; in ophthalmology—Albrecht von Grafe and (speculum oculi) Helmholz; in bacteriology and serotherapy—Pasteur, Koch, and Behring. The subject of skin diseases was most ingeniously elaborated by Ferdinand Hebra.

General Anatomy.—A splendid basis for the further development of modern medicine was laid by Marie François Xavier Bichat (1771–1802), through his investigation of the vital qualities of tissues. What Haller had tried to do for the muscles, Bichat attempted to accomplish for all the tissues of the body. Bichat was the first to promulgate the idea that each tissue might by itself become diseased, and that the symptoms of diseased organs depend upon tissue changes. Gilbert Breschet (1784–1845) worked on the lymphatic vessels and the history of development, and Isidore Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire (1772–1844) on comparative anatomy.

Of Italian and English anatomists are to be mentioned: Paolo Mascagni (1752–1815; lymphatic vessels; comparative anatomy), Antonio Scarpellini (1747–1832; anatomy of the bones, organs of sense); the brothers John and Charles Ball, the latter (1774–1842) known also as a physiologist (brain, nerves); and Robert Knox (1793–1862; comparative anatomy). Germany performed the greatest service in physiological and allied branches. The first to be named in this connection is Theodor Schwann (1810–82), the discoverer of the cell as the fundamental element of the body of plants and animals. Johann Ev. Purkyne (1787–1869) worked along the same lines, and his Aller Köcher (1817; pensioned 1901) followed close in their wake. Work in comparative anatomy was done by Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840), Ignaz Blumenbach (1752–1850), Ignaz Döllinger (1770–1841), Karl Asmund Rudolphi (1771–1832), and Johann Friedrich Meckel (1781–1852). Friedrich Gustav Jakob Henle (1809–85), and Wilhelm Menke (1804–96) were prominent teachers of general anatomy and histology; Friedrich Tiedemann (1781–1861) was an eminent brain anatomist, while Nikolaus Rüdinger (1832–96; injection of carbolic for the preservation of corpses in the dissecting room), Friedrich Sigmund Merkel (b. 1845; topographical anatomy), and Wilhelm His (b. 1831; history of development), must also be mentioned.

Following the reform of studies under van Swieten in 1749, anatomy was cultivated in Vienna more than ever before. The more important men were Lorenz Gasser (professor 1757–65; trigeminus), Joseph Barth (technique of injection), George Prochaska (1749–1829; Linum) and Joseph Hyrtl (1811–94); technique of injection and corrosion, organ of hearing, comparative and topographical anatomy, known as a pre-eminent teacher, investigator, and a man of noble character.

Karl Langer (1819–87; mechanism of the joints), Carl Toldt (b. 1840; histology, anthropometry), and Karl Wedl (1815–91; normal and pathological histology) are others of this School. The professors at present teaching this subject in the Austrian universities still belong chiefly to the school of Hyrtl-Langer.

In North America anatomy was cultivated especially in Philadelphia, where, besides the school founded in 1764, there existed from 1820 to 1875 a private institution established by John Balentine O'Brien Lawrence (d. 1823), "The Philadelphia School of Anatomy". In 1775 Japan became acquainted for the first time with the anatomical knowledge of Europe through a translation of a work by the German Johann Adam Kulmus which had appeared in 1728. A diligent study of anatomy and of medicine in general began when the University of Tokio was established in 1871.

Pathological Anatomy was placed upon a new basis by Bichat's theory of the tissues, and it was later greatly advanced by physiology, physiological chemistry, and by improved means of investigation (compound achromatic objective lens of the microscope). The increased attention, which clinical physicians bestowed on this subject, increased the knowledge of its progress. Among these must be especially mentioned Laënnec, who defined tuberculosis and studied the pathological anatomy of lung diseases, especially of phthisis. Numerous though the able investigators were who performed meritorious services in perfecting this branch, the development of modern pathological anatomy will forever be intimately connected with the names of the pioneers, Rokitansky and Virchow. The first pathological procedure at Vienna was held by Alois Rudolph Vetter from 1796 to 1803, well known as the author of the first German work on pathological anatomy. In 1832, after the death of Joseph Wagner, Karl Rokitansky (1804–78; later Freiherr von) became professor and professor. He was educated in the views of Johann Friedrich Meckel (1781–1852), Friedrich Christian Freiherr Martin Lister (1777–1835), but particularly of Gabriel Andral of Paris (1797–1876), a leading representative of humoral pathology. Rokitansky's training was thus based upon the French school, but he subsequently brought about a still closer connexion between anatomical and physical diagnostics. His endeavour to become acquainted with the entire course of development of pathological changes was greatly assisted by the valuable material for dissecting which the metropolis afforded. His excellence is seen in his descriptions of pathological changes; he replaced the previous symptomatic pictures of disease by creating an anatomical pathology and anatomical types of disease. He was not so successful in establishing his doctrine of crisis based upon humoral pathology, and just here Virchow's fruitful activity begins.

Rudolf Virchow (1821–1902), professor in Berlin and a pupil of Johannes Müller and Johann Lucas Schönlein, early became acquainted with the cellular doctrine of Schwann and Schwann (1775–1828), the well-known phrenologist and founder of the theory of cerebral localization, and Joseph Berres (1796–1844; microscopical anatomy). The founder of the modern anatomical school of Vienna was the highly gifted Joseph Hyrtl (1811–94); technique of injection and corrosion, organ of hearing, comparative and topographical anatomy, known as a pre-eminent teacher, investigator, and a man of noble character.
Diseases thus represent a reaction of the sum of the cells when they are attacked by harmful influences, the causes of diseases. Virchow's chief work "Die Pathologie des menschlichen Körpers" appeared in 1856. Greater attention was now paid not only to pathological anatomy, but to its sister sciences, pathological chemistry, experimental pathology, and bacteriology. The chief representatives of experimental pathology were: in France, Claude Bernard (1813-78), Charles Edouard Brown-Séquard (1818-95), and Etienne Jules Marey (b. 1830); in Germany, Ludwig Traube (1818-76), and Julius Cohnheim (1839-94); in Vienna, Salomon Stricker (d. 1898) and Philipp Knoll (1841-1900). Experiments on animals are extensively made today in this field of investigation.

**Bacteriology, Theory of Immunity, Serotherapy, Disinfection.** The first to suspect that living beings invade the organism and exist in the blood and pus was the learned Jesuit Athanasius Kircher (1671), although there is no doubt that the "little worms" observed by him were really blood-corpuscles. With the help of his improved microscope Leeuwenhoek discovered a number of bacteria. The idea that infectious diseases were caused by a living contagion invading the body from without entered the first expressions of this idea into the Vienna physician Markus Antonius Plenica (d. 1786). Otto Friedrich Müller, in 1786, was the first to doubt that the microscopical living beings, then comprising under the name of *infusoria*, really belonged to the animal kingdom. In 1838, Christian Gottfried Ehrenberg gave a description of the finer structure of the "infusoria," and proved the materialistic view to be without foundation. What Plenica had only suspected was now clearly formulated by Henle, who defined the conditions under which bacteria are to be regarded as direct causes of disease. The unifying activity of Robert Koch (d. 1910) from about 1878 succeeded in bringing about a revolution in the understanding of the microbe, so that it could be made of service to practical medicine. Apart from ascertaining the bacterial origin of cholera and tuberculosis, Koch's greatest achievements are the improvement of the microscope (Abbé, Zeis), the method of colouration and pure cultures.

The success with the lymph of cowpox, a weakened poison as a protection against a full poison, as well as the old experience that those who had once recovered from an infectious disease usually became immune from new infection, led savants to look for the cause of the phenomena. In 1880 Pasteur, on the basis of his experiments concerning chicken cholera, located the specific poison in the blood serum of the chicken and proved that it was a bacteria of the body (theory of exhaustion), while Chauveau believed in a residue of metabolic products which prevented a new settlement of bacteria or new infection (retention theory). The investigation of Metchnikoff, and in 1889 of Buchner, advanced the idea that blood-serum possesses a certain hostility to bacteria. In 1880 Von Behring proved that the blood-serum of animals which has been made immune against diphtheria, if injected into another animal, would make the latter also immune against diphtheria. That element in the serum hostile to bacteria he called antitoxin. The introduction of antitoxin into the therapeutics of diphtheria was the greatest practical success of bacteriology. Efforts were naturally made to secure by similar methods protection against other infectious diseases, efforts only partly crowned with success (tetanus, plague, cholera, snake poison). Following Jenner's method of producing immunity by means of living, weakened causes of infection, Pasteur (1856) found a protection against lyses, while Haffkine, in 1887, made experiments not only with killed germs, but in 1897 similar experiments with the plague. From 1891 dates Koch's experiment with extracts of bacteria against tuberculosis. By means of preparations of pure bacteria-cultures, made according to Koch's method, it became possible to devise exact methods for destroying bacteria. In the field of the modern method of disinfection, Koch also worked as a pioneer, not only in precisely defining the difference between prevention of development and the killing of bacteria, but also by subjecting physical and chemical disinfectants to new tests. The modern steam sterilizers are based upon the discovery of Koch that steam under the ordinary pressure of the atmosphere is sufficient to kill even resistant lasting forms. He pointed out the ineffectiveness of alcohol, glycerine, and other substances upon the spores of anthrax, and the diminished effect of carbolic acid in an oily or alcoholic solution. Von Behring's experiments showed a diminution of power of some disinfectants in the presence of albumen, concerning which Krönig and Paul made experiments in 1887. The inoculation with the immortalized germ, Von Behring's experiments showed a diminution of power of some disinfectants in the presence of albumen, concerning which Krönig and Paul made experiments in 1887. The inoculation with the immortalized germ, an obsolete method of informing the body with its germs to develop a certain kind of immunity, was performed by Louis Pasteur, who made the first attempts in 1882. François Magendie (1783-1855), opposing Bichat (vitalism), maintained that there is no uniform vital energy, and that the vital qualities of the different organs are to be explained upon a physical and chemical basis and by means of experiments. His investigations in hemodynamics and the function of the nervous system (roots of the spinal cord, the ear) has been followed by work of the muscles, the discovery of muscular nerves, the chemistry of the bile and the urine, theory of diabetes mellitus, assimilation of sugar, atrophy of the pancreas, the power of the pancreatic juice to digest albumen, and the theory of animal heat. The physiology of the circulation was elaborated by Etienne Honne, who discovered the umbilical vein, the heart, and the invention of the sphygmograph. The relation of muscles and nerves to electricity was studied by Guillaume Benjamin Duchenne (1806-75), while Charles Edouard Brown-Séquard (1818-94), the founder of modern organo-therapeutics, investigated the reflex irritability of the spinal cord, the blood, respiration, and animal heat. In Great Britain were Marshall Hall (1780-1857; theory of reflex action), William Bowman (1816-92; structure of the striated muscles, and theory of the secretion of urine), Alfred Henry Garrod (1846-79; sphygmography, physics of the nerves), Augustus Volney Walker (1816-70; dis- pedia of the red corpuscles of the blood, studies of the nerve-fibres and degeneration) and William Prout (1785-1869; discovery of free hydrochloric acid in the gastric juice).
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1869) founded at Breslau the first German physiological institute. His most important studies were concerned with the physiology of the organs of sense, especially of sight, the physiology of the muscles and nerves, the ciliary movement of the epithelium of the mucous membrane, the structure of the nerve-fibre (artery-cells) and the human organs of walking (Wilhelm and Eduard), experiments in irritability by means of induction currents, and the irritation of the pneumogastric and sympathetic nerves and its influence upon the heart (Ernst and Eduard). Physiological chemistry is represented by Friedrich Tiedemann and Leopold Gemlin (1788-1853); digestion, absorption and assimilation, the importance of the lymphatic system for absorption, Friedrich Wöhler (1800-82; artificial preparation of urea), and Karl Bogislav Reichert (1811-83; crystallization of blood pigment). We must also mention the nervous physiologist R. F. Langenbecker (1805-64), discoverer of the tactile corpuscles. The greatest credit for developing modern physiology is due to the school of the versatile Johannes Müller (1801-58). Müller's importance, comparable to that of Aristotle, is due on the one hand to the results of his own investigations (studies on the physiology of the organs of sense, the sympathetic nervous system, the theory of reflex action, the production of voice in the larynx, and the description of the cartilage-nucleus), and on the other hand to his activity in all branches of physiology and in his grasp of the entire field of physiological knowledge. The most important investigators of the century in the domain of histology, physiological chemistry, and physics, were pupils of Müller. Besides the immediate disciples of Müller, such as Schwann, Kolliker, and Virchow, attention may be called to Robert Remak (1815-65; description of the marrowless nerve fibres, of the course of the fibres in the brain and spinal cord) and Heinrich Friedrich Bidder (1810-94; sympathetic nerve system, nerves of the heart, metabolism).

The doctrine of metabolism was advanced by the famous chemist, Justus Freiherr von Liebig (1803-73; excretion of nitrogen in the form of urea, importance of uric acid, albumen as a source of muscular strength), Theodor Ludwig Wilhelm Bischoff (1807-32; urea) and Karl von Voit (b. 1831; metabolism of nitrogen, organic albumen). The latter, together with Max von Pettenkofer (1818-1901), made numerous experiments in the change of gases in man during rest and work. Georg Meissner (b. 1829; origin of the constituents of urine, muscle sugar), Schwann (discoverer of peptin), Karl Gotthelf Lehmann (1812-65; pepton). The chemistry of the blood was investigated by Ernst Felix Josef Hoppe-Seyler (1825-93; blood pigment, blood corpuscles), Julius Robert Meyer (1814-78; mechanism of heat), Hermann Ludwig Ferdinand von Helmholtz (1821-94; physiological optics), and Émil du Bois-Reymond (1818-96; animal electrical phenomena, physics of the muscles and nerves). Just as versatile as Johannes Müller were Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Ludwig (1816-95; physiology of the circulation and excretions, theory of the functions of the kidneys, endoesthesia, discovery of the nerves of secretion) and Ernst Wilhelm Ritter von Brücke (1819-92; studies of the ciliary muscle as a muscle of accommodation, theory of colours, physiology of the voice, structure of the muscle-fibres, biliary capillaries, digestion, absorption). Karl von Voit (1815-92) worked on the chemistry of respiration and the counting of the blood corpuscles; Adolf Fick (1829-1901) with physiology of the muscles and nerves; Moritz Schiff (1823-96) with the nervous system, discovery of the harmful results of the extirpation of the thyroid gland, function of the base of the brain and the cerebellum; Rudolf Heidenhain (1834-97) with physiology of the glands; Alexander Rollett (b. 1834) with the glands of the stomach, blood; Eduard Friedrich Wilhelm Pfüger (b. 1829) with the gases of the blood, processes of oxidation in the body; Ewald Hering (b. 1834) with the theory of self-regulation of the act of breathing, sensitivity of retina to colours, and Theodor Wilhelm Engelmann (b. 1834), with electro-physiology, motion of the ciliary epithelium, physiology of the heart and of the organs of sense. The localization of the brain was investigated especially by Gustav Fritsch (b. 1838), Eduard Hitzig (b. 1838), Leschke (b. 1802), and Sigmund Exner (b. 1846). Of eminent physiologists outside of Germany we may mention the Dutchman Franz Cornelis Donders (1818-99; physiological optics, determination of refraction) and Jakob Moleschott (1819-94; metabolism and doctrine of foods).

Owing to the progress of the theoretical auxiliary sciences, practical medicine reached a high state of development, especially in diagnosis, but also to a certain extent in therapeutics. A general revolution was effected by the establishment of physiological diagnosis. Auenbrugger's epoch-making discovery, percussion (1761), passed over in silence by van Swieten and de Haen, the leading spirits of the Vienna school, and mentioned only in timid fashion by Maximilian Stoll, might have been forgotten. Further forgotten, but by Kurz, Corvisart de Marees (1755-1821), after an objective examination, had not translated Auenbrugger's "Inventum novum" into French, and published it in 1808 with a commentary. René Theophile Hyacinthe Laennec (1817-1826) enriched the physical method of examination by the invention of auscultation (noting the different tones and noises in the chest by placing the ear against it). His pupil Pierre Adolphe Pierry (1794-1879) perfected percussion (definition of the borders and outlines of the organs, invention of the plessimeter, improvement of the stethoscope). Laennec's invention attracted attention but slowly. His chief opponent was Francois Joseph Victor Broussais (1772-1838), but in England John J.充 (1787-1861) and William Stokes (1804-78), and in Germany, Christian Friedrich Nasse (1778-1851), Peter Krubenken (1787-1865), Johann Lukas Schönlein (1793-1864), and others assumed a friendly attitude. Auscultation and percussion came into general use in the Germanic countries much later than in England and France, but they were then brought into prominence by the Vienna physician Joseph Skoda (1805-81), who in 1839 treated physical diagnosis scientifically and fundamentally (auscultation and percussion). The new methods made possible the exact clinical diagnosis of diseases of the heart and the lungs to a degree never previously imagined. Besides Laennec and Skoda must be mentioned among the great number of bi-
vestigators: Jean Baptiste Bouillaud (1796–1881) and James Johnson (1777–1845), who investigated affec-
tions of the heart and rheumatism of the joints. August François Chomel (1788–1855; pericarditis and rheu-
matism), James Hope (1796–1841; certain arthriti-
s, including osteoarthritis), Hermann Lebert (1813–78), Johann Oppolzer (1808–91), Felix Niemeyer (1820–71), Ludwig Traube (1818–76), Heinrich von Bamberger (1822–58), and Adalbert Ducheck (1824–52).

Among therapeutic aids the introduction of digi-
tal purgatives by Traube deserves special mention. M. J. Oertel (d. 1897) tried to cure certain arthriti-
s (fatty degeneration of the heart, obesity) by means of
dietetic mechanical treatment (Terrainkur) and the
brothers August and Theodor Schott established the
so-called Nauheim method (carbonic acid baths and
gymnastics). Great credit in connection with the
diagnosis and treatment was due to M. Anton Winternitz (1812–82; pleuritis), Karl August Wurzlicher (1815–
78; range of temperature in pneumonia), Leon Jean
Baptiste Cruveilhier (1791–1875; pneumonia in chil-
dren), Theodor Jürgensen (infectious nature of pneu-
monia), Robert Bree (1807; bronchial asthma), Bier-
ner (1870), Leyden (1875; crystals of asthma), and
Czermich (1882; spinals). The subject of pulmo-

tary tuberculosis, profusely treated by Amand
Laurent Bayle (1774–1816; 1810 discovery of miliary
tuberculosis, tuberculosis a general disease); Virchow
developed the anatomic character of tuberculosis; Ville-
min in 1865–8 proved its contagiousness, and his ex-
periments were re-examined and confirmed among
others by Lebert (1903), Kiefer (1905), Baumann (1880).
Vieprey (1877), and Weichselbaum (1882).

With the discovery of the tubercle bacillus by R.
Koch in 1882, the path to the suppression of tuberculo-
sis was indicated. Cornet in 1888 showed the
danger of the aperient, which resulted in the prohibi-
tion of spitting and the placing of cuppidoirs with disinfec-
ting solutions. In 1890 Koch appeared with his discovery of
the tubercle bacillus, which he improved in 1897 and 1901.
In 1902 Behring began his experiments on cows to secure
immunity. Of late the treatment of tuberculosis is
chiefly dietetic. Diagnosis and therapeutics of the
diseases of the larynx were greatly advanced by the
invention of the laryngoscope in 1860 (Ludwig Türek
1820–83;便宜; and Johann Nepomuk Czernak, 1828–73).

The range of temperature, a diligent cultivation by de Haen and later by James
Currie (1733–1819), was systematically done for the
first time by Friedrich Wilhelm Felix von Bären-
 sprung (1822–64), Traube, and Wunderlich. In the

treatment of metabolic diseases we must mention the
notion of diabetic seal of Friedrich Theodor von Frerichs
(1819–85).

Diagnosis and therapeutics of diseases of the stomach
were advanced by the introduction of the stomach
pump invented by the English surgeon Bush in 1822, an
instrument recommended and used since 1809 by Adolf
Kussmaul (d. 1902), in enlargement of the stomach,
and for the examination of the stomach with the
symptomatic pump was employed by Karl Friedrich
Canstatt in 1846, Duchenne, and later by Kussmaul
(1877), the stomach catheter was used for diagno-
sic purposes by Wilhelm Leube in 1871.
The subject of typhlitis and perityphlitis was investigated among
others by Puchelt (1829), Burne, Smith, Bamberger, and
Oppolzer; diseases of the kidneys by Richard
Bright (1827), Pierre François Oliver Rayer (1793–
1867), Johnson (1852), Julius Vogel (1814–50), and
Herrmann Senator (1896); diseases of the bladder by
Josef Grünfeld (1872), Trouvé (1878), Max Nitze
(1879; endoecopy), Rovsing (1890, 1898), Kroglius
(1890, 1894), Guyon, Leube, and Robert Ullmann
(1888); diseases of veins by Richard Bright.
The development of modern diagnosis and the ther-
peutics of nervous diseases are connected with the
names of eminent physiologists and clinical physi-

Of the latter we may mention Moris Heinrich Romb-
berg (1795–1873), Wilhelm Griesinger (1817–68),
Duchenne, and the universal Jean Martin Charcot (d.
1893). Faradisation (1831), as a therapeutic means
specialized against lameness, was introduced by Duche-
ene in 1847. Among special studies of individual dis-

eas were: on tabes dorsalis by Romberg, Duchenne,
Armand Trouseau (1801–66), Nikolas Friedrich
(d. 1852), Leyden (d. 1910), Karl Friedrich Westphal
(b. 1833), Charcot, and Alfred Fournier, who in 1876
pointed out the connexion between tabes and diabe-
tes; on polyneuritis by Brouardel, Nauheim, Oppolzer, Friedrich
Westphal, Charcot. A peculiar complex of symptoms
was described for the first time by Robert James
Graves (d. 1853), later (1840) by Karl von Basedow
(Basedow’s Disease). The picture of neurasthenia
was given for the first time in detail in 1869 by Georg
Beard; Weir-Mitchell together with Playfair proposed for
it the so-called fattening cure.

As to progress in psychiatry, there is now a more
human conception of the care for the insane com-
pared with that obtaining in former times. This
movement originated principally in England (Thomas
Arnold, d. 1818; William Perfeet, b. 1740; Alexander
Fison, 1763–1865) and subsequently in France (b. 1755–1826; Jean Etienne Dominique Esquirol, 1772–
1840), and found in Italy in Vincenzo Chiariugi (d.
1822) and in Germany in Johann Christian Reil (1759–
1813), zealoussupporters. With this movement came a
general and profound study of the subject stimulated by
the results of pathological anatomy, especially judicious theo-
ry, proper physical occupation of the insane, and the
discontinuance of the isolation system. Special atten-

Modern Dermatology begins with the endeavours of
Johann Jakob Plenk (1738–1807) at Vienna to estab-
lish a classification of skin diseases on a basis of exter-
nal clinical appearance. Work of a similar nature was
done by Anna Maria Lorry (1777), Robert Wil-
ian (1795), Thomas Bateman (1815), all of whom
introduced simplification into dermatology. Con-
stant Belt (1781–1840), and Camille Melchior Gigot
(1797–1866). Jean Louis Albert (1766–1837) made
a classification according to pathological principles,
while Pierre François Oliver Rayer used anatomy and
physiology as a basis. The pathological-anatomical
method, introduced by Julius Rosenbaum (1807–74),
was established by Friedrich Wilhelm Felix von
Bärensprung (1822–64; eczema marginatum, erythema caused by fungus, and herpes
zosus) and his successor, Georg Lewin (1820–96; 

eczema). Pierre Antoine Ernest Nasin (1807–
78) worked along the same lines as Hebra (parasitcal
and constitutional skin-diseases, erythema indurata)
Hebra’s most important pupils are Heinrich
Becker (1835–86; of various skin disease).

The development of modern diagnosis and the thera-
peutics of nervous diseases are connected with the
names of eminent physiologists and clinical physicians.

For a number
of valuable special investigations we are indebted to Tilbury Fox (1836–78; impedigio contagioso, describes Stellwag. A letter to the Cataract, 1823–1904; deafness of accommodation, innervation of the iris), Julius Jacobson (1828–89; diphtheritis conjunctivae), Otto Becker (1828–90; pathological topography of the eye, lens), Josef Ritter von Haener (1819–92; forensic injury of the eye), Ludwig Mauhtemer (1840–94; optical defects of the eye, glaucoma), Albrecht Nagel (1819–87; strabismus, paracentesis of the cornea, corneal, the Russian Alexander Ivanov (1839–90; inflammation of the retina and the optic nerves, glass eye), and Victor Felix Szokalski (1811–91; textbook).

The introduction of local anesthesia by means of cocaine in 1854 by Rudolf Koller of Vienna, greatly facilitated operation on the eye.

Obstetrics. — One of the most eminent obstetricians was Lukas Johann Feuerer of Vienna (1751–1835), who upon the request of the emperor studied in Paris and London from 1785 to 1788. He represented the so-called "waiting method," using instruments as rarely as possible, taught rational dietetics during pregnancy and confinement, and was the first to employ electricity for reviving asphyxiated children. Work on the subject of his was done by Wilhelm Joseph Schmitt (1760–1824; forces operation in the longitudinal position, methods of examination, mechanism of parturition). In contradistinction to Boër, Friedrich Benjamin Osiander (1759–1822) represented the most extreme operative tendencies, while Adam Elias von Siebold (1775–1828) took a middle course. Modern obstetrics began in 1847 with James Young Simpson (1811–70), the manufacturer of the English forces and cranioclast; he was the first to employ narcosis (first with ether and in the same year also with chloroform) for women in labour, but at present this is done only in case of operations. Of far greater importance is the simultaneous discovery of anesthesiopnea (pyemia) by Ignaz Philipp Semmelweis of Vienna (1818–65). He introduced the practice of disinfecting hands and instruments with a solution of chloride of lime, and thereby reduced the mortality of lying-in women from 9:92 to 1:27 per cent. This most important discovery that external infection causes suppurative fever was utilized in general practice only by a later period. Propositions similar to Semmelweis had been made as early as 1843 by Oliver Wendell Holmes of Boston, but they were not known in Europe.

Important advances in modern times are marked by descriptions of the narrow pelvis by Gustav Adolf Michaelis (1798–1848) and Karl Konrad Theodor Litman in 1851, and of the oblique oval pelvis by Litman in 1854, and in 1836 in the case of such a pelvis by Spiegelberg in 1870; the manual removal of the placenta in 1853, and prophylaxis against blemorrhoea of the newly born by Credé in 1854; axial traction forces by Chassagen in 1861; combined turning by Braxton Hicks in 1860–3; the mechanism of delivery by Leishman and Hodge in 1861, placenta retention between the uterus and the cervix by Litman in 1853.
The classical Cæsarean operation, as previously performed, consisted in opening but leaving in the uterus, with great risk to life, the ovary. In 1783, after a successful operation at Pavia in 1785 performed it, therefore, with the subsequent removal of the uterus and ovaries, and thus obtained much more favourable results. With the perfection of antiseptic, or rather aseptic, treatment in modern times, the classical Cæsarean operation is being again performed. The total removal of the ovaries (ovotomy) on account of their degeneration was performed for the first time in 1809 by Ephraim MacDowell at Danville, Kentucky, the technique of the operation being perfected by Hutchinson in 1859, Spencer Wells and Marion Sims in 1873, Freund in 1878, and Cerny in 1879. Total extirpation of the uterus is performed especially in the case of cancer.

Of all the branches of obstetrics, gynecology, surgery made the greatest progress, first in France and England, later also in Germany. Side by side with the renowned surgeon-in-chief, of the Napoleonic armies, Jean Dominique Lenny (1766–1842), we have, as the most versatile, Guillaume Dupuytren (1777–1835); next to him Phillibert Joseph Roux (1780–1854); resection and transplants (1870–1871) in图形: Guérin-Dupuytren, Alfred Armand Louise Marie Velpeau (1795–1868), treatment of hernia by injection of iodine, Jacques Mathurin Delpech (1777–1832); studies about phage-denias, gangraena nosocomialis, tenotomy of the tendo Achilllis, Jean Zuléma Amussat (1796–1855, lithotripsy), Auguste Vidal (1803–56, varicocoele), Joseph François Nollet (1781–1821), fractures and subluxations, Auguste Nélaton (1807–73, lithotomy), Edouard Chassaignac (1805–79, écartement linéaire, drainage), and Charles Gabriel Pravaz (1791–1853, orthopedia, subcutaneous injection). Of English surgeons we must mention the brothers Bell, John (collateral circulation after ligation) and Charles (operative surgery); John (1749–1812); John Hunter (1728–1807); extirpation of the hip joint; the famous surgeon, Astley Paton Cooper (1768–1841; textbook), and William Lawrence (1785–1867). In America we may note the chief surgeon of the War of Independence, John Collins Warren (1773–1815), Philipp Syng Physick (1768–1837; new formations), Willard Parker (1800–84; cystotomy), and Frank Hastings Hamilton (1812–96; fractures and dislocations). Passing to the German surgeons let us mention first of all Vincenz von Kern of Vienna (1760–1829; open treatment of wounds), his successor, Joseph von Wattman (1789–1866; lithotomy), and Frans Schuh (1805–65; new formations, hernia); in Germany Louis Stroebel (1835–1915; tenotomy, resection); Johann Friedrich Diefenbach (1794–1847; plastic operations), and Albert Theodor Middeldorf (1824–68; galvanocautery).

A new epoch of progress begins in 1846 with the introduction of narcosis. The discoverer of the narcotic effect of ether is the American physician and chemist, Charles Jackson (1803–80), who, together with William Morton, made experiments upon his own person. The first narcosis was undertaken in 1846 by Warren, and in the same year in London by Robert Liston. Simpson first employed ether in an obstetric operation in 1847, but soon afterwards introduced into practice chloroform. In modern times a mixture of ether and chloroform is generally used. Both ether and chloroform are powerful analgesics (evaporation of ether, injection of cocaine, bromoethyl). Of still greater importance than narcosis was the treatment of wounds with carbolic acid by the Englishman Joseph Lister in 1867 (antiseptic treatment of wounds). In the course of time carbolic acid was replaced by other antiseptics, as salicylic acid, benzoic acid, and carbolic acid had to yield to the aseptic method (careful protection of the field of operation against infecting germs). A third achievement of modern times is operating with an artificial absence of blood (operations on the extremities), mentioned for the first time by Friedrich von Recklinghausen in 1873. Narcosis and antiseptics now make possible a series of daring operations, before impossible, with essentially better chances of success. In the recent development of German surgery Bernhard von Langenbeck (1810–87), known especially as a military surgeon, holds a leading position. Of his school we have among others Adolf von Bardeleben (1819–95), author of a textbook, Karl Thiersch (1822–95; transplantation), Johann Nepomuk von Nussbaum (1829–90; transplantation of bones, extension of nerves), Theodor von Bilroth (1829–94; extirpation of the larynx and struma, resection of the pylorus) and Richard von Volkmann (1830–89; surgery of the joints). A very important means of locating (e.g. pneumonia) the human body, and for the examination of fractures is the Röntgen rays discovered by William Karl Röntgen in 1895 (Röntgen photography).


LEOPOLD SENFELDER.

Medicine, Pastoral. See Pastoral Medicine.

Medicine and Canon Law.—In the early centuries the practice of medicine by clerics, whether secular or regular, was regulated by Church law. A secular clergy, who had the privilege of the Church, nor was it at all uncommon for them to devote a considerable part of their time to the medical avocation. Abuses, however, arose, and in the twelfth century ecclesiastical canons were framed which became more and more adverse to clerics practicing the art of medicine. The “Corpus Juris Canonici” contains a decree prohibiting secular clerics and regulars from attending public lectures at the universities in medicine and law (cap. Namagnopere, 3, Ne clericu aut manum). The reason adduced is, lest through such sciences, spiritual men be again plunged into worldly cares. They were not hereby forbidden to make private studies in medicine or to teach it publicly. The Council of Constance in issuing a similar prohibition, had especially in view monks, who left their cloisters under pretext of attending university lectures, and in this were imitated by secular priests, who thus violated their obligation of residence. This law was extended by Honoria III to all clerics having ecclesiastical dignities. It is not binding, consequently, on the lower clergy, or on those clerics who pursue the sciences or private studies. The penalty imposed for violation was excommunication ipso facto.

As to the practice of medicine by clerics, the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215) forbade its employment when cutting or burning was involved. In the decree (c. Sententiam 9, Ne cler. vel mon., it is said: “Let no abbeys or convents mention medicine, and medicine which involves cutting or burning.” This was especially prohibited to regulars (cap. tua noe, 19, De Homioidlii), and they are also forbidden to exercise the science of medicine in any form (c. Ad aures, 7, de et. qual.). This general prohibition is extended to all clerics, inasmuch as the art of medicine is of its nature secular and is condemned by the Church, incurring an irregularity (c. 9, X, V, 12). Canonists, however, generally hold that in case of necessity and where danger to life is not involved, clerics can practice.
medicines through pity and charity towards the poor, in default of ordinary practitioners. The Sacred Congregations have on several occasions granted permission to priests to make and distribute medical concoctions, and allowed priests who had formerly been physicians to practice the art, but with the clause "gratis" and thereafter known as "the dispensers of the Slipper," however, shall be held accountable for the absence of other physicians." A clause is likewise sometimes added that they may accept recompense if spontaneously offered, but never from the poor. In cases where a cleric had formerly been a physician, he may not practise medicine except through necessity, without obtaining a papal indulgence. A physician is therefore bound to treat ecclesiastically gratis, though the bishop may allow them to make voluntary contributions. Likewise, the precept of charity binds medical practitioners to give their services to the poor free of charge. Physicians who prescribe remedies involving infractions of the Decalogue, are themselves guilty of grave sin. This is also the case if they experiment on a sick person with unknown medicines, unless all hope has been given up and there is at least a possibility of doing them good. Physicians are to be reminded that they have no dispensing power concerning the fast and abstinence prescribed by the Church. They may however give their prudent judgment as to whether a sick person who would obtain some convenience to his health, is obliged by the ecclesiastical precept. They are warned that, if they declare unnecessarily that a person is not obliged to fast, they themselves commit grave sin. They also sin mortally if they attempt, without being forced by necessity, to cure a serious illness, when they are aware that through their own fault and a false diagnosis they may be the cause of grave harm to the patient. Physicians who are assigned to the care of convicts of nuns should not be less than fifty years of age, and younger practitioners are not to be employed unless those of the prescribed age are not obtainable. When they have the ordinary care of nuns, they are made to have general license to enter the cloister, even at night in cases of great urgency. They are not, however, to be alone with the patient. Physicians who are not ordinary require special faculties to enter the cloister.

Regulars living in missionary countries have the privilege, especially by the Bull of Clement XII, "Cum Siecit," of practising medicine. To make use of this privilege, use of medical science in behalf of those patients who died under their treatment. According to the second decretal rule, all physicians and surgeons contract irregularity for possible future sacred orders if any of their patients die through want of proper diligence or of due study of the art of medicine on the part of the physician. Hence, Benedict XIV (De Syn. Dioc., I. 13, c. 10) declares that in general when physicians wish to enter the clerical state, a dispensation should be obtained ad cautelam, as they can never receive this privilege, unless they use means prescribed by medical science in behalf of those patients who died under their treatment. According to the second decretal rule, all are irregular who practise medicine or surgery rashly, through want of proper knowledge and experience, if they thus cause the death of another. Particularly as regards clerics, this irregularity is declared the more incurable by regulars who have received tonsure and by seculars in sacred orders who practise medicine in a forbidden manner, with burning and cutting, and thereby bring about a fatal result. Irregularity is also contracted by mutilation, which consists in the severing of any principal member of the body, that is, one having a distinct and peculiar function. Even if the incision or mutilation be done in the name of God for the healing of others, even if it be done through indirect zeal, incur canonical irregularity. As regards physicians and surgeons who are not clerics, they incur no irregularity for counselling or performing mutilation, because the canonical "defect of minlessness" (see Irregularity) does not apply to them. Should they afterwards wish to receive sacred orders, they should be dispensed ad cautelam.

The ecclesiastical canons contain many and various prescriptions concerning lay physicians, which are enumerated at length by Ferraris (op. cit. infra). Thus physicians are warned that they must endeavour to persuade their patients to make sacramental confession of their sins (cap. Cum Infinitas, 13, de poenit.).

St. Pius V decreted that no physician should receive the doctorate unless he took oath not to visit a sick person longer than three days without calling a confessor, unless there was some reasonable excuse. If he violated this oath, he fell under excommunication. Canonists and moralists (among them St. Alphonsus Liguori) however, declare that this is not unanimously held to be the general rule. The place where it never became an established usage. They also teach that even where it had been received, it applied only to cases of mortal sickness, or where there was danger that it might become mortal, and that it sufficed for the physician to give this warning by means of a third party. The canons also declare that when a sick person is bound to treat ecclesiastically gratis, though the physician is bound to correct ecclesiastical faults, the Church may allow them to make voluntary contributions. Likewise, the precept of charity binds medical practitioners to give their services to the poor free of charge.

William H. W. Fanning.

Medina, Bartholomew, Dominican theologian, b. at Medina, 1527; d. at Salamanca, 1581. With Domingo Soto, Melchior Canus, and Domingo Bañez he studied theology at the University of Salamanca under the celebrated professor Francis Vitoria. His life was devoted almost entirely to teaching theology at Sal-
MEDINA

Marina, first in the chair of Durandus, afterwards as principal professor. He was appointed to the "cathedra primaria" after a successful concursus, in public, against the learned Augustinian, John of Guevara. Although he was well versed in Greek anc. Hebrew, he loved theology more, and all his writings preserved are theological, being principally commentaries on the Summa of St. Thomas. He is usually called the Father of Probabilism. Writers speak of his teaching on this important question of moral theology. Some hold that he did not introduce, but merely formulated, Probabilism when he wrote: "It seems to me that if an opinion is probable, it may be followed, even though the opposite opinion be more probable," (I, II, q. xix, a. 6). Others say he proposed that probabilis intellectus (speaking of mind) should be in practice so that there was no departure from rules of conduct formerly followed. Others still, e. g. Echard, followed by Billuart, maintain that the system proposed by Medina differed greatly from Probabilism as it has been explained by its later defenders, and they cite its definition: "that opinion is probable which is held by wise men and is supported by first-class arguments". Hurter (Nomencl.) writes: "He seems to have led the way to Probabilism." Echard admits, with Vincent Baron, O. P., that Medina opened the way for a flood of probabilistic theories, and closes with the declaration: St. Thomas is our Master, others only in so far as they follow his teaching. Probabilism is not allowed to admit Medina against them; probabilists are lost to admit that he proposed a new doctrine, or do not wish to give to him all the credit of introducing a new system for forming the conscience in doubtful cases. The following is a list of his most important works: Commentaria in primam secundae (Salamanca, 1577), "Commentaria in tertiam secundae" (Salamanca, 1578), "Breve instruction de comose se administre el sacramento de la penitencia" (Salamanca, 1580).

Quèrt-Echard, SS. Ord. Pred., II, 258; Bourdon, Théories et systèmes des probabilités en théologie morale (Fribourg, 1894), 8.

D. J. Kennedy.

MEDINA, Miguel de, theologian, b. at Belalcázar, Spain, 1489; d. at Toledo, 1 May, 1578. He entered the Franciscan order in the convent of St. Maria de la Puerta at Hornachuelos, near Cordoba, on 1 January, 1510. Soon after, he was sent to the College of St. Idefonso at Alcalá, where he entered the order of St. Jerome on 11 October, 1512. In 1516, he was ordained a priest. He continued his studies and then returned to his first love, theology. He was appointed professor at the College of St. Idefonso in Alcalá, where he remained until his death. His teachings were highly respected, and he was known for his scholarship and piety.

Medina was a prolific writer, authoring many commentaries and works on theology. He is known for his contributions to the field of moral theology and his efforts to reconcile the works of St. Thomas Aquinas with contemporary theological thought.

In his Commentaries, Medina sought to provide a balance between the rigor of St. Thomas Aquinas and the more flexible approach of the probabilistic school. His works were influential in shaping the development of moral theology in the Catholic Church.

Medina's influence extended beyond academia, as he was known for his piety and dedication to his faith. He was a respected figure in the Franciscan order and was held in high esteem by his colleagues and students.

Gregory Cleary.
Medrano, FRANCISCO, Spanish lyric poet, b. in Seville, not to be confounded with Sebastian Francisco de Medrano who was also a poet and lived at about the same time. The dates of his birth and death are unknown, but he lived during the latter part of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries. Little is known of his life except that he visited Rome. His works were published at Palermo (1617) as an appendix to the imitation of Ovid's "De Remedio Amoris" by Pedro Venegas, a poet of Seville. According to the Spanish critic Adolfo de Castro, Medrano is the best of the Spanish imitators of Horace, comparing favourably in that respect with Fray Luis de Leon. Endowed with literary taste, he writes in good Spanish, and his style is free from the gorgonism of his time. Among the odes of Medrano, his "La profecia del Tajo" is very similar to one of Fray Luis de Leon of the same title. Although both are based upon Horace's ode to Mark Antony in which he would separate him and Cleopatra, there is a great difference between them. Leon's ode departs from the original of Horace, while Medrano's is an imitation of the latter so close as to amount almost to a translation. The poems of Medrano are reprinted in "La Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, Vols. XXXII, XXXV, and XLI (Madrid, 1849-80)."

VENTURA FUENTES.

Medulic, ANDREAS, Croatian painter and engraver, called by Italian authors Medola, Medula, Schiavona, Schison, etc., b. at Sibenik, Dalmatia, 1522; d. at Venice, 1582. The son of poor parents, Andreas received instruction in engraving still early, and studied closely the pictures and woodwork on the walls of the public buildings and of his native town, and, on his return home, to sketch on paper all that he had seen. So tireless was his devotion to his drawing that his father took him to Venice, and there entrusted him to his godfather, Rosso, a painter of very little merit. Under Medulic's guidance Medola first discovered the secret power to make a wooden assistant, compelled to work from early morning till evening to procure bare nourishment and clothing, strive to perfect himself in his art. He began by studying and copying the works of the then renowned painter, Francesco Mazzola (known as Parmigianino), and the paintings of Titian. From those studies, the painters Medulic learned that the delicate lightness of touch, that animation of colour, which constitute the pre-eminent characteristics of his own pictures. While still young in years, chance procured for him the acquaintance of Pietro Aretino, commonly known as "the Divine" and the "accoutre of princes" (Flagellum principum), from whom Medulic received always a most friendly reception and much valuable instruction. About this time Medulic began to copy the engravings of Parmigianino, the first to execute pictures on copper with nitric acid. J. Paolo Lomazzo, contemporary painter and writer, states that Parmigianino was Medulic's instructor in this branch. Medulic was a most skilful imitator; the individual character of his painting gave rise to a special school in Venice, the "Scuola di Schiavone".

Tintoretto was not ashamed to work with the needy youth, to assist him, and even to study his beautiful style of colouring, recommending in writing all painters to study colour from Medulic's pictures, adding that "every painter is blazing with the history of the great masters, he possesses at least one picture of Medulic's in his studio." Among those who occasionally purchased his pictures and greatly prized them, was Titian himself who when commissioned by the Venetian Government to choose the best painters in Venice to decorate with mural paintings the public library of St. Mark, included Medulic among Veronese, Battista Zelotti, Giuseppe Salvati, and Battista Franco. Medulic retained lifetime great veneration for Titian and is indeed proclaimed by many authors (Filibeau, Ramdor, Nagler) his most celebrated imitator. For the Ruzzini family in Venice, Medulic painted the "Baptism of Jesus," but the subject of his artistic achievement, the well known "St. Cecilia Playing the Organ" (half length), with two attendant angels, and "Madonna Presenting her Son to Holy Simeon," in the house of the Priuli in the Via San Salvador, Medulic painted in fresco some scenes from the life of St. John; for the Foscarini the "Descent of the Holy Ghost." A great number of works, now scattered throughout the world, were painted for the churches of Venice and other cities and for individual collectors. On 22 May, 1563, the judges appointed from among the celebrated painters of Venice to decide the process of the brothers Zucchi were Titian, Jacob of Pistoia, Andrea Medulic, Paul Veronese, and Tintoretto. Medulic also worked with iron on copper, under the direction of authorities, was the first to engrave with a dry needle. His etchings are highly praised for their special elegance, beauty, and vigour; among his best works of this class may be mentioned, "Moses Saved by Pharaoh's Daughter," "Abduction of the Trojan Helen," "Sts. Peter and Paul," "Curing of the Lame Man" (after Rubens). Medulic died at an advanced age, and his talented assistant, to work from early morning till evening to procure bare nourishment and clothing, strive to perfect himself in his art. He began by studying and copying the works of the then renowned painter, Francesco Mazzola (known as Parmigianino), and the paintings of Titian. From those studies, the painters Medulic learned that the delicate lightness of touch, that animation of colour, which constitute the pre-eminent characteristics of his own pictures. While still young in years, chance procured for him the acquaintance of Pietro Aretino, commonly known as "the Divine" and the "accoutre of princes" (Flagellum principum), from whom Medulic received always a most friendly reception and much valuable instruction. About this time Medulic began to copy the engravings of Parmigianino, the first to execute pictures on copper with nitric acid. J. Paolo Lomazzo, contemporary painter and writer, states that Parmigianino was Medulic's instructor in this branch. Medulic was a most skilful imitator; the individual character of his painting gave rise to a special school in Venice, the "Scuola di Schiavone".

Tintoretto was not ashamed to work with the needy youth, to assist him, and even to study his beautiful style of colouring, recommending in writing all painters to study colour from Medulic's pictures, adding that "every painter is blazing with the history of the great masters, he possesses at least one picture of Medulic's in his studio." Among those who occasionally purchased his pictures and greatly prized them, was Titian himself who when commissioned by the Venetian Government to choose the best painters in Venice to decorate with mural paintings the public library of St. Mark, included Medulic among Veronese, Battista Zelotti, Giuseppe Salvati, and Battista Franco. Medulic retained lifetime great veneration for Titian and is indeed proclaimed by many authors (Filibeau, Ramdor, Nagler) his most celebrated imitator. For the Ruzzini family in Venice, Medulic painted the "Baptism of Jesus," but the subject of his artistic achievement, the well known "St. Cecilia Playing the Organ" (half length), with two attendant angels, and "Madonna Presenting her Son to Holy Simeon," in the house of the Priuli in the Via San Salvador, Medulic painted in fresco some scenes from the life of St. John; for the Foscarini the "Descent of the Holy Ghost." A great number of works, now scattered throughout the world, were painted for the churches of Venice and other cities and for individual collectors. On 22 May, 1563, the judges appointed from among the celebrated painters of Venice to decide the process of the brothers Zucchi were Titian, Jacob of Pistoia, Andrea Medulic, Paul Veronese, and Tintoretto. Medulic also worked with iron on copper, under the direction of authorities, was the first to engrave with a dry needle. His etchings are highly praised for their special elegance, beauty, and vigour; among his best works of this class may be mentioned, "Moses Saved by Pharaoh's Daughter," "Abduction of the Trojan Helen," "Sts. Peter and Paul," "Curing of the Lame Man" (after Rubens). Medulic died at an advanced age, and his talented assistant, to work from early morning till evening to procure bare nourishment and clothing, strive to perfect himself in his art. He began by studying and copying the works of the then renowned painter, Francesco Mazzola (known as Parmigianino), and the paintings of Titian. From those studies, the painters Medulic learned that the delicate lightness of touch, that animation of colour, which constitute the pre-eminent characteristics of his own pictures. While still young in years, chance procured for him the acquaintance of Pietro Aretino, commonly known as "the Divine" and the "accoutre of princes" (Flagellum principum), from whom Medulic received always a most friendly reception and much valuable instruction. About this time Medulic began to copy the engravings of Parmigianino, the first to execute pictures on copper with nitric acid. J. Paolo Lomazzo, contemporary painter and writer, states that Parmigianino was Medulic's instructor in this branch. Medulic was a most skilful imitator; the individual character of his painting gave rise to a special school in Venice, the "Scuola di Schiavone."
lating from the Latin of Archdeacon John Lynch" (1848); "Lives of the most eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects, of the Order of St. Dominic, translated from the Italian of Vincenzo Marchese (1852), out of print; " Tales and Fortunes of the Lords of Tyrone and Tyrconnell" (1868); "Rise and Fall of the Irish Franciscan Monasteries and Memoirs of the Irish Hierarchy in the Seventeenth Century" (1870). These works, all published in Dublin, have earned renown, and, except those marked out of print, have gone through numerous revised editions. Father Meehan wrote "The Cysters of Ireland," and the others which he named "Flowers from Foreign Fields." He edited Davis's "Essays" (1883), Mangan's "Essays and Poems" (1884), and Madden's "Literary Remains of the United Irishmen" (1887). He also wrote some graceful verse, which is to be found in various anthologies.

SILLARD in Catholic World (Sept., 1890).

PETER A. SILLARD.

MEERSCHAERT, THEOPHILE. See OKLAHOMA.

Megara, a titular see, suffragan to Corinth, in Achaia. The city, which was built on an arid strip of land between two rocks, had two ports, on the Saronic Gulf and the Gulf of Corinth respectively. In the eighth and seventh centuries b.c., Megara became the metropolis of flourishing colonies, the chief of which were Megara Hyblea and Selinus, in Sicily, Selymbria, Chalcedon, Astakos, Byzantium, and the Athenians, who were excluded from Megara, and the Attic market by Pericles, in 432, was one cause of the Peloponnesian War. The Megarian territory, already very poor, was then ravaged year after year, and in 427 Nicias even established a permanent post on the island of Minoa over against Nisaea. Shortly before this Megara had become the birthplace of the Sophist, Euclides, a disciple of Socrates, who, about the year 400 b.c., founded the philosophic school of Megara, chiefly famous for the cultivation of dialectic. It subsequently shared the political vicissitudes of the other Greek cities. About the end of the fifth century after Christ, under the Emperor Anastasius I, its fortifications were restored. The names of some early Greek bishops of Megara are given in Le Quen, "Oriens Christianus," II, 205. In the "Notitia episcopatum" of Leo the Wise (c. 900), the earliest authority of the kind for this region, the name of Megara does not appear. Numerous Latin bishops in the Middle Ages are mentioned in Euelb, "Hierarchia catholica medii evi!", I, 348; II, 208. Megara is now a town of 6500 inhabitants, the capital of the same name. On Easter Sunday the women there perform an antique dance which comes from Athens to see. Not a vestige remains of the temples which Pausanias described. Efforts are made to locate the acropoles of Minoa and Nisaea on various little eminences along the coast.

BRUGMANN, Romain (Berlin, 1825): LAKE, Northern Greece, II, 388; SATURN, Dial. Greek and Roman Geo., II, 310-17. S. VAILHE.

MEGARIANS.—The Megarian School is one of the imperfectly Socratic Schools, so called because they developed in a one-sided way the doctrines of Socrates. The Megarians, of whom the chief representatives were Euclid, the founder of the school, and Stilpo, flourished at Athens, during the first half of the fourth century B.C. The Eleatics, coming from Parmenides, the doctrine that there is no change or multiplicity in the world, they combined this principle with the Socratic teaching that knowledge by means of concepts is the only true knowledge. It follows from this that the only reality is the unchangeable essential nature, that the world of our sense experience is mere shadow, and that there is nothing possible except what actually exists. The affirmation of the existence of "bodiless forms," which seems to have been the Megarian designation for the unchangeable essential nature of things, is the school's most important contribution to speculative thought. Its analogy with the Platonic doctrine of ideas is evident. In the formal logical portion of his system, they emphasized the supremacy of the notion of goodness. Knowledge, Socrates taught, is the only virtue; it is identical with moral excellence. The highest object of knowledge is the highest good. But, as the Eleatics taught, the highest object of knowledge is the highest reality, being. Therefore, the Megarians conclude, the highest good and the highest reality are one and the same. Whatever Parmenides predicated of being, namely oneness, immutability, etc., may be predicated of the good also. The good is insight, reason, God; it alone exists. In order to defend these tenets, which to the popular mind seemed not only untrue but absurd, the Megarians developed to a high degree the art of disputation. This art (the eristic method, or method of strife, as it was called in contradistinction to the heuristic method, or method of finding, advocated by Socrates), was introduced into philosophy by the Eleatic, Zeno, surnamed the Dialecticant. It was adopted in the Megarian School, and carried by its followers of Euclid to a point where it nearly served as a system of logic. To Euclid himself we owe the use of the method of argumentation known as the reductio ad absurdum, which consists in attacking, not the premises, but the conclusion, of the opponent's argument and showing the absurd consequences which follow if his contention is admitted. This method, however, was germinally contained in Zeno's method by which, in his fallacies, he had striven to show that motion, change, and multiplicity are illusions.

PLATO, Dialogues, especially Sophistes, 242 B; SCHLEICHER-MACHER, PlatOns Werke, II (Berlin, 1904-10), 2; FRANTZ, Gesch. der Logik im Abendlande, I (Leipzig, 1855, sqq.), 33; ZELLER, Socrates and the Socratic Schools, tr. Reichel (London, 1893), 230 sqq.; TURNER, Hist. of Phil. (London, 1904), 42 sqq. W. GILLEN.

MEGE, ANTOINE-JOSEPH, a Maurist Benedictine, b. in 1625 at Clermont; d. 15 April, 1691, at the monastery of St.-Germain-des-Prés near Paris. On 17 March, 1643, he became a Benedictine at the monastery of Vendôme. In 1659 he taught theology at the Abbey of St. Denis and afterwards devoted himself to preaching. In 1681 he was made prior of the monastery at Retheil in Champagne. Towards the end of his life he withdrew to St.-Germain-des-Prés, where he divided his time between prayer and study. His most important literary production is "Commentaire sur la règle de S. Benoît," and a MS. history of the congregation of St. Maur from 1610 till 1653 (Paris, 1687). This commentary is an attack upon the rigorous interpretation of the rule by Abbot Rancé of La Trappe, and was forbidden in 1689 by a chapter of the Maurist superiors at the instance of Bossuet. His other works are a translation of St. Ambrose's treatise "On Virginity" (Paris, 1655), "La Morale chrétienne" (Paris, 1661), a few accessional writings and translations.


MICHAEL O'TOY.

MEGIDDO. See MEGADE.

MEHRAU, formerly a Benedictine, now a Cistercian Abbey, is situated on Lake Constance, west of Bregenz, in the district of Vorarlberg, Austria. The original monastery was founded by St. Columbanus who, driven from Luxeuil, settled about 611 at this spot and built a monastery after the model of Luxeuil. A convent for women soon arose near the monastery for men. Little has been preserved of the history of either foundation up to 1079. In this year the monastery was reformed by the monk Gottfried.
sent by Abbot William of Hirsau, and the Benedictine rule was introduced. It is probable that when the reform was effected the convent for women was suppressed. In 1097-98 the abbey was rebuilt by Count Ulrich of Bregenz, its secular administrator and protector. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the abbey acquired much landed property; up to the middle of the eighteenth century that date it had the right of patronage for sixty-five parishes. In the era of the Reformation the abbey was a strong support of the old Faith in Vorarlberg. In particular Ulrich Mütz, afterwards abbot, exerted much influence in Bregenserwald (a mountainous district of northern Vorarlberg) by preaching with great energy against the spirit of religious innovation. It was not until 1533 that it had the right of patronage for sixty-five parishes. During the Thirty Years War the abbey suffered from the devastation wrought by the Swedes, from the quartering upon it of soldiers, and from forced contributions; it was also robbed of nearly all its revenues. Nevertheless, it often offered a free refuge to religious expelled from Germany and Switzerland. At a later date it was once more in a very flourishing condition; in 1738 the church was completely rebuilt, and in 1774-81 the monastic buildings were also entirely reconstructed. The existence of Mehrerau was threatened, as was that of other religious foundations, by the attacks upon monasteries in the reign of the Emperor Joseph II. However what was saved, the Blessed Virgin obtained the withdrawal of the decree of suppression, although it had already been signed. The Peace of Presburg (1805) gave Vorarlberg, and with it the abbey, to Bavaria, which in April, 1806, took an inventory of the abbey. In reply to the last attempt to save the abbey, namely the offer to turn it into a training-school for male teachers, the State, declared in August, 1806, that on 1 September the monastic organization would be dissolved and the monks would have to leave the abbey. The valuable library was scattered, part of it was burnt. The forest and agricultural lands belonging to the monastery were taken by the State; in February, 1807, the church was closed, and the other buildings were sold at auction. In 1808-09 the church was taken down and the material used to build the harbour of Landau. When the district came again under the rule of Austria, the monastic buildings were used for various purposes. In 1853 they were bought from the last owner, along with some pieces of land connected with them, by the Cistercian Abbey of Wettingen, Switzerland (see Wettingen). This monastery had been forcibly suppressed by the Canton of Aargau in 1841, and for thirteen years the abbey had been seeking a new home; on 18 October, 1854, the Cistercian Abbey of Wettingen-Mehrerau was formally opened. In the same year a monastery school was started. In 1859 a new Romanesque church was built; its greatest ornament is the monument to Cardinal Hergenröther (d. 1890), who is buried there. About the middle of the last century, during the fifties and sixties, the buildings were gradually enlarged. In 1910 besides the abbey (from 1002 Eugene Notz) the abbey had 32 priests; including those that had been connected with the abbey but were church was built in work outside, 64 priests; in addition there were 5 clerics, 30 lay brothers, and 4 novices. The monastery has a house of studies and a college, in which some 200 pupils are taught by the monks of the abbey. The periodical "Cisterciensерchronik," edited by Father Gregor Müller, has been issued since 1889.

Meren, Aguas y Anaxagoras Drignanta. Ord. S. Benedicti (Vienna, 1885); Brunner, Ein Benediktinerbuch (Würzburg, 1880); 10-18, 169, Ein Cistercienserichtbuch (Würzburg, 1891); 83-85 of Wettingen, Cistercienserchronik (1904), 299-313; Linder, Album Apudia Brigantina (1904); Schemuken von Brizen (1910).

JOSEPH LINKE.

Meignan, Guillaume-René, Cardinal Archbishop of Tours, French apologist and Scriptural exegete, b. at Chauvigné, France, 12 April, 1817; d. at Tours, 20 January, 1896. Having ascertained his vocation to the priesthood, on the completion of his academic studies at the Angers lycée and at Château-Gontier, he studied philosophy in the seminary of Le Mans, where he received the subdiaconate in 1839. From this institution he passed to the Collège de Toulouse, was professor there of the Doctrine of Le Mans, where, while teaching in one of the middle grades, he continued his own ecclesiastical studies. All through his career he seems to have been blessed with the friendship and sympathetic counsel of the most eminent men among the Catholics of his time and country. The Abbé Bercy, an Orientalist of some distinction, who was attracted to Le Mans and later at Toulouse, advised him to make Scriptural exegesis his special study. Mgr Bouvier ordained him priest (14 June, 1840) and sent him to Paris for a further course in philosophy under Victor Cousin. Meignan made the acquaintance of Ozanam, Montalembert, and others like them, who urged him to prepare for the special controversial needs of the day by continuing his studies in Germany. Following this advice, he became the pupil at Munich of such teachers as Görres (q. v.), Döllinger, and Windschmann; and when his earlier attraction for Scriptural studies was thoroughly reawakened under the stimulus of the then fresh Tübingen discussions, he repaired to Berlin where he attended the lectures of Neander, Hengstenberg, and Schelling. In or soon after May, 1843, Meignan returned to Paris to be numbered among the clergy of the archdiocease, but was soon (1845) obliged to visit Rome for the good of his health, which had become impaired. He seemed to recover immediately, and was able to prosecute his sacred studies so successfully that he was made Doctor of Theology at the Sapienza (March, 1846). Here again he was helped by the friendly interest and advice of many eminent men of Pereone and Gerbet, as well as by the teaching of Passaglia, Patrizi, and Theiner. Between this period and 1861, when he became professor of Sacred Scripture at the Sorbonne, he filled various academic positions in the Archdiocese of Paris, of which Mgr Darboy made him vicar-general in 1863. In 1864 he was elevated to the Bishopric of Châlons, in 1882 transferred to the See of Arras, and in 1884 to the Archbishopric of Tours.

By the logic of circumstances he was one of the chief antagonists of Ernest Renan. In his work he aimed to enlighten the lay mind on current topics of controversy and, while giving a knowledge of the assured results of criticism, to supply his readers with the Christian point of view. His aggressive and triumphant career as an apologist began as early as 1856 with the publication of "Les prophéties messianiques. Le Pentateuque" (Paris). In 1860 appeared "M. Renan et le Cantique des Cantiques" (Paris); in 1863 "M. Renan et les prophéties messianiques. Le Pentateuque" (Paris); in 1864 "De l'irrédemption, ses influences actuelles" (Paris); in 1869 "Salomon, son règne, ses écrits" (Paris); in 1892 "Les prophéties d'Israël et le Messie" (Paris); in 1893 "Danilus" (Paris); in 1894 "Jean-Baptiste" (Paris). He wrote many other works on kindred topics. His treatment of Messianic prophecy extends far beyond mere verbal exegesis, and includes a critical examination of historical events and conditions. Like other great Catholic controversialists of his time, he had to suffer adverse criticism; these criticisms were finally refuted by the Pope in the bull In XIII, who raised him to the cardinalate, 15 Dec., 1892.

BOISSONNOT, Le cardinal Meignan (Paris, 1899).

E. MACHERSON.

Meiller, Jean-Baptiste, a French Canadian physician and educator, b. at Saint-Laurent, P. Q., 9 May, 1796; d. 7 Dec., 1878. He studied the classics at the
To defray the expenses of his buildings and charitable works, he made use of church festivals, social gatherings, and other occasions to call upon the generosity of kings and princes, of the rich and noble, of the clergy and of the laity. Frequently, he himself, relying upon his friendship and often appealing to his own labours for the state; but he also very liberally used his personal means for the benefit of the Church. Towards his subjects Meinwerk was frequently harsh, but kind at heart, and, if any serious offence had been given, he would conciliate the party by presents. Twice he visited Rome, the first time in 1014, to assist at the coronation of Henry II, then, in 1028, as companion of Otto III. On this trip he received from Wolfgang, Patriarch of Aquileia, the body of St. Felix for Abdinghof. Similarly he obtained for his diocese, entirely or in part, the relics of Sts. Valerian, Minias, Philip, Juvenal, and of the great martyr-bishop Blasius. His body was buried, according to his wish, in the crypt of the church of Abdinghof. Abbot Conrad von Allenhause raised the relics and 25 April, 1376, placed them in a beautiful monument in the sanctuary. This has been considered equal to a canonisation, but his feast is not in the Primum of Pacensis, nor in, the new, modified schema of the dioceses for 1909 show any church, chapel, or altar dedicated to his name. On the secularization of Abdinghof, 1803, the remains were brought to the church of Bussdorf. The "Vita" (Mon. Germ. SS., XI, 104), written anonymously by a monk of Abdinghof, soon after 1150, is a history, not a legend, though somewhat ornamented by legendary additions.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Meissen, a former see of north-east Germany. The present city of Meissen, situated in the Kingdom of Saxony on both banks of the Elbe, owes its origin to a castle built by King Henry I about 928 to protect German colonists among the Wends. To insure the success of the Christian missions, Otto I suggested at the Roman Synod of 962 the creation of an archiepiscopal see at Magdeburg. To this proposal John XII consented, and, shortly before his death in 968, it was decided at the Synod of Ravenna (967) to create three other sees—namely Meissen, Mersburg, and Zeit— as suffragans of Magdeburg. The year in which the Diocese of Meissen was established is not known, the oldest extant records being forgeries; however, the record of endorsement by Otto I in 971 is genuine. The first bishop of Meissen was appointed in 968, and a foundation (monasterium) which in the course of the eleventh century developed a chapter of canons. In 1346 the diocese stretched from the Erzgebirge in the south to the mouth of the Neisse and to the Queis, on the east to the Oder, on the north to the middle course of the Spree. It embraced the five provovices of Glatz, Breslau, Kruszw, Wurzen, and Lebus. It included four archbishoprics of Nisani (Meissen), Chemnitz, Zschillen (Wechselburg), and Niederlausitz, and the two deaneries of Meissen and Bautzen. Poorly endowed in the beginning, it appears to have acquired later large estates under Otto III and Henry II.

The chief task of the bishops of the new see was the conversion of the Wends, to which Bishops Volkind (d. 992) and Eido (d. 1015) devoted themselves with great zeal; but the work of evangelization was slow, and was yet incomplete when the investiture conflict threatened to arrest it effectively. St. Benno (1066-1106), bishop at the time when these troubles were most serious, was appointed by Henry IV and appears to have been in complete possession until 1076; in that year, however, although he had taken no part in the Saxon revolt, he was imprisoned by Henry for nine months. Escaping, he joined
the Saxon princes, espoused the cause of Gregory VII, and in 1085 took part in the Gregorian Synod of Querlindburg, for which he was deprived of his office by the emperor, a more imperially disposed bishop being appointed in his place. On the death of Gregory, Benno made peace with Henry, and, being reappointed to his former see, undertook the peacemaker's work among the Slavs. Among his successors, Herrig. (d. 1119) sided with the pope, Godebold with the emperor. In the thirteenth century the pagan Wends were finally converted to Christianity, chiefly through the efforts of the great Cistercian monasteries, the most important of which were Dobrilugk and Neu- selitz. Among the converts of the House of Meissen, Mariental near Zittau, Marienstern on the White Elster, and Mühlberg deserve mention. Among the later bishops, who were after the thirteenth century princes of the empire, the most notable are Wittigo I (1268–93) and John I of Eisengen (1340–71). The former began the magnificent Gothic cathedral, in which are buried nine princes of the House of Wettin; the latter, as notary and intimate friend of the Margrave of Meissen, afterwards the Emperor Charles IV, protected the interests of his church and increased the revenues of the diocese. During the latter's administration, in 1344, Prague was made an archiepiscopal see. In 1455 Urban V appointed the Archbishop of Prague legatus natus, or perpetual representative of the Holy See, for the Dioceses of Meissen, Bamberg, and Regensburg (Ratisbon); the opposition of Magdeburg made it impossible to exercise in Meissen the privileges of this office, and Meissen remained, though under protest, subject to the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Magdeburg. John's successor, John Berno (1376–9), who resigned Meissen on his election to the See of Prague, Nicholas I (1379–92), John III (1393–8), and Thimo of Colditz (1399–1410) were appointed directly from Rome, which set aside the elective rights of the cathedral chapter. Thimo, a Bohemian by birth, neglected the diocese and ruined it financially. Margrave William I of Saxony prevailed on Boniface IX in 1405 to free Meissen from the authority of the metropolitan and to place it directly under the Holy See. The illustrious Bishop Rudolf von der Planitz (1411–27), through wise regulations and personal sacrifices, brought order out of chaos. The Hussite wars caused great damage to the diocese, then ruled over by the noble brothers Caspar (1451–63) and Dietrich of Schönberg (1461–76), it soon recovered, and on Dietrich's death there was a fund of 8800 gold florins in the episcopal treasury. John V of Weissenbach (1476–87) through his mania for building and his travels soon spent this money, and left a heavy burden of debt. In 1488–1518 further impoverished the diocese through his obstinate attempt to obtain full sovereignty over his see, which brought him into constant conflict with Duke George of Saxony; his spiritual administration was also open to censure. John VII of Schleinitz (1518–37) was a resolute opponent of Luther, whose restless career in the neighbourhood of Meissen and jointly with George of Saxony, endeavoured to crush the innovations. The canonization of Benno (1523), urged by him, was intended to offset the progress of the Lutheran teaching. John VIII of Maltitz (1537–49) and Nicholas II of Carlowitz (1549–55) were unable to withstand the ever-spreading Reformation, which, as the means of preserving faithfulness in Saxony and gained ground even among the canons of the cathedral, so that the diocese was on the verge of dissolution. The last bishop, John of Hauagwitz (1555–81), placed his resignation in the hands of the cathedral chapter, in virtue of an agreement with Elector Augustus of Saxony, went over to Protestantism, married, and retired to the castle of Ruhetal near Mögeln. The electors of Saxony took over the administration of the temporalities of the diocese which in 1666 were finally adjudged to them. The canons turned Protestant, and such monasteries as still existed were secularized, their revenues and buildings being devoted principally to educational works. (For the vicarates Apostolic of Lau- sitz-Meissen see Saxony.)

Urbundbuch der Hochstifts Meissen, ed. Gerhard (3 vols., Leipzig, 1884–97), in the Codex Diplomaticus Saxoniae Regni; v. Kastner, Gesch. der Bistümer des Freistaates Sachsen (Dresden, 1884); von Bruhn (von Kaufungen), Das Domkapitel von M. im Mittelalter (Meissen, 1905); Mitteil. des Vereins für Gesch. des Mittelalters M. (9 vols., Meißen, 1886–1910); Neues Archiv für städtische Gesch. (Dresden, 1880–).

Joseph Lins.

Meissonier, Ernest, French painter, b. at Lyons 21 February, 1815; d. at Paris, 31 January, 1891. If the Lyonnais genius in painting is found in such artists as Chenavard, Flandrin, Puvia de Chavannes, and in such landscape painters as Ravie, Meissonier does not belong to this family. At an early age his parents took him to Paris where they set up chemical works in the Marais. A family friend introduced him to the much frequented studio of Léon Cogniet (1794–1880). His first efforts date from 1831. These are portraits, generally busts, of the bourgeois of the neighbourhood (there is one at the Louvre), life-size, and somewhat wooden in composition in execution. At about this time appeared a more significant picture, the "Visit to the Burgomaster's", three middle-class Hollanders in eighteenth-century costume, seated at a table and smoking. Herein the painter for the first time attempted those small genre subjects in costumes of the past whose pleasing picturesque ness was to contribute so much to his fame. But fame was to elude him for ten years Meissonier had to earn his living by illustration; and so he made vignettes for a number of works, to-day much sought after as "romantic editions", "Paul et Virginie", Lamartine's "Chute d'un Ange" (1839), "Le Vicaire de Wakefield", and "Les Français peints par eux-mêmes" (1840–42). By degrees, however, the young artist attracted attention. Between the "classicists", or partisans of Ingres and the "romanticists" ardent followers of Delacroix, he found favour with a public rather indifferent to the quarrels of the schools and very willing to become acquainted with a style of art which did not require so much thought. In fact Meissonier seems to have quite escaped these greater controversies, many artistic controversies, e.g. the renovation of art by the school of Barbizon and the wonderful naturalistic revolution inaugurated by Paul Huet, Corot, and Rousseau, he seems a stranger to all these interests and passions.

There was on the other hand a small genre school, to-day somewhat forgotten, that of Eugène Isabey, Eugène Lami, Célestin Nanteuil, and the brothers Johannot, which was occupied with representing small scenes of manners in the quaint every-day costume of the Middle Ages or the Renaissance. They were pleasing extemporizers, skillful and brilliant storytellers who put on canvas, often with spirit, the history of Paris. Their popularity, after Scott, was a stroke of genius to choose as models these men who are among the best masters of painting, and this at a time when Romanticism had begun to overload its canvases with violence and excesses. Besides, these artists had been for a long time greatly esteemed by collectors, and by suggesting relationship with them Meissonier increased his chances of success with am-
ateurs. Moreover no other manner suited so well the special faculties of Meissonier, his extraordinary gift of observation and his almost absolute lack of imagination. But he was clever enough to restore genre painting and to blend imitation with invention; thus, for Dutch subjects he substituted those of the Regency or of the sixteenth century. Above all he excelled in microscopic canvases, wherein the wonderful reproduction of the minutest details is a perpetual source of astonishment. In painting, the "finished" product is always sure to appeal to the philistine, and when found together with smallness, and when to the pleasure of accuracy is joined that of a feat of skill, admiration knows no bounds. No more is needed to explain the incredible success of Meissonier.

In 1842 began that series of small thumb-nail pictures, the reputation of which so long outshone that of his larger works. First came "The Young Man playing the Bass-viol," then the "Painter in his studio" (1843), the "Guard-room", the "Readers", the "Smokers", the "Bravi" (1847), the "Reading at the House of Diderot", the "Bowling-party", "La Rixe" or "The Quarrel" (1855). This year, which marked the first Universal Exhibition, marked also the apogee of Meissonier's triumphs. He was already the favourite painter of his time; his career marked the most illustrious. He was compared with the classic artists and the masters of genre; this was an exaggeration, and to-day we find much to criticize in him. His art is by the what had been already observed. It is regrettable that he did not make better use of his own gifts of observation; that he did not take his subjects directly from life, as did Dau- nier, but by painting from memory he got a semblance of mere curiosity; that he did not create something "new" instead of giving us a modernized antique and giving his pictures the false appearance of a tableau de musee. This criticism is perhaps unjust; sixteenth-century scenes have nothing better to show than "La Rixe" and "The Bravi"; and neither Stendhal nor Morimée is reproached for his Renaissance style of composition. Nevertheless it is true that despite superficial resemblances Meissonier is far inferior to the Dutch masters. To compare him with Terborch is to pay him too great an honour. His sharp faceted drawing, engraved with painful precision (cf. Fromentin, "Les Maîtres d'autrefois", 1876, 256) of his painting, swimming with trifles, without aim or restraint, his indefinite analysis of a host of insignificant objects, all grouped in the compass of an amazingly small space, go to make up a series of quaint hash works, unattractive and useless, like those pieces of embroidery which distress us when we realize the immense waste of labour they give proof of. What is wanting in these pictures is that which constitutes the value of art, emotion and life.

In 1859 Meissonier was charged to paint the "Battle of Solferino" (Louvre). This was the beginning of a new series of works, which date from the Second Empire, and in which the artist undertook to celebrate the glories of the First Empire. Renouncing his small insect-like designs of fancy, he attempted historical and open air subjects, movements of crowds and armies, and set himself the task of painting the great scenes of the imperial épopée. In 1864 he submitted his "1814" (Louvre); in 1867 his "Deaix to the Rhine"; next came "1805", "1807" (Metropolitan Museum, New York), and a large number of other military incidents. To convey the impression of a broken road, he selected a corner of his garden, had it trampled by men and horses, had trucks and carts drawn over it, and sprinkled the whole with flour to imitate melting snow. To paint Napoleon, he made use of the grey cloak and the very hat that the emperor wore. But in spite of all he falls short of the lithographs of Raffet with their prodigious mystery and their breath of the heroic.

What will last of these curious pictures is the fabulous amount of studies and sketches accumulated by the painter in preparation of his pictures. One is filled with respect before the mass of observations; there are drawings, studies of soldiers, of equipments, of horses, which are priceless documents. It is never more than an ensemble study, there is never more than a detail, a gesture, a movement, a muscle, caught and reproduced with unheard-of precision and strength, as by the camera of the most infallible instruments. There is no other example—even if we count Menzel himself—of a similar power of analysis applied to the realm of facts. To unravel a detail from the confusion of painting Meissonier was without an equal. He had an eye constructed like the lens of a magnifying glass, or like the eye of a primitive man capable of registering thousands of sensations which our civilized retina no longer perceives. For example, he was successful in catching the movement of a running horse, which no one has been able to do since the caveman, and later the cinematograph confirmed the marvellous truth of his observations.

Only everything remained for him in a fragmentary state. His was the eye of a myopic, the eye of a fly, cut like a crystal into millions of facets, the most astounding instrument known for decomposing everything into its elements, for seeing distinctly into the world of the infinitesimal, but this prodigious power of decomposition left him incapable of putting anything together again.

It is not astonishing that his "1807" cost him fourteen years of labour; he was no longer able to weld together his scraps, his extracts from nature. He scrutinized, rummaged, ransacked to infinity, and found himself powerless to give life to anything. He spoke truly when he wished to do nothing but design and when he dreamed of a picture which should be no more than a collection of sketches, of fragments and disconnected events, like the "Pensees" of Pascal, yet giving at the same time the shock and the sensation of life. The difference was, however, that the "Pensees" were to become a book of his materials, never succeeded in producing a great work, and not even in giving the impression that he
had clearly conceived one. So this man loaded with honours, wealth and glory, was perpetually unhappy and discontented. His pride and his suspicious sensi-
tiveness were proverbial. This sickly self-love was the chief cause of the division among the French art-
ists. In 1889, when the traditional Salon reopened, he opposed the Salon of the “Champ-de-Mars” or of the
Société Nationale. This unreasonable scheme had regrettable consequences and introduced into the
school the anarchical system which for twenty years has gone on developing.

Such was this eminent and most unfinished of artists, assured by the deserting of the mark of hon-
or, paid him by erecting his statue in the Garden of the
Louvre, but still less deserving of the unjust criticisms
he has since had to bear in expiation of his great glory.
He was in reality the victim no less than the product of
a valuable faculty carried to hypertrophies and
monstrosity. He may perhaps be more equitably judged by the lesser known portions of his work, in which
his faculties for analysis and observation found their
true use, as in the small portraits such as that of
“The Younger Dumas” (Louvre), those of “Stan-
ford” or “Vanderbilt”, or again his small studies from
nature as in his “Views of Venice” at the Louvre, and
especially his peerless collection of drawings at the
Louvre: a collection which are at least as the materials,
the remains or the fragments thereof. On 13 October,
1838, he married Jenny Steinheil, who died in June,
1888; in August, 1890, he married Mlle Bezanson; he
died 31 January, 1891, and after a Requiem Mass at
the Madeleine, 3 February, 1891, he was buried at
Pontoise. After his death, a number of his portraits
GÉRARD, Moniteur (1897); GASTON, Les Beaux-Arts en
Europe, II (1859); Salons (not collected in vols.);
PLANCHERS, Salons (1855); CRÉMEL, Les
nouveaux mouvements de l’art (1868); MICHEL,
Nouvelles Notes sur l’art moderne (1896); BARTON,
Les peintres du siècle: ALEXANDRE, La Peinture miliaire en France; MÜHLE,
Der Jahrhundert französischer Maler (1901).

LOUIS GILLET.

Melanchthon, Philipp, collaborator and friend of Luther, b. at Bretten (in Unterpfalz, now Baden), 16
February, 1497; d. at Wittenberg, 29 April, 1560.

(1) His Rearing and Education.—Melanchthon
was of respectable and well-to-do parentage. His
father, Georg Schwarzerd (Schwarzerd) was a cele-
brated armorer, while his pious and intelligent
mother, Ursula Iringh, was a remarkable woman of
Bretten. He received his first instruction at home
from a private tutor, and in 1507 he went to Pforz-
heim, where he lived with his grandmother Elizabeth,
sister of the great humanist, Johann Reuchlin. Here
the Rector, Georg Simler, made him acquainted with
the Greek and Latin poets, and with the philosophy of
Aristotle. But of greater influence still was his inter-
course with Reuchlin, his grand-uncle, who gave
a strong impetus to his studies. It was Reuchlin also
who persuaded him to translate his name Schwarzerd
into the Greek Melanchothon, (written Melanthon after
1531). In 1509 Melanchothon, not yet 13 years of age,
entered the University of Heidelberg. This institu-
tion, which was one of the first universities in the
world, had two faculties, Rhetoric and Agricola (see
Humanism). It is true that Pallas Spangel, Melanchothon’s eminent teacher, was also familiar with humanists and humanism, but
he was none the less an able scholar and adherent of
Thomism. Melanchothon studied rhetoric under Peter
Günther, and astronomy under Conrad Helvetius, a pupil of Regiomontanus. He continued his theological
studies, reading the ancient poets and philosophers
and historians as well as of the neo-Latinus, grammar, rhet-
oric, and dialectics. He obtained the baccalaureate
in 1511, but his application for the master’s degree in
1512 was rejected because of his youth. He there-
fore went to Tübingen, where the scientific spirit was
in full vigour, and he became there a pupil of the cele-
brated Latinist Heinrich Bebel, and, for a second
time, of Georg Simler, who was then teaching humani-
ties in Tübingen, and was later professor of jurispru-
dence. He studied astronomy and astrology under
Johann Stöffler. With Franciscus Stadianus he
planned an edition of the genuine Greek text of Aris-
totle, but nothing ever came of this. His thirst for
knowledge led him into jurisprudence, mathematics,
and even medicine.

In 1514 he won the master’s degree as first among
eleven candidates, and was made an instructor in the
university. His subjects were Vergil and Terence;
later he was assigned the lectureship on eloquence and
expounded Cicero and Livy. He also became (1514)
press-corrector in the printing office of Thomas
Anshelm, pursued his private studies, and at last turned
to theology. For the antiquated scholastic methods of
this science as taught at Tübingen, and for Dr. Jacob
Lemp, who, as Melanchothon said, had attempted to
picture Transubstantiation on the blackboard, he had,
later on, only words of derision. He studied jurispru-
dence on his own account and took up the New Testament
in the original text, but did not at this time reach any
definite theological point of view; in this branch of
knowledge, as he himself afterwards repeatedly
declared, his intellectual father was Luther. He
naturally took Reuchlin’s part in the latter’s contro-
versy with the Council of Basle, and in 1515 he published,
and wrote in 1514 a preface to the “Epistola claram
virorum” ; but he did not come prominently to the
fore. His own earliest publications were an edi-
tion of Terence (1516), and a Greek grammar (1518).
In 1518 he was offered, on Reuchlin’s recom-
 mendation, a professorship of Greek at Wittenberg.
“I know of no other man who is so capable of
writing to him,” wrote Reuchlin to the Elector of Saxony,
“save only Erasmus Roterodamus, and he is a Dutch-
man.” The first impression made by the simple,
bashful and frail-looking youth was not favourable.
But his opening address: “De corrigendis adoles-
centibus studiis” (29 Aug., 1518), elicited enthusiastic
response. He extolled the mental and moral sources of genuine science as a signal merit of the new
humanistic and scientific spirit, and he promised to
apply this method to the study of theology.

(2) Melanchothon and the German Reformation.—Luther was a strong believer in making humanism
serve the cause of the “Gospel”, and it was not long
before the still growing Reformation took hold of
Bretten. He received his first instruction at home
from a private tutor, and in 1507 he went to Pforz-
heim, where he lived with his grandmother Elizabeth,
sister of the great humanist, Johann Reuchlin. Here
the Rector, Georg Simler, made him acquainted with
the Greek and Latin poets, and with the philosophy of
Aristotle. But of greater influence still was his inter-
course with Reuchlin, his grand-uncle, who gave
a strong impetus to his studies. It was Reuchlin also
who persuaded him to translate his name Schwarzerd
into the Greek Melanchothon, (written Melanthon after
1531). In 1509 Melanchothon, not yet 13 years of age,
entered the University of Heidelberg. This institu-
tion, which was one of the first universities in the
world, had two faculties, Rhetoric and Agricola (see
Humanism). It is true that Pallas Spangel, Melanchothon’s eminent teacher, was also familiar with humanists and humanism, but
he was none the less an able scholar and adherent of
Thomism. Melanchothon studied rhetoric under Peter
Günther, and astronomy under Conrad Helvetius, a pupil of Regiomontanus. He continued his theological
studies, reading the ancient poets and philosophers
and historians as well as of the neo-Latinus, grammar, rhet-
oric, and dialectics. He obtained the baccalaureate
in 1511, but his application for the master’s degree in
1512 was rejected because of his youth. He there-
fore went to Tübingen, where the scientific spirit was
in full vigour, and he became there a pupil of the cele-
brated Latinist Heinrich Bebel, and, for a second
time, of Georg Simler, who was then teaching humani-
ties in Tübingen, and was later professor of jurispru-
dence. He studied astronomy and astrology under
Johann Stöffler. With Franciscus Stadianus he
planned an edition of the genuine Greek text of Aris-
totle, but nothing ever came of this. His thirst for
knowledge led him into jurisprudence, mathematics,
and even medicine.

In 1514 he won the master’s degree as first among
eleven candidates, and was made an instructor in the
university. His subjects were Vergil and Terence;
later he was assigned the lectureship on eloquence and
expounded Cicero and Livy. He also became (1514)
press-corrector in the printing office of Thomas
Anshelm, pursued his private studies, and at last turned
to theology. For the antiquated scholastic methods of
this science as taught at Tübingen, and for Dr. Jacob
Lemp, who, as Melanchothon said, had attempted to
picture Transubstantiation on the blackboard, he had,
later on, only words of derision. He studied jurispru-
dence on his own account and took up the New Testament
in the original text, but did not at this time reach any
definite theological point of view; in this branch of
knowledge, as he himself afterwards repeatedly
declared, his intellectual father was Luther. He
naturally took Reuchlin’s part in the latter’s contro-
versy with the Council of Basle, and in 1515 he published,
and wrote in 1514 a preface to the “Epistola claram
virorum”; but he did not come prominently to the
fore. His own earliest publications were an edi-
tion of Terence (1516), and a Greek grammar (1518).
In 1518 he was offered, on Reuchlin’s recom-
 mendation, a professorship of Greek at Wittenberg.
“I know of no other man who is so capable of
writing to him,” wrote Reuchlin to the Elector of Saxony,
“save only Erasmus Roterodamus, and he is a Dutch-
man.” The first impression made by the simple,
bashful and frail-looking youth was not favourable.
But his opening address: “De corrigendis adoles-
centibus studiis” (29 Aug., 1518), elicited enthusiastic
response. He extolled the mental and moral sources of genuine science as a signal merit of the new
humanistic and scientific spirit, and he promised to
apply this method to the study of theology.
fended him, e. g. against the Italian Dominican, Thomas Radinus of Piacenza, and the Sorbonne in Paris (1521).

But he was not qualified to play the part of a leader and the turn of a troublous period. The life which he had fitted for was the quiet existence of the scholar. He was always of a retiring and timid disposition, temperate, prudent and peace-loving, with a pious turn of mind and a deeply religious training. He never completely lost his attachment for the Catholic Church and for many of her ceremonies. His limitations first became apparent when, during Luther's stay at the Wartburg, 1521, he found himself in Wittenberg confronted with the task of maintaining order against the Zwickau fanatics, with their wild notions as to the establishment of Christ's Kingdom upon earth, communism, and so forth. What Luther accomplished in a few days on the impossible to Melanchthon. On the other hand he showed his ability as an organizer when he undertook the reorganization of Church affairs in Saxony which then appeared to be in a very bad state. For the visitations ordered by the Emperor; Luther drew up the "Instructions for Visitors of the parochial clergy" (printed, 1528), which work is remarkable for its practical sense and simplicity. Here also appears the difference between Luther and Melanchthon, for Melanchthon warns pastors against reviling pope or bishop; whereas Luther remarks: "You must denounce vehemently the Papacy and its followers, for it is already God even as the devil and his kingdom." Melanchthon, it is true, preached the doctrine that faith alone justifies and that God will forgive sins for the sake of Christ, and without work. Yet, but he added: "We must, which God has commanded, and nevertheless do good works, excuted for his personal conduct in the Reichstag, for his apprehension and contempt, his dignified attitude against the Catholic party. He himself, one added, in justification of his course: "I know that the people de cry our moderation; but it does not become us to heed the clamour of the multitude. We must labour for peace and for the future. It will prove a great blessing for us all if unity be restored in Germany." He feared the chaos and bloodshed. Hence he made concessions to the Catholics at the subsequent conferences and debates on religion. He seems to have been lured by some dream of an Evangelical-Catholic Church. He thought it possible to remain within the Catholic Church, even with the new theology. But he was never a Crypto-Catholic, as has been laid to his charge, and while existing in every other way a spirit of submission, he held firm in the "purified doctrine," and repeatedly qualified as blasphemy the lending of a hand, even in the cause of peace, to any suppression of the truth.

The story that when his mother asked which was the better of the two religions, he replied that the modified one was the more feasible, while the brother who was the surer, is nothing but a ridiculous invention. His attempt to bring about a reconciliation between the two brought him, instead of thanks, only mortification and abuse. From the age of 30 to that of 50, Melanchthon was at the height of his career as spokesman and advocate of the Reformation, which, as had formerly been the case in Hesse and Prussia, was in-
produced under his guidance into Württemberg, Brandenburg, and Saxony. He never abandoned himself to the difficulties of the day, nor did he find himself differing from Luther on many points, for as time went on Melanchthon emancipated himself more and more from Luther’s teaching. More eventful still and more painful was the last portion of his life, following the death of Luther (1546). He rejected the Augsburg Interim (1548) which was to regulate Church polity and Luther attacked it, but the Interim was finally settled by the Council on the ground that it did not harmonize with Evangelical principles. On the other hand he was prevailed upon to take part in a conference for a modified Interim, the so-called Leipzig Interim, and he addressed on this occasion a letter (25 April, 1548) to Minister Carlwitz, of Saxony, which was once more published and Luther attacked it. The letter was held by the violence of Luther, and again showed himself favourable to the Catholic system of church organization and was even ready to accept Catholic practices, though he desired to hold fast to the “evangelical” doctrines.

The result of this was the Adiaphorism controversy, in which Melanchthon declared Catholic practices adiaphorous (indifferent things, neither good nor bad), hence permissible provided that the proper doctrine were maintained and its import made clear to the people. Matthias Flacius Iliiucus and other zealots objected that these practices had heretofore been the cause of great scandal and that Melanchthon was attacked and reviled by Flacius, Amsdorf, and the other “Gnesio Lutherans”, as a renegade and a heretic. The Lutheran theologians met at Weimar in 1556, and declared their adherence to Luther’s teaching as to good works and the Last Supper. Melanchthon participated in the religious discussion which took place in 1555 between the Lutherans and the Protestant theologians. His Lutheran opponents’ behaviour toward him here proved grossly insulting. The last ten years of his life (1550–60) were almost completely taken up with theological wrangles (adaphoristic, osiaristic, stankaristic, majoristic, Calvinistic and crumpeclaviniest) and with attempts to compose these various differences. He continued in spite of all to labour for his Church and for her peace. But one readily understands why, a few days before he died, he gave as a reason for not fearing death: “thou shalt be freed from the theologians’ fury (a rabie theologorum)”. His last wish was that the Churches might become reunited in Christ. He died praying, quite a Lutheran prayer.

(3) MELANCTHON AS A THEOLOGIAN.—Melanchthon considered it his mission to bring together the religious thoughts of the Reformation, to co-ordinate them and give them a clear and intelligible form. He did not feel himself called upon to seek out their original premises or to speculate on their logical results. His theology was the substantial impress of his humanistic thought, for he saw in ancient philosophy a precursor of Christianity and sought to reconcile it with Christian Revelation. Even in dogma he took up whatever adapted itself most easily to the general trend of humanistic religious thought, and his dogmatical departures from Luther were a softening of doctrine. His theological system is contained in the “Loci Communes”, as revised by him; in substance it was brought to completion by the edition of 1535. As late as 1531 he had upheld the harsh tenets of fatalism with regard to all events and of determinism with regard to the human will. He subsequently gave “Synergism” his support, as against the determinism of both Luther and Zwingli. His theological system is contained in the “Loci Communes”, as revised by him; in substance it was brought to completion by the edition of 1535. As late as 1531 he had upheld the harsh tenets of fatalism with regard to all events and of determinism with regard to the human will. He subsequently gave “Synergism” his support, as against the determinism of both Luther and Zwingli. His theological system is contained in the “Loci Communes”, as revised by him; in substance it was brought to completion by the edition of 1535.

Likewise he emphasized the necessity of good works from the practical, ethical standpoint. For Melanchthon, as for Luther, 1556, that good works are necessary for eternal life, inasmuch as they must necessarily follow reconciliation with God. This was again attenuated later on: what is necessary, he said, is a new spiritual life or sense of duty, i.e. a righteous conscience.

As years went by he even abandoned Luther’s doctrine as to the Last Supper, and looked on Christ’s spiritual communication of Himself to the faithful and their internal union with Him as the essential feature of the Sacrament; i.e. he inclined towards Calvin’s theory. In 1560 his teachings were introduced into all the churches of Saxony, through the “Corpus Philippicum” (a collection of Melanchthonian doctrinal writings). But the latter came a change fourteen years after his death. The Philippists or Crypto-Calvinists were thrown into prison and sent into exile. They subsequently identified themselves more and more with Calvinism, even on the question of predestination. Lutheranism, narrow and harsh, won the day with its Formula of Concord (1580). So strong indeed was the rejection of the doctrine of the security of the saints, than a Calvinist. From that time on until well into the eighteenth century, Melanchthon’s memory was assailed and reviled, even in Wittenberg. It is said that Leonard Hutter, the leading theologian there at the beginning of the seventeenth century, was so enraged by an appeal to Melanchthon as an authority, even in one of his writings, that he tore down the latter’s portrait torn down from the wall and trampled under foot before the eyes of all. It was not until the period of the Enlightenment that Melanchthon was again appreciated and recognized as the real founder of a German-Evangelical theology. Indeed, he carried his labours into all the other theological fields, in some of which he outshone all other theologians. He was only toiled at least as a contributor. He promoted the study of the Scriptures not only by his own active work thereon from first to last, but also by his teachings, and by his exhortations to the clergy. Like Luther, he laid particular stress on the necessity of a thorough philological training, as well as of a knowledge of history and archaeology, for the proper interpretation of the Bible. He assisted Luther constantly in his German translation of the Bible, and also, it is said, in the production of the Latin translation which appeared at Wittenberg, in 1529. In exegesis he stood out vigorously for one sense, and that the literal, (sermo literalis), as against the “four senses” of the scholastics, which was nothing to be sought in the words of the Bible save the dogmatic and practical application and development. His commentaries on the Old Testament are not as important as those which he wrote on the New. The most noteworthy are those on the Epistles to the Romans and the Colossians, which have been published repeatedly. These are largely given to the discussion of facts and of dogmatic and polemical matters, and they have exerted considerable influence on the history of Protestant doctrines. The impulse also which he gave to the study of theology by historical methods, was felt for a long time. In his handling of the Chronicle of Carlo he treated of the history of the Church jointly with that of the state, and thereby set an example which found many imitators. He was also the first to attempt a history of dogma, and led the way in Christian biography. In homiletics he was early recognized as the originator of a more methodical form of pulpit oratory, as contrasted with the “heroic” sermons of Luther. He did not himself appear as a preacher. The churchwardens made selections from the Gospel on Sundays and Feast days, in his house or in a lecture-hall, using for this purpose the Latin tongue for the benefit of the Hungarian students who did not understand the German
sermons preached in church. This was the origin of his "Postillen" (homilies). Finally, he was the author of the first Protestant treatise on the method of theological study.

(4) MELOCHTHON AS PROFESSOR AND PEDAGOGUE.

—Melanchthon was the embodiment of the entire intellectual culture of his time. His learning covered all the branches of knowledge as it then existed, and what is more remarkable, he possessed the gift of imparting his knowledge always in the simplest, clearest and most practical form. On this account the numerous manuals and guides to the Latin and Greek grammars, to dialectics, rhetoric, ethics, physics, politics, and history, which he produced in addition to his many editions of, and commentaries on, classical authors, were, when once translated, adopted, and were republished for more than a century. The exposition shows the utmost care; the style is natural and clear. In his academic teaching also, he disdained all rhetorical devices. His power lay not in brilliant oratory, but in clearness and in the choice of the most appropriate expression (proprietas sermonis). He did not look upon learning and literature as ends in themselves, but as means for inculcating morality and religion. The union of knowledge with the spirit of religion, of humanism with the "Gospel," was ever the keynote of his public activity, and through him it became for centuries the educational ideal of "Evangelical" Germany, even, in a certain sense, of Germany as a whole. It is not easy to estimate the full extent of Melanchthon's importance in this field. By this many-sided practical activity and his work as an organizer he became the founder of higher education in "Evangelical" Germany; the elementary school lay outside his sphere. Numerous Latin schools and universities owed to him their establishment or reorganization. And in numberless cases he must have been the first to call on competent instructors, to settle controversies, or to give his opinion on the advantage or necessity of courses of study. His ideas on teaching in the three-class Latin schools are more fully set forth in the "Unterricht der Visitatoren" (1528) already referred to, and in the "Wittenberger Kirchen-und Schul-ordnung" (1533). Their novelty lies partly in the selection of subjects, but chiefly in the method. Latin naturally holds the place of honour.

Melanchthon put an end to grammatical torture and the "Doctrinale" of Alexander de Villa Dei; grammar exercises were appended to the texts. He himself had a Latin school, the Statuariae Privata, in his house, in which he prepared a few boys for the university. In 1526, he founded a second grade of the more advanced school, the Obere Schule, in Nuremberg near St. Ägidien. He looked on this as a connecting link between the Latin school and the university. It comprised dialectics and rhetoric, readings from the classics, as well as mathematics, and Greek. This grade of school, however, did not meet with any great success. The reorganization of universities, as advocated by Melanchthon, affected chiefly the arts and theological courses. The faculty of Arts became wholly humanistic. Logic, till then dominant in education, gave way to the languages, and Greek and Hebrew assumed more prominence. As sources of philosophy the classic authors replaced the writers of the Middle Ages. For the scholastic study of the liberal arts a more simple and practical course in dialectics and rhetoric was substituted. Likewise in theology, Scriptural interpretation was brought to the fore. Dogmatic principles were developed by exegesis; to these there were gradually added special exegeses. This transition marks a decided return to original sources. This transformation was wrought not only in the University of Wittenberg, but also in that of Tübingen, where Melanchthon himself took part in the work of reform, in those of Frankfort, Leipzig, Rostock, and Heidelberg, where in 1557 he took part in the deliberations concerning the university statutes. Wherever he could not appear in person he sent his advice in writing, while his disciples, for whom he obtained professorships, taught in accordance with his ideals and his method. The new universities of Marburg (1527), Königsberg (1544), and Jena (1548), which were founded under the Reformation, also found in Melanchthon a guide and a counselor. Hence his title, "Preceptor Germaniae".

Works of Melanchthon, edited by BRETSCHEIN and BINGEL in Corpus Reformatorum, 1-XXVIII (Leipzig, 1834-60); G. OEHME, Philipp Melanchthon, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1873); MELOCHTHON ALS PRECEPTOR GERMANICUS (Berlin, 1880); ELLINGEN, PH. MELOCHTHON (Berlin, 1902); MULLER, LEHRBUCH DER WITTENBERGISCHE LUTHERSCHULE, 3rd ed. (Halle, 1897); RUDIGER, PHILIPP MELOCHTHON (Halle, 1900); JANSEN, HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE (London, 1898-99); PASSING.

KLEMENS LÖFFLER.

Melanias, Saint (the Younger), b. at Rome, about 383; d. in Jerusalem, 31 December, 439. She was a member of the famous family of Valerii. Her parents were Publicola and Albina, her paternal grandmother of the same name is known as Melanias, Senior. Little is known of the saint's childhood, but after the time of her marriage, which occurred in her thirteenth year, we have more definite information. Through obedience to her parents she married one of her relatives, Pinianus a patrician. During her married life of seven years she had two children who died young. After their death, Melanias, inclined toward a celibate life reasserting itself, she secured her husband's consent and entered upon the path of evangelical perfection, parting little by little with all her wealth. Pinianus, who now assumed a brotherly position toward her, was her companion in all her efforts toward sanctity. Because of the Visigothic invasion of Italy, she and her children moved to Messina. For 10 years lived near Messina in Sicily. Here, their life of a monastic character was shared by some former slaves. In 410 she went to Africa where she and Pinianus lived with her mother for seven years, during which time she grew well acquainted with St. Augustine and his friend Alypius. She devoted herself to works of charity and piety, especially, in her zeal for souls, to the foundation of a nunnery of which she became superior, and of a cloister of which Pinianus took charge. In 417, Melanias, her mother, and Pinianus went to Palestine by way of Alexandria. For a year they lived in a hospice for pilgrims in Jerusalem, where she met St. Jerome. She again made generous donations, upon the advice of the saint, to her estates in Spain. About this time she travelled in Egypt, where she visited the principal places of monastic and eremitical life, and upon her return to Jerusalem she lived for twelve years, in a hermitage near the Mount of Olives. Before the death of her mother (431), a new series of monastic foundations had begun. Pinianus, ambassador at the Court of Theodosius II, and in the conflict with Nestorianism. An interesting episode in her later life is the journey of the Empress Eudocia, wife of Theodosius, to Jerusalem in 438. Soon after the emperor's return Melanias died.

The Greek Church began to venerate her shortly after her death, but she was almost unknown in the Western Church for many years. She received greater attention since the publication of her life by Cardinal Rampolla (Rome, 1903). In 1908, Pius X granted her office to the congregation of clergy at Somascha. This may be considered as the beginning of a zealous ecclesiastical cult, to which the saint's
Life and works have entitled her. Melania’s life has been shrouded in obscurity nearly up to the present time; many people having wholly or partially con-
found it. Before the accuracy of her life we owe to the dis-
covery of two MSS.; the first, in Latin, was found by
Cardinal Rampolla in the Escurial in 1884, the second,
a Greek biography, is in the Barberini library. Car-
dinal Rampolla published these important dis-
coveries at the Vatican printing-office. A new biog-
raphy (1903) by Georges Goyau is worthy of mention.
The accurate knowledge of her life we owe to the dis-
covery of two MSS.; the first, in Latin, was found by
Cardinal Rampolla in the Escurial in 1884, the second,
a Greek biography, is in the Barberini library. Car-
dinal Rampolla published these important dis-
coveries at the Vatican printing-office. A new biog-
raphy (1903) by Georges Goyau is worthy of mention.

Archbishop Goold died, 11 June, 1880, there were
11,661 children receiving Catholic education without
costing a penny to the state, while their parents were
contributing their share as taxpayers to the state system.

(2) Most Rev. Thomas Joseph CArr, on the solid
foundation laid by his predecessor, the first Bishop
of Melbourne, has raised a stately and imposing ed-
ifice. The present archbishop was transferred from
the ancient see of Galway, and arrived in Melbourne
on the first anniversary of Dr. Goold’s death, 11 June,
1887. Three years after his arrival he undertook the
great task of completing St. Patrick’s cathedral. For
over forty years the building of this magnificent tem-
ple absorbed every thought of the first Vicar-General,
the Right Rev. John Fitzpatrick, D.D. Yet a sum of
one hundred thousand pounds was required to carry
out the original design, exclusive of the towers which
are still unfinished. On the death of Dr. Fitzpatrick
in 1889, the archbishop enlisted the practical symp-
athy and hearty co-operation of the clergy and laity of
the archdiocese in this large undertaking. On 31
October, 1897, the cathedral was consecrated, entirely
free from debt. The foundation stone was laid in April,
1890, to the day of dedication was two hundred and thirty thousand pounds.
No modern cathedral in Ireland approaches the Mel-
bourne see, and even the two ancient cathedrals,
Christ’s Church, and St. Patrick’s, Dublin, fall far
short in seating accommodation and massive beauty.
The episcopal silver jubilee of the archbishop was
celebrated 26 August, 1907, with unbounded enthusi-
asm, when over 10,000 found standing or sitting room
within the walls of the cathedral. The clergy and
laity took occasion of this celebration to mark their ap-
preciation of Archbishop Carr’s great services to the
Church in Australia during the twenty years of his rule.
Because of his short time in position the proposal in
testimonial, a debt of eight thousand pounds was
cleared off the cathedral hall and a thousand pounds
over-subscribed handed him for educational purposes.

In connexion with that event a review was made, and
official statistics compiled, of the growth and progress of
the Church during that period. The number of clergy had increased from 26 to 56. The
total cost in the erection of churches, schools, presbytery,
halls, educational and charitable institutions amounted
to an enormous sum (considering the population) of
£1,272,874.

The development of Catholic education and the in-
crease in the number of schools not only kept pace with
the general growth, but led the van of progress.
The archbishop adhered religiously to the principle of
his predecessor in his endeavour to provide as far as
possible, Catholic education for every Catholic child.
To make effectual and permanent provision in the de-
partment of education, new teaching orders were intro-
duced. In addition to those already fighting the edu-
cational battle the archbishop, within a few years,
had the Marist Brothers, the Sisters of Charity, the
Sacred Heart Sisters, the Sisters of Loreto, the Sisters
£500,000 was expended during these years on
school buildings and residences for religious engaged
in Catholic education. In 1887 the number of pupils
attending the Catholic schools of the archdiocese was
11,661 as compared with 25,369 at the close of 1908.

This building and maintaining of a separate school sys-
tem means a double tax on the Catholic community
as the payers they contribute the proceeds of State ed-
education, and as Catholics they pay for their own; and
count the cost as nothing compared with the eternal in-
terests at stake. When the purely secular system of
education was introduced into Victoria in 1872, some anti-Catholics leagued together, and declared that the new system would "rend the Catholic Church asunder". The opposite has been the result. The very sufferings and disabilities associated with the maintenance of their own schools have united solidly the Catholic body; while the absence of religion from the State schools has "sent aunder" Protestantism in producing a generation of non-believers. No review of the Archdiocese of Melbourne would be complete without reference to the growth of Catholic literature, particularly during recent years. To stem the tide of irreligious reading, splendid efforts have been made in Melbourne, with the Catholic press and with Catholic literature. When the archbishop came to Melbourne (1887) there was only one Catholic paper, the "Advocate" in Victoria. Since then a monthly magazine, the "Austral Light", under his direction (1892), a penny weekly paper, the "Tribune" (1900), and the Australian Catholic Truth Society (1904), have come into existence, and are doing great apostolic work in the diffusion of Catholic truth. The Catholics of the archdiocese are almost entirely Irish or of Irish origin. The priesthood was exclusively Irish till recent years, when vocations among the native born are rapidly on the increase. The religious, teaching in the schools or conducting the charitable institutions, were in the earlier years from Germany and France.

SUMMARY OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF MELBOURNE.—

Disticts, 57; Churches, 168; Secular Clergy, 113; Regular Clergy, 38; Religious Brothers, 54; Nuns, 851; Superior Schools, for Boys, 8; for Girls, 28; number of pupils, 3443; Parochial Primary Schools, 107; number of pupils, 9,926; Total number of pupils in Parochial and Superior Schools, 16,362; Orphanages and Industrial Schools, for Boys, 1, for Girls, 1; Reformatory School for Girls, 1; Magdalen Asylums for Penitent Women, 2; Home for Neglected Children, 1; Home for the Poor, 1; Home for Women and Girls out of employment, 1; Foundling Hospital, 1; Receiving Home in connexion with Foundling Hospital, 1; Catholic population of the archdiocese according to Government census returns of 1901, 145,333.

PATRICK PHELAN.

Melchers, Paul, Cardinal, Archbishop of Cologne, b. 6 Jan., 1813, at Münster, Westphalia; d. 14 Dec., 1895, at Rome. He studied law at Bonn (1830-35), and held the presidency of the university at Bonn, and theology at Munich under Klee, Görres, Windsheim and Döllinger. Ordained in 1841, he was assigned to duty in the village of Halttern. In 1844 he became vice-rector of the diocesan seminary, rector (1851), canon of the cathedral (1852), vicar-general (1854). Pius IX appointed him Bishop of Osnabrück (1857) and Archbishop of Cologne (1866). Here he laboured zealously and, moreover, inaugurated (1867) at Fulda, those annual reunions of the German bishops which have since produced such excellent results. Though he had always accepted and taught the doctrine of papal infallibility, he regarded its formal definition as untimely, a conviction which he, with thirteen other bishops, expressed in a pastoral letter of 16 Sept., 1896. At the same time, however, the bishops, in a pastoral letter which they signed without exception, warned the faithful against reports unfavourable to the future (Vatican) Council and exhorted them to await calmly its decisions. In the Council itself Archbishop Melchers took a prominent part. At a session of the Council, 1870, he expressly negatively answered the question of papal infallibility; but he refused to sign an address in which fifty-five other members of the minority notified the pope of their immediate departure and reiterated their non placet. He left Rome before the fourth solemn session, giving as his reason the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war, and declaring his readiness to abide by the decisions of the Council. On his return to Cologne he proclaimed in an eloquent address (24 July) the dogma defined 18 July. As a means of ensuring obedience to the Council, the bishops assembled by him at Fulda, published (1 Sept.) a joint letter which produced a deep and salutary impression, and for which Pius IX expressed (20 Oct.) his gratitude. In the first five paragraphs he eliminated the opposition of Bonn, the archbishop (20 Sept. and 8 Oct.) called on Professor Dieringer, Reusch, Langen and Knoedt to sign a declaration accepting the Vatican decrees and pleading conformity thereto in their teaching. Dieringer alone compiled; the others were suspended and eventually (12 March, 1872) excommunicated.

The encroachments and repressive measures of the Kulturkampf (q. v.) were firmly resisted by Archbishop Melchers. In June, 1873, he communicated two priests who had joined the Old Catholics; for this and for other administrative acts he was fined and imprisoned six months (12 March—9 Oct., 1874). On 2 Dec., 1875, the president of the Rhine Province demanded his resignation on pain of deposition; he refused, but learning that preparations were being made to deport him to Kuslbin, he escaped (13 Dec.) to Maastricht and took refuge with the Franciscans. From their monastery he administered his diocese during ten years. Knowing, however, the temper of the German government and feelings of the Roman Curia from his see would prove injurious to religion, he, on different occasions informed Leo XIII of his willingness to resign for the general good. The pope at last reluctantly consented, but called him to Rome and created him cardinal (27 July, 1885). In 1892 during a serious illness, he was received into the Society of Jesus and lived as a Jesuit until his death six years later. He was laid to rest in the cathedral of Cologne amid obsequies that attested the people's admiration and love. St. Paul's church in the same city, completed in 1908, fittingly commemorates Melcher's heroic struggle for the liberty of the Church.

His principal publications are: "Erinnerungen an die Feier des 50 jährigen Bischofs jubilium des h. Vaters Pius IX" (Cologne, 1876); "Eine Unterweisung über das Gebet" (Cologne, 1876); "Eine Unterweisung über das heilige Messopfer" (Cologne, 1879); "Das Sendschreiben des heiligen Vaters Papst Leo XIII über den Socialismus" (Cologne, 1880); "Die katholische Lehre vom Kirche" (Cologne, 1881); "Kapitel einer Einsamkeit" (Cologne, 1892); "Die canonic deciduæ diocesani visitatones" (Rome, 1892).

LUDWIG, Kardinal Erzbischof Dr. Paulus Melchers und die St. Pauluskirche in Köln (Cologne, 1899); GRANDERSHEIT- KIRCHNER, Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils, II. Teil (Freiburg, 1903-1906); GRANDERSHEIT, Acta et Decreta S. S. Conciliorum Recentiorum, tom. VII (Freiburg, 1890).

J. FORGET.

Melchisedech. See MELCHISADEK, SAINT, POPE.

Melchisedech [Gr. Μέλχισεδέκ, Heb. בֵּית־כַּבֵּד, "King of righteousness" (Gen. xiv, 18-20) who, on Abraham's return with the booty taken from the four kings, "brings forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the most high God blessed him", and received from him the tithes of all" (v. 20). Josephus, with many others, identifies Salem with Jerusalem, and adds that Melchisedech "supplied Abram's army in a hospitable manner, and gave them provisions in abundance ... and when Abram gave him the tenth part of his prey, he accepted of the gift" (Ant., i, 2, 2). Cheyne says it is a plausible and puerile conjecture (Encyc. Bib., s. v.), which "plausible conjecture" Kaufmann, however, rightly condemns (Jew. Encyc., s. v.). The Rabbins identified Melchisedech with Sem, son of Noe, rather for polemic than historic reasons, since they wished to set themselves against what is said of him as a type of Christ "without father, without mother, without genealogy" (Heb., vii, 3).

...
Melchisdechians, a branch of the Monarchians, founded by Theodotus the banker. (See Monarchians.) Another quite distinct sect or party is refuted by Eusebius, who states that he had been a pupil of St. John Chrysostom. His book Επὶ τὸν Μοναρχίαν, or according to Photius "Against the Melchisdechians" (P. G., lxv, 1117), speaks of these new teachers as making Melchisdech an incarnation of the Logos. They were anathematized by the bishops, but would not cease to preach. They seem to have been otherwise orthodox (Ep. 72) refusing to make any accords with the heretics. They held the Saviour to be the head of the Hebrews or Gentiles. They keep the Sabbath, but are not circumcised. They will not touch any man. If food is offered to them, they ask for it to be placed on the ground; then they come and take it. They give to others with the same precautions. Nothing more is known of this curious sect.

For the Monarchian Melchisdechians the ancient authorities are Pseudo-Tertullian, Priscillian, Iliodorus, Florus, and the Apologie of Apollinaris; also see Origen, Marcus Brutus (Leipzig, 1808); Irenaeus, Against Heresies, v. (See Monarchians.).

John Chapman.

Melchites (Melchites). I. Origin and Name.—Melchites are the people in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt who remained faithful to the Council of Chalcedon (451) when the greater part turned Monophysite. The original meaning of the name therefore is an opposition to Monophysism. The Nestorians had their communities in eastern Syria till the Emperor Zeno (474-491) closed the last of them. In 496 they drove them over the frontier into Persia. The people of western Syria, Palestine, and Egypt were either Melchites who accepted Chalcedon, or Monophysites (called also Jacobites in Syria and Palestine, Copts in Egypt) who rejected it, till the Monothelete heresy in the seventh century further complicated the situation. But Melchite religion, as far as can be gathered from Scripture, was closely connected with the ancient doctrine of the western Church, and it was not until the middle of the seventh century that the Nestorian, Christian, Monophysite, and Monothelite Churches were finally divided.

The name "Melchite" is not a term of abuse, nor is it currently used by the Nestorians. The Nestorians called the Chalcedonians "Heretics," and the Chalcedonians called the Nestorians "Monophysites." The name was also used by the Nestorians in the East to designate the Chalcedonians, and they were called "Melchites" by the Nestorians in the West. The name was also used by the Nestorians to designate the Chalcedonians, and they were called "Melchites" by the Nestorians in the West.
dering disloyalty of these two provinces broke out in the form of rebellion against Chalcedon. For centuries (till the Arab conquest) Monophysism was the symbol of national sentiment, and the Patriarch of Antioch. The root of the matter was always political. The people of Egypt and Syria, keeping their own languages and their consciousness of being separate races, had never been really amalgamated with the Empire, originally Latin, now fast becoming Greek. They had a chance of political independence, their hatred of Rome found a vent in this national question. The cry of the faith of Cyril, "one nature in Christ," no betrayal of Euphrasius, meant really no submission to the foreign tyrant on the Bosphorus. So the great majority of the population in these lands turned Monophysite, rose in continual rebellion against the creed of the Empire, committed savage atrocities against the Chalcedonian bishops and officials, and in return were fiercely persecuted.

The beginning of these troubles in Egypt was the deposition of the Monophysite Patriarch Dioscur, and the election by the government party of Proterius as his successor, immediately after the council. The people, especially the lower classes, and the great crowds of monks, refused to accept Proterius, and began to make tumults and riots that 2000 soldiers sent from Constantinople could hardly put down. When Dioscur died in 454 a certain Timothy, called the Cat or Wesael (αλουρος), was ordained by the Monophysites as his successor. In 457 Proterius was murdered; Timothy drove out the Chalcedonian clergy and so organized Coptic (αλουρος) Church of Egypt. In Syria and Palestine there was the same opposition to the council and the government. The people and monks drove out the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, Martyrius, and set up one Peter the Dyer (γασφετος, fullo), a Monophysite, as his successor. John, the successor of Timothy, gave up his beseys by Chalcedon. When he came back to his new patriarchate he found the whole country in rebellion against him. He too was driven out and a Monophysite monk Theodocus was set up in his place. So began the Monophysite national churches of these provinces. Their opposition to the court and rebellion lasted two centuries, till the Turkish conquest (Syria, 637; Egypt, 641). During this time the government, realising the danger of the disaffection of the frontier provinces, alternated fierce persecution of the heretics with vain attempts to conciliate them by compromises (Zeno's Henotikon in 482, the Acacian Schism, 484–519, etc.). It should be realised that "Egypt was the last stronghold of Monophysites than Syria or Palestine. Egypt was much closer knit as one land than the other provinces, and so stood more uniformly on the side of the national party. (For all this see Monophysitism.)

Meanwhile against the nationalistic party stood the minority on the side of the government and the council. They were the Melchites. Why they were so-called is obscure, though they were the loyal Imperialists, the emperor's party. The name occurs first in a pure Greek form as Μελχηταί. Evagrius says of Timothy Sakaphiaklos (the Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria set up by the government when Timothy the Cat was driven out in 460) that "some called him the Imperialist (γα Μελχητος της αυταρητης") (II. E., II, 11). These Melchites were naturally for the government officials, in Egypt almost entirely so, while in Syria and Palestine a certain part of the native population was Melchite too. Small in numbers, they were until the Arab conquest strong through the support of the government and the army. The contrast between Monophysites and Melchites (Nationalists and Imperialists) was vivid. When the Monophysites spoke the national language of the country (Coptic in Egypt, Syriac in Syria and Palestine), Melchites for the most part were foreigners sent out from Constantinople who spoke Greek. For a long time the history of these countries is that of a continual feud between Melchites and Monophysites; sometimes the one, sometimes the other, is persecuted, the patriarchate is occupied by a Melchite; then again the people get the upper hand, drive out the Melchite bishops, set up Monophysites in their place and murder the Greeks. By the time of the Arab conquest the two Churches exist as rivals with rival lines of bishops. But the Monophysites are much the larger party, especially in Egypt, and form the national religion of the country. The difference by now expresses itself to a great extent in liturgical language. Both parties used the same liturgies (St. Mark in Egypt, St. James in Syria and Palestine), but while the Monophysites made a point of using the national language in church (Coptic and Syriac), the Melchites generally used Greek. It is true, however, that this was less the case than has been thought; the Melchites, too, used the vulgar tongue to a considerable extent (Charon, "Le Rite byzantin", 26–29).

When the Arabs came in the seventh century, the Monophysites, true to their anti-imperial policy, rather helped than hindered the invaders. But they were punished in the same way by the conquerors as the usual terms granted to Christians; they became two sects of Rayas under the Moslem Khalifa, both were equally persecuted during the repeated outbursts of Moslem fanaticism, of which the reign of Al-Hakim in Egypt (996–1021) is the best known instance. In the tenth century Syria was more fully incorporated in the empire (Antioch captured in 968–969, lost again to the Seljuk Turks in 1078–1081). This caused for a time a revival of the Melchites and an increase of enthusiasm for Constantinople and everything Greek among them. Under the Moslems the characteristic notes of both churches became, if possible, stronger. The Monophysites and the 'Greek-speaking' Catholics of Damascus and other important local sects. On the other hand, the Melchite minorities clung all the more to their union with the great church that reigned free and dominant in the empire. This expressed itself chiefly in loyalty to Constantinople. Rome and the West were far off; the immediate object of their devotion was the emperor's court and the emperor's patriarch. The Melchite patriarchs under Moslem rule became insignificant people, while the power of the Patriarch of Constantinople grew steadily. So, looking always to the capital for guidance, they gradually accepted the position of being his dependents, almost suffragans. When the Bishop of Constantinople assumed the title of "Ecumenical Patriarch" (680), the Melchites followed him, including all who protested. This attitude explains their share in his schism. The quarrels between Photius and Pope Nicholas I., between Michael Cerularius and Leo IX. were not their affair; they hardly understood what was happening. But naturally, almost inevitably, when the schism broke out, in spite of some protests [Peter III. of Antioch (1053–1077) protested vehemently against Cerularius's schism: see Fortescue, "Orthodox Eastern Church", 189–192], the Melchites followed their leader, and when orders came from Constantinople to strike the pope's name from their diptychs they quietly obeyed.

III. FROM THE SCHISM TO THE BEGINNING OF THE UNION. — So all the Melchites in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt broke with Rome and went into schism at the command of Constantinople. Here, too, they justified their name of Imperialist. From this time to almost our own day there is little to chronicle of their history. They existed as a "nation" (millef) under the Khalifa; when the Turks took Constantinople (1453) they made the patriarch the head of that city's "nation" (Rum i.e., the Orthodox Church) for civil affairs. Other bishops, or even patriarchs, could only approach the government through him. This further increased his authority and influence over all the Orthodox in
the Turkish Empire. During the dark ages that follow, the Ecumenical Patriarch continually strove (and generally managed) to assert ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Melchites (Orth. Eastern Ch., 240, 259, 295, 298, 310, etc.). Meanwhile the three patriarchs (of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem) found it necessary to do among their diminished flocks, for long periods, to live at Constantinople, idle ornaments of the Phanar. The lists of these patriarchs will be found in Le Quien (loc. cit. below). Gradually all the people of Egypt, Syria, and Palestine since the Arab conquest forgot their original languages and spoke only Arabic, as they do still. This further affected their liturgies. Little by little Arabic began to be used in church. Since the seventeenth century at the latest, the native Orthodox of these countries use Arabic for all services, though the great number of Greeks among them keep their own language.

But already a much more important change in the liturgy of the Melchites had taken place. We have seen that the most characteristic note of these communities was their dependence on Constantinople. That was the difference between them and their old rivals the Monophysites, long after the quarrel about the nature of Christ had practically been forgotten. The Monophysites, having taken the decision of Chalcedon, declared their loyalty to Alexandria and Antioch-Jerusalem pure. They still use these rites in the old languages (Coptic and Syriac). The Melchites on the other hand submitted to Byzantine influence in their liturgies. The Byzantine litanies (Synoptai), the service of the Ptolemaide and other elements were introduced into the Greek-Alexandrian Rite before the twelfth or thirteenth centuries. Greeks, in Syria and Palestine the Melchites admitted a number of Byzantine elements into their services (Chorun, op. cit., 9–25).

Then in the thirteenth century came the final change. The Melchites gave up their old rites altogether and adopted that of Constantinople. Theodore IV (Chronicle, p. 112, 113) marks the date of this change. The crusaders held Antioch in his time, so he retired to Constantinople and lived there under the shadow of the Ecumenical Patriarch. While he was there he adopted the Byzantine Rite. In 1203 Mark II of Alexandria (1195–c. 1210) wrote to Theodore asking various questions about the liturgy. Theodore II of Florence and Constantine VI (1214–1227) also wrote to Mark, and Mark undertook to adopt it (P. G., CXXXVIII, 953 sq.). When Theodorus IV of Antioch (1260–1276) was able to set up his throne again in his own city he imposed the Byzantine Rite on all his clergy. At Jerusalem the old liturgy disappeared at about the same time (At last, op. cit., 21, 23).

We have then for the liturgies of the Melchites these periods: first the old national rites in Greek, but also in the languages of the country, especially in Syria and Palestine, gradually Byzantinized till the thirteenth century. Then the Byzantine Rite alone in Greek in Egypt, in Greek and Syriac in Syria and Palestine, with gradual adoption of the Latin in 1272 to the twelfth century. Lastly the same rite in Arabic only by the natives, in Greek by the foreign (Greek) patriarchs and bishops.

The last development we notice is the steady increase of this foreign (Greek) element in all the higher places of the clergy. As the Phanar at Constantinople grew more and more powerful the Melchites, so did it more and more, in ruthless defence of the feeling of the people, send them Greek patriarchs, metropolitans, and archimandrites from its own body. For centuries the lower married clergy and simple monks have been natives, speaking Arabic and using Arabic in the liturgy, while all the prelates have been Greeks, who often do not even. Thus, in our own time, the native Orthodox have rebelled against this state of things. At Antioch they have now succeeded in the recognition of their native Patriarch, Gregory IV (Hadad) after a schism with Constantinople. The troubles caused by the same movement at Jerusalem are still fresh in everyone's mind. It is certain that as soon as the present Greek patriarchs of Jerusalem (Ignatius V) and Alexandria (Photios) die, there will be a determined effort to appoint natives as their successors. But these quarrels affect the modern Orthodox of these lands who do not come within the limit of this article, inasmuch as they are no longer Melchites.  

IV. Uniates.—We have said that in modern times since the foundation of Uniate (Byzantine) churches in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, only these Uniates should be called Melchites. Why the old name is now reserved for them it is impossible to say. It is, however, a fact that it is so. One still occasionally in a western book finds all Christians of the Byzantine Rite in these countries called Melchites, with a further distinction between Catholic and Orthodox Melchites; but the present writer's experience is that this is never the case among themselves. The man in union with the great Eastern Church in those parts never called himself or allows himself to be called a Melchite. He is simply "Orthodox in Greek or any Western language, Rumi in Arabic. Everyone there understands by Melchite a Uniate. It is true that the term is not very commonly used. They are more likely to speak of themselves as rumi katholik or in French Grecs catholiques; but the name Melchite, if used at all, always means to Eastern people these Uniates. It is convenient for us too to have a definite name for them less entirely wrong than 'Greek Catholic' for the Greeks, in Syria and Palestine, the Uniates; and 'Melchite' at all. A question that has often been raised is whether there is any continuity of these Byzantine Uniates since before the great schism, whether there are any communities that have never lost communion with Rome. There are such communities certainly in the south of Italy, Sicily, and Corsica. In the case of the Melchites we find none. It is true that there have been approaches to reunion continually since the eleventh century, individual bishops have made their submission at various times, the short-lived unions of Lyons (1274) and Florence (1439) included the Orthodox of these countries too. But there is no continuous line; when the Union of Florence was made all the Orthodox Christians in the East fell away. The present Melchite Church dates from the eighteenth century.

Already in the seventeenth century tentative efforts at reunion were made by some of the Orthodox bishops of Syria. A certain Euthymius, Metropolitan of Tyre and Sidon, then the Antiochene Patriarchs Athanasius IV (1700–1726) and the famous Cyril of Bergaza (d. 1724), the rival of Cyril Lukaris of Constantinople, who for a time was rival Patriarch of Antioch) approached the Holy See and hoped to receive the pallium. But the professions of faith which they submitted were considered insufficient at Rome. The latinizing tendency in Syria was so well known that the cardinals of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith drew up and sent to the Antiochene bishops a warning letter with a list of Latin heresies (in Assemani, "Bibl. Orient.", III, 639). However, in 1724 Seraphim Tanas, who had studied at the Roman Propaganda, was elected Patriarch of Antioch by the latinizing party. He at once made his submission to Rome and sent a Catholic profession of faith. He took the name Cyril (Cyril VI, 1724–1759); with him begins the line of Melchite patriarchs in the new sense (Uniates). In 1728 the schismatics elected Sylvester, a Greek monk from Athos. He was recognized by the Phanar and the other Orthodox churches; through him the Orthodox line continues. Cyril VI suffered considerable opposition from the Catholic patriarchs, and he died in 1759. He was succeeded by the Catholic patriarch Ignatius I in 1759.
tional struggle against the Orthodox majority, he resigned his office. Ignatius Jauhar was appointed to succeed Cyril; he succeeded, but the appointment was rejected at Rome and Clement XIII appointed Maximus Hakim, Metropolitan of Baalbek, as patriarch (Maximus II, 1760–1761). Athanasius Dahan of Beirut succeeded by regular election and confirmation after Maximus's death and became Theodosius VI (1761–1764). In 1764 Ignatius Jauhar succeeded in being re-elected patriarch. The pope excommunicated him, and persuaded the Turkish authorities to drive him out. In 1773 Clement XIV united the few scattered Melchites of Alexandria and Jerusalem to the jurisdiction of the Melchite patriarch of Antioch. When Theodosius VI died, Ignatius Jauhar was again elected; he was confirmed, and took the name Athanasius V (1788–1794).

Then followed Cyril VII (Siage, 1794–1796), Agapius III (Matar, formerly Metropolitan of Tyre and Sidon, patriarch 1796–1812). During his time there was a movement of Josephinism and Jansenism in the sense of the synod of Pistoia (1786) among the Melchites, led by Germanus Adam, Metropolitan of Baalbe. This movement was in vain and was put an end to by the synod of the patriarch. The synod of 1806 held at Qarafa which approved many of the Pistoian decree.

The election of the patriarch was without authority from Rome in Arabic in 1810; in 1835 they were censured at Rome. Pius VII had already condemned and withdrawn Jansenism from the Melchites of Basalbek. Among his errors was the Orthodox theory that consecration is not effected by the words of institution in the liturgy. Eventually the Melchites (Agapius) and the other Melchite bishop were persuaded to renounce these ideas. In 1812 another synod established a seminary at 'Ain-Tras for the Melchites. The newly elected Ignatius IV (Sarruf, Feb.–Nov., 1812, murdered), Athanasius VI (Matar, 1813), Macarious IV (Tawil, 1813–1815), Ignatius V (Qattan, 1816–1833). He was followed by the famous Maximus III (Maslum, 1833–1855). His former name was Michael. He had been infected with the ideas of Germanus of Basalbek, and had been elected Metropolitan of Aleppo, but his election had not been confirmed at Rome. The synod renounced these ideas and became titular Metropolitan of Myra, and procurator of his patriarch at Rome. During this time he founded the Melchite church at Marseilles (St. Nicholas), and took steps at the courts of Vienna and Paris to protect the Melchites from their Oriental enemies.

Hitherto the Turkish government had not recognized the Uniates as a separate millet; so all their communications with the State, the berat given to their bishops and so on, had to be made through the Orthodox. They were still officially, in the eyes of the law, members of the rum millet, that is of the Orthodox community under the Patriarch of Constantinople. This naturally gave the Orthodox endless opportunities of annoying them, which were not lost. In 1831 Maslum went back to Syria, in 1833 after the death of Ignatius V he was elected patriarch, and was confirmed at Rome after many difficulties in 1836. His reign was full of disputes. In 1835 he held a national synod at 'Ain-Tras, which laid down twenty-five canons for the regulation of the rites of the Rite of the Latin Church; the synod was approved at Rome and is published in the Collectio Lacensis (II, 579–592). During his reign at last the Melchites obtained recognition as a separate millet from the Porte. Maximus III obtained from Rome for himself and his successors the additional titles of Alexandria and Jerusalem, which were previously reserved for the metropolitan of Sidon. In 1841 he held a synod at Jerusalem in which he renewed many of the errors of Germanus Adam. Thus he got into new difficulties with Rome as well as with his own people. But these difficulties were gradually composed and the old patriarch died in office in 1855. He is the most famous of the line of Melchite patriarchs. He was succeeded by Clement I (Bahus, 1856–1864), Gregory II (Yussef, 1865–1897), Peter IV (Jerajiri, 1897–1902), and Cyril VIII (Jeha, the reigning patriarch, who was elected 27 June, 1903, confirmed at once by telegram from Rome, enthroned in the patriarchal church at Damascus, 8 August, 1903).

V. CONSTITUTION OF THE MELCHITE CHURCH.—The head of the Melchite Church, under the supreme authority of the pope, is the patriarch. His title is "Patriarch of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and all the East." "Antioch and all the East" is the old title used by all patriarchs of Antioch. It is less arrogant than it sounds; the "all" is in the original Roman Prefecture of the East (Prefectura Orientalis) which corresponded exactly to the patriarchate before the rise of Constantinople (Fortescue, "Orth. Eastern Church", 21). Alexandria and Jerusalem were added to the title under Maximus III. It should be noted that these come after Antioch, although normally Alexandria has precedence over it. This is because the patriarch is fundamentally of Antioch only; he trace his succession through Cyril VI to the old line of Antioch. He is in some sort only the administrator of Alexandria and Jerusalem until the number of Melchites in Egypt and Palestine shall justify the erection of separate patriarchates for them. Meanwhile he rules equally over his whole sees. This title is also a grander title used in Polychronis and for specially solemn occasions in which he is acclaimed as "Father of Fathers, Shepherd of Shepherds, High Priest of High Priests and Thirteenth Apostle".

The patriarch is elected by the bishops, and is nearly always chosen from their number. The election is not submitted to the pope. When elected he is immediately joined to Propaganda; it is canonical the patriarch-elect sends a profession of faith and petition for confirmation and for the pallium to the pope. He must also take an oath of obedience to the pope. If the election is invalid, nomination devolves on the pope. The patriarch may not resign without the pope's consent. He must make his visit ad limina, personally or by deputy, every ten years. The patriarch has ordinary jurisdiction over all his church. He confirms the election of and consecrates all bishops; he can translate or depose them, according to the canons. He founds parishes and (with consent of Rome) dioceses, and has considerable rights of the nature of dispensation from fasting and so on. The patriarch is the head of the patriarchal church at Damascus (near the Eastern Gate). He has also residences at Alexandria and Jerusalem, where he spends at least some weeks each year; he is often at the seminary at 'Ain-Tras, not far from Beirut, in the Lebanon.

The bishops are chosen according to the bull "Reversurus", 12 July, 1867. The other bishops in communion with the patriarch choose three names, of which the pope selects one. All bishops must be celibate, but they are by no means necessarily monks. Priests who are not monks may keep wives married before ordination, but as in all uniate churches celibacy is very common, and the married clergy are looked upon rather askance. There are seminaries at Beirut and at the College of St. Ann under Cardinal Lavigerie's White Fathers, Beirut, etc. Many students go to the Jesuits at Beirut, the Greek College at Rome, or St. Sulpice at Paris. The monks follow the Rule of St. Basil. They are divided into two great congregations, that of St. John the Baptist at Shuweir in the Lebanon and that of St. George, both in Beirut. The Shuweirites have a further distinction, i.e. of those of Aleppo and the Baladites. They also convents of Basilian nuns.

Practically all Melchites are natives of the
Arabs in tongue. Their rite is that of Constantino, almost always celebrated in Arabic with a few verses and a few eulogies (epithets, etc.) in Greek. But on certain solemn occasions the liturgy is celebrated entirely in Greek.

The sees of the patriarchate are: the patriarchate itself, to which is joined Damascus, administered by a vicar; then two metropolitan dioceses, Tyre and Aleppo; two archiepiscopates, Bosra with Hauran, and Homs and with Hantik; seven bishoprics, Sidon, Beirut (with Jebeil), Tripoli, Acre, Zehla, and the Beqaa, Paneas, and Baalbek. The patriarchates of Jerusalem and Alexandria are administered for the patriarch by vicars. The total number of Melchites is estimated at 130,000 (Silbermann) or 114,080 (Werner).

For the origin and history see any history of the Monophysite heresy. Neale, History of the Holy Eastern Church (London, 1847-1850), IV and V; The Patriarchate of Alexandria—supplementary volume: The Patriarchate of Antioch, ed. Williams (London, 1873); Charon, Histoire des Patriarcat Mélites (Rome, in course of publication), a most valuable work; Rauhut, Documenti inediti per servire a l'istoria del Christianismo in Orient (3 vols., Paris, 1897); Le Quien, Oriens Christianus Paris, 1690, 287-393 (Alexandrine Patriarchate), 690-730 (Jerusalem), II, 137-157 (Jerusalem).


A. Fortescue.

Melchisedek. See Melchisedech.

Melénès Valdés, Juan, Spanish poet and politician, b. at Ribera del Fresno (Badajoz) 11 March, 1754; d. in exile at Montpellier, France 24 May, 1817. He studied law at Salamanca and while there, began his poetical career. In 1789, with the Batlle, he was appointed to the Spanish Academy for the best eulogies on the pleasures of life in the country. In 1781 he went to Madrid where he made the acquaintance of the minister and author, Jovellanos, whose favour he enjoyed, and who had him appointed to a chair in the University of Salamanca. In 1784 Mélenès was one of the 350 competitors for a prize offered by the city of Madrid for the best comedy of the generation. His comedy, "Las bodas de Camacho el rico" founded on the famous story of Cervantes, was awarded the prize and presented, but, as a stage production, it was not successful. This failure gave his detractors opportunity for much unfavourable criticism. Mélenès, enlisting by publishing in 1786 the first volume of his poems which made much of what it in that quickly ran through several editions and firmly established his literary reputation. He now entered upon a political career which was to prove his ruin. Through the favour of his friend Jovellanos, he obtained the posts successively of judge of the court of Saragos and of the court of Castile. He was residing at Madrid in 1791, and fiscal of the supreme court in Madrid in 1797. On the fall of Jovellanos, Mélenès was ordered to leave Madrid, and after brief stays in Medina del Campo and Zamora, he finally established his residence at Salamanca. After the revolution of 1808, Mélenès accepted from the government of Joseph Bonaparte the post of councillor of state and late that of minister of public instruction. This lack of patriotism naturally involved him in trouble with his countrymen, so that when the Spaniards returned to power in 1813, he was compelled to flee to France. Here he passed four years amid misery and misfortune, and died at Montpellier poor and neglected in his old age.

Though Mélenès cannot be considered a great poet, he was not lacking in talent. His poems are characterized by delicacy of expression and grace, rather than by vigour and great flights of fancy. He shows to best advantage in his eclogues and romances, which are distinguished for their easy flow and facility. In spite of the fact that he is but little read to-day, he undeniably exercised some influence in the literary restoration during the reign of Charles III, and has sometimes been called by admiring Spaniards "Restaurador del Parnaso" (Restorer of Parnassus). Besides the works already mentioned, Mélenès wrote a lyric poem on the creation, an epic entitled "La Calde de Lusbe", an ode to Winter, and a translation of the Iliad. Complete editions of the poems of Mélenès, with a life of the author by Quintana, were published in Madrid in 1820 (4 volumes), and in Barcelona in 1838. "La Biblioteca de Autores Españoles" (LXIII) reproduces the poems.

Ventura Fuente.

Meletion Schism. See MELETUS OF ANTIOCH; MELETUS OF LUCYPOLIS.

Meletius of Antioch, Bishop, b. in Melitene, Lesser Armenia; d. at Antioch, 381. Before occupying the see of Antioch he had been Bishop of Sebaste, capital of Partibria or Prima Antiochia, and was sent as a legate by Diocletian from Sebaste to Beroea and thence to Antioch; his elevation to Sebaste may date from the year 358 or 359. His sojourn in that city was short and not free from vexations owing to popular attachment to his predecessor Eustathius. Asia Minor and Syria were troubled at the time by the theological disputes of a new ascetic-Arian character. Under Eustathius (324-330) Antioch had been one of the centres of Nicene orthodoxy. This great man was set aside, and his first successors, Paulinus and Euaihlus held the see but a short time (330-332). Others followed, most of them unequal to their task, and the Church of Antioch was rent in twain by schism. The Eutychian controversy raged in the orthodox camp, but details of this division escape us until the election of Leontius (344-358). His sympathy for the Arian heresy was open, and his disciple Ætius preached pure Arianism which did not hinder his being ordained deacon. This was too much for the patience of the orthodox under the leadership of Flavius and Diodorus. Ætius had to be removed. On the death of Leontius, Eudoxius of Germanicia, one of the most influential Arians, speedily repaired to Antioch, and by intrigue secured his appointment to the vacant see. He held it only a short time, was banished to Armenia, and in 359 the Council of Seleucia appointed a successor named Ananias, who was at one time also exiled. Eudoxius was restored to favour in 360, and made Bishop of Constantinople, whereby the Antiochenepiscopal succession was re-opened. From all sides bishops assembled for the election. The Arians were the dominant party. Nevertheless the choice seems to have been a compromise. Meletius, who had resigned his see of Sebaste and who was a personal friend of Acacius, was elected. The choice was generally satisfactory, for Meletius had made promises to both parties so that orthodox and Arians thought him to be on their side.

Meletius doubtless believed that truth lay in delicate distinctions, but his formula was so indefinite that even to-day, it is difficult to seize it with precision. He was neither a thorough Nicene nor a decided Arian. Meanwhile he passed alternately for an Anomean, an Homoioan, an Homoian, or a Neo-Nicene, seeking always to remain outside any inflexible classification. It is possible that he was yet uncertain and that he expected from the contemporary theological ferment some new and ingenuous solution unsatisfactory to himself, but above all non-committal. Fortune had favoured him thus far; he was absent from Antioch when elected, and had not been even sounded concerning his doctrinal leanings. Men were wearing
Interminable discussion, and the kindly, gentle temper of Meletius seemed to promise the much-desired peace. He was no Athanasius, nor did unheroic Antioch wish for a man of that stamp. The qualities of Meletius were genuine; a simple life, pure morals, sincere piety and affable manners. He had no transcendent merit, unless the even harmonious balance of his Christian virtues might appear transcendent. The new bishop held the affection of the large and turbulent population he governed, and was esteemed by such men as St. John Chrysostom, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Basil, and even his adversary St. Epi-
phanius. St. Gregory Nazianzen tells us that he was a very pious man, simple and without guile, full of godliness; peace shone on his countenance, and those who knew him best, Paulinus, and Faustus, were sure of his true character, and what he was called, and his Greek name revealed it, for there was honey in his disposition as well as his name. On his arrival at Antioch he was greeted by an immense concourse of Christians and Jews; every one wondered for which faction he would proclaim him- self, and already the report was spread abroad, that he was simply a partisan of the Nicene Creed. Meletius took his own time. He began by reforming certain notorious abuses and instructing his people, in which manner work he might have aroused enmity had he not avoided all questions in dispute. Emperor Constans, a militant Arian, called a conference calculated to force from Meletius his immost thought. The em-
peror's purpose was founded on a question, a text, upon the chief text in the Arian controversy. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way" (Prov., viii, 22).

In the beginning Meletius was somewhat long and tedious, but exhibited a great Scriptural knowledge. He cautiously declared that Scripture does not contra-
dict the doctrine of the Incarnation; but not one word of explanation of the doctrine of God's only begot-
ten Son. One does not get beyond an approximation which permits us to understand to a certain extent, and which brings us gently and progressively from visible things to hidden ones. Now, to believe in Christ is to believe that the Son is like unto the Fa-
ter. His image. Who is in everything, creator of all; and not an imperfect but an adequate image, even as the effect corresponds to the cause. The generation of the only begotten Son, anterior to all time, carries with it the concepts of subsistence, stability, and exclu-
sivism. Meletius then turned to moral considera-
tions, but he had satisfied his hearers, chiefly by the repeated citation of Arian texts. One of the chief objects was to fortify the doctrine of the Holy Ghost in the face of heresy and error. The orthodoxy of the bishop was fully established, and his profession of faith was a severe blow for the Arian party. St. Basil wrote the hesitating St. Epiphanius that "Meletius was the first to speak freely in favour of the truth and to fight the good fight in the reign of Constans". As Meletius ended his discourse his audi-
cence asked him to add more of his teaching. He extended three fingers towards the people, then closed the rule and said, "Three Persons are conceived in the mind but it as though we addressed one only". This gesture remained famous and became a rallying sign. The Arians were not slow to avenge themselves. On vague pretexts the emperor banished Meletius to his native Armenia. He had occupied his see less than a month.

This exile was the immediate cause of a long and deplorable schism between the Catholics of Antioch, henceforth divided into Meletians and Eustathians. The churches remaining in the hands of the Arians, Paulinus governed the Eustathians, while Flavious and Thenius were the chiefs of the Meletian flock. In every family one child bore the name of Meletius, whose portrait was engraved on rings, reliefs, cups, and the walls of apartments. Meletius went into exile in the early part of the year 361. A few months later Emperor Constans died suddenly, and one of the first measures of his successor Julian was to revoke his pre-
ecessor's decrees of banishment. Meletius quite prob-
ably returned at once to Antioch, but his position was a difficult one in presence of the Eustathians. The Council of Alexandria (362) tried to re-establish har-
mony and put an end to the schism, but failed. Both parties were steadfast in their claims, while the vehe-
mence and iniquity of the orthodox mediatrix increased their dissension, and ruined what small prospects of peace. Though the election of Meletius was beyond contestation, the hot-headed Lucifer Cagliari yielded to the solicitations of the opposing faction, and instead of temporizing and awaiting Meletius's approaching return from exile, assisted by two confessors he has-
tily consecrated as Bishop of Antioch the Eustathian Paulinus, and by virtue of his grave, im-}
portancy, for it definitively established the schism. Me-
letius and his adherents were not responsible, and it is a peculiar injustice of history that this division should be known as the Melethon schism when the Eustathians or Paulinians were alone answerable for it. Meletius's return soon followed, also the arrival of Eusebius of Vercelli, but he could accomplish nothing under the circumstances. The persecution of Emperor Julian, whose chief residence was Antioch, brought new vex-
ations. Both factions of the orthodox party were equally harassed and tormented, and both bravely tried.

An unexpected incident made the Meletians prominent. An anti-Christian writing of Julian was an-
swered by the aforesaid Meletian Diodorus, whom the emperor had coarsely ridiculed. "For many years", said the imperial apostol of Hellenism, "his chest has been sunken, his limbs withered, his cheeks flabby, his countenance livid". So intent was Julian upon des-
cribing the morbid symptoms of Diodorus that he was frequently燎 to forget that he should be writing for a pope, less had no desire to draw attention and persecution upon himself, aware that his flock was more likely to lose than to gain by it. He and two of his chorosip-
copi, we are told, accompanied to the place of martyr-
dom two officers, Bonousus and Maximilian. Meletius also is said to have sent a convert from Antioch to Jerusalem. This, and a mention of the flight of all Antiochene ecclesiastics, led to the arbitrary supposi-
tion that the second banishment of Meletius came during Julian's reign. Be that as it may, the sudden end of the persecuting emperor and Jovian's accession must have greatly shortened the exile of Meletius. Jovian met Meletius at Antioch and showed him great kindness, and on the death of Constans, the order of the emperor, and expressed to Meletius his wish of entering into communion with him. Meletius, ill-advised, delayed answering him, and St. Athanas-
sius went away leaving with Paulinus, whom he had not yet recognized as bishop, the declaration that he admitted him to his communion. Such blundering resulted in sad consequences for the Meletian cause. The moderation constantly shown by Athanasius, who thoroughly believed in Meletius's orthodoxy, was not found in his successor, Peter of Alexandria, who did not conceal his belief that Meletius was an heretic. For a long time the position of Meletius was contested by the very ones who, it seemed, should have established it more firmly. A council of 26 bishops at Antioch pre-
sided over by Meletius was of more consequence, but a pamphlet ascribed to Paulinus again raised doubts as to the orthodoxy of Meletius. Moreover, new and unsuspected difficulties soon arose.

Jovian's death made Ariasianism again triumphant and a violent persecution broke out under Emperor Valens. At the same time the rivalry between Alexandria and Antioch helped the cause of Meletius. However illustrious an Egyptian patriarch might be, the Christian episcopate of Syria and Asia Minor was too national or racial, too self-
centred, to seek or accept his leadership. Athanasius,
Indeed, remained an authoritative power in the East, but only a bishop of Antioch could unite all those who were now ready to frankly accept the Nicene Creed. In this way the rôle of Meletius became daily more prominent. While in his own city a minority contested his right to the see and questioned his orthodoxy, his influence was at least received in the East and from various parts of the empire bishops accepted his leadership. Chalcedon, Ancrya, Melitene, Pergama, Cæsarea of Cappadocia, Bostra, parts of Syria and Palestine, looked to him for direction, and this movement grew rapidly. In 365 Meletius could count on 26 bishops, in 379 more than 150 rallied around him. Theologically his influence was at least received in Asia Minor. Meletius and his disciples, however, had not been spared by the Arians. While Paulinus and his party were seemingly neglected by them, Meletius was again exiled (May, 365) to Armenia. His followers expelled from the churches, sought meeting places for worship wherever they could. This new exile, owing to a lull in the persecution, was of short duration, and probably in 367 Meletius took up again the government of his see. It was then that John, the future Chrysostom, entered the ranks of the clergy. The lull was soon over. In 371 persecution raged anew in Antioch, where Valens resided almost to the time of his death. At this time St. Basil occupied the see of Cæsarea and was unfortunately his excommunication. With rare insight Basil thoroughly understood the situation, which made impossible the restoration of religious peace in the East. It was clear that the antagonism between Athanasius and Meletius protracted endlessly the conflict. Meletius, the only legitimate Bishop of Antioch, was the only acceptable one. Unfortunately he remained in exile for the third time. In these circumstances Basil began negotiations with Meletius and Athanasius for the pacification of the East.

Aside from the inherent difficulties of the situation, the slowness of communication was an added hindrance. Not only did Basil’s representatives have to travel from Cæsarea to Armenia, and from Armenia to Alexandria, he also had to go to Rome to obtain the sanction of Pope Damascus and the acquiescence of the West. Notwithstanding the blunder committed at Antioch in 363, the generous spirit of Athanasius gave hope of success, his sudden death, however (May, 373), caused all efforts to be abandoned. Even at Rome and at the West Basil and Meletius were received with disappointment. While they worked persistently to restore peace, a new Antiochene community, declaring itself connected with Rome and Athanasius, increased the number of dissidents, aggravated the rivalry, and renewed the disputes. There were now three Antiochene churches that formally adopted the Nicene Creed. The generous scheme of Basil for appeasement and union had ended unfortunately, and to make matters worse, Evagrius, the chief promoter of the attempted reconciliation, once more joined the party of Paulinus. This important conversion won over to the intruders St. Jerome and Pope Damascus; the very next year, and without any declaration of the see of St. Basil. Through disinterestedness, the latter did not entirely give up hope of bringing the West, especially the pope, to a fuller understanding of the situation of the Antiochene Church. But the West did not grasp the complex interests and personal issues, nor appreciate the violence of the persecution against which the orthodox parties were struggling. In order to enlighten these well-intentioned men, closer relations were needed and deputies of more heroic character; but the difficulties were great and the “status quo” remained.

After many disheartening failures, there was finally a glimpse of hope. Two legates sent to Rome, Dorotheus and Santichus, returned in the spring of 377, bringing with them the Bishop of Rome and a letter from Basil instantly proceeded to publish everywhere. These declarations pronounced anathemas against Arius and the heresy of Apollinaris then spreading at Antioch, condemnations all the more timely, as theological excitement was then at its highest in Antioch, and was gradually reaching Palestine. St. Jerome entered with their special gratitude, with which St. Basil instantly proceeded to appeal to Pope Damascus in a letter still famous, but which the pope did not answer. Discontented, Jerome returned to Antioch, let himself be ordained presbyter by Paulinus, and became the echo of Paulinist imputations against Meletius and his following. In 378 Dorotheus and Santichus returned from Rome, bearers of a formal condemnation of the error, hinted out by the Orientals; this decree definitely united the two halves of the Christian world. It seemed as though St. Basil was but waiting for this object of all his efforts, for he died 1 Jan., 379. The cause he had served so well was deemed worthy of a double death. The two months earlier warranted a hopeful outlook. One of the first measures of the new emperor, Gratian, was the restoration of peace in the Church and the recall of the banished bishops. Meletius therefore was reinstated (end of 375), and his flock probably met for worship in the “Palais” or old church. It was a heavy task for the aged bishop to re-establish the fortunes of the orthodox party. The most urgent step was the ordination of bishops for the sees which had become vacant during the persecution. In 379 Meletius held a council of 150 bishops in order to assure the triumph of orthodoxy in the East, and published a profession of faith which was to obtain the approval of the Council of Constantinople (382). The end of the schism was near at hand. Since the two factions which divided the Antiochene Church were orthodox there remained but to unite them actually, a difficult move, but easy when the death of either bishop made it possible for the survivor to exercise full authority without hurting pride or discipline. This solution Meletius recognized; but both the Eastern and Western conciliar and peace-making proposals were rejected by Paulinus who refused to come to any agreement or settlement. Meanwhile, a great council of Eastern bishops was convoked at Constantinople to appoint a bishop for the imperial city and to settle other ecclesiastical affairs. In the absence of the Bishop of Alexandria, the presidency rightfully fell to the Bishop of Antioch, whom the Emperor Theodosius received with marked deference, nor was the imperial favour unprofitable to Meletius in his quality of president of the assembly. It began by electing Gregory of Nazianzus Bishop of Constantinople, and to the great satisfaction of the orthodoxy it was Meletius who enthroned him. The Council immediately proceeded to confirm the Nicene faith, but during this important session Meletius died almost suddenly. Feeling his end was near, he spent his remaining days re-emphasizing his eagerness for unity and peace. The death of one whose firmness and gentleness had kindled great expectations caused universal sorrow. The following year, 381, Theodosius was present, took place in the church of the Apostles. The funeral panegyrics were touching and magnificent. His death blasted many hopes and justified grave forebodings. The body was transferred from Constantinople to Antioch, where, after a second and solemn funeral service, the body of the aged bishop was laid beside his predecessor St. Babylas. But his name was to live after him, and long remained for the
Eastern faithful a rallying sign and a synonym of orthodoxy.

Alford, "Oxford Dictionary of the Bible" (1955); Harpsiel, "Histories of the Councils of the Church", II, 1; Leclercq in "Encyclopedia of the Period
to and Church", V, 5; Cavallera, "La schisma di Antiochia
in IV e V secolo" (Paris, 1953).

H. Leclercq.

Meletius of Lyopolis, Bishop of Lyopolis in Egypt, gave his name to a schism of short duration. There is uncertainty as to the dates of his birth, his death, and his episcopate. It is known, however, that he was bishop of the above-mentioned city as early as 303, since in a council held about 303 at Alexandria by Peter, archbishop of that city, Meletius was deposed for several reasons, among others for sacrificing to idols. Meager references by St. Athanasius were our only source of information until important documents were discovered in the eighteenth century by Scipio Maffei at Verona in a manuscript dealing with the Meletian schism in Egypt. The three documents preserved in Latin are undoubtedly authentic. There is first, a letter of protest by four Egyptian bishops, Hesychius, Pachomius, Theodore, and Phileas, dating at the latest from 307, from the very beginning of the schism of Meletius, and before the excommunication of the latter who was termed by the bishops, diabolicus conscriptus (a devilish imposter). "We have heard," said the bishops, "grievous reports regarding Meletius who is accused of troubling the divine law and ecclesiastical rules. Quite recently, a number of witnesses having confirmed the reports, we feel compelled to write this letter. Meletius is undoubtedly aware of the very ancient law which forbids bishops to ordain outside his own diocese. Nevertheless, without regard for this law, and without consideration for the great bishop and father, Peter of Alexandria, and the incarcerated bishops, he has created general confusion. To vindicate himself he will perhaps declare that he was compelled to act thus, as the congregations were without pastors. Such a defense would be in conflict with their names (cucumentes) had been appointed. Were they neglectful of their duties, their case should have been presented before the incarcerated bishops. If the latter had been martyred, he could have appealed to Peter of Alexandria, and thus have obtained the authority to ordain. Second, an anonymous note added to the following letter to the bishops of Egypt: "Meletius and his deacons received the letter and read it, paid no attention to the protest and presented himself neither before the incarcerated bishops, nor Peter of Alexandria. After all these bishops, priests, and deacons had died in their dungeons at Alexandria, he immediately repaired to the city. Among other intrigues there were some that certain Iosidors and one Arius, seemingly honourable, both of them desirous of being admitted to the priesthood. Aware of the ambition of Meletius and what he sought, they hastened to him, and gave him the names of the visitors (cucumentes) appointed by Peter. Meletius excommunicated them and ordained two others, one of whose names he retained, and provided for his mines." On learning this, Peter wrote to his Alexandria flock. Here comes the third document, in which occurs the phrase interpreted as follows: "Having heard," said Peter, "that Meletius, without considering the letter of the blessed bishops and martyrs, has intruded himself into my diocese, and deprived my deputies of their power, and consecrated others, I advise you to avoid all communion with him until I can bring him before me face to face in the presence of prudent men, and investigate this affair.""  

The conduct of Meletius was all the more reprehensible in as much as his insubordination was that of one in very high office. St. Epiphanius and Theodoret testify that the Meletians stood next in rank to Peter of Alexandria, after which they were basely endeavouring to supplant at the moment, when Peter was forced to flee from persecution and live in hiding. It was not only against Peter, but also against his immediate successors, Achillas and Alexander, that Meletius maintained his false position. This we know from St. Athanasius, an authoritative witness. Comparing the information given us by St. Athanasius with that furnished by the documents above, the date of the beginning of the Meletian schism may be determined with fair accuracy. It was evidently during the episcopate of Peter, who occupied the See of Alexandria from 300 to 311. Now St. Athanasius in his "Epistola ad episcopos" states positively that "the Meletians were declared heretical thirty-six years ago", i.e. at the Council of Nicaea (325). Apparently, therefore, Athanasius was writing in 361. If now we deduct fifty-five years, we have the year 306 for the condemnation of the Meletian schism; and as the persecution of Diocletian raged bitterly between 303 and 305, the beginnings of the schism seem to belong to the year 304, or 305. St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus gives a circumstantial account (Haer. 113) in contradiction with the foregoing narrative. According to him, the schism arose from a dispute between Peter and Peter regarding the reception of certain of the faithful, particularly of ecclesiastics, who had abjured the Faith during the persecution. This account, preferred by some historians to the statement of St. Athanasius, is no longer credible since the discovery of the aforesaid documents by Maffei at Verona. Now, then, explain the origin of the sect, Meletianism, and their religious views. It seems to us to arise in this manner: after Peter's death Meletius was arrested and sent to the mines; on his way he stopped at Eleutheropolis, and there founded a church of his sect; Eleutheropolis being the native town of Epiphanius, the latter naturally came in contact with Meletians in his early days. They would of course represent a minor remnant of the origin of their sect; and thus their partial and misleading narrative was afterwards inserted by Epiphanius in his great work on heresies. Finally, the reference to the Meletian schism by Sozomen and Theodoret quite accord with the original documents discovered at Verona, and more or less with what St. Athanasius has said: the sects are designated by St. Athanasius merely mentions the schism in passing and very likely follows St. Epiphanius.  

The suppression of the Meletian schism was one of the three important matters that came before the Council of Nicaea. Its decree has been preserved in the synodices, two of which are given to the Egyptian bishops. Meletius, it was decided, should reunite to the pulpits of his own city of Lyopolis, but without exercising authority or the power of ordaining; moreover he was forbidden to go into the environs of the town or to enter another diocese for the purpose of ordaining its subjects. He retained his episcopal title, but the ecclesiastics ordained came to receive against his imposition of hands, the ordinations performed by him being therefore regarded as invalid. Throughout the diocese where they were found, those ordained by him were always to yield precedence to those ordained by Alexander, nor were they to do anything without the consent of Bishop Alexander. In the event of the death of a non-Meletian bishop or ecclesiastic, the vacant prelature might be given to a Meletian, provided he were worthy and the popular election were ratified by Alexander. As to Meletius himself, episcopal rights and prerogatives were taken from him owing to his incorrigible habit of everywhere exciting confusion. These mild measures, however, were in vain; the Meletians joined the Arians and did more harm than ever, being insectivorous with St. Athanasius. Referring to this attempt at reunion the latter said: "Would to God it had never happened."
MELITUS

About 325 the Melitians counted in Egypt twenty-nine bishops, Melitius included, and in Alexandria itself, four priests, three deacons, and one army chaplain. Conformably to the Nicene decree, Melitius lived first at Lygopolis in the Thebaid, but after Bishop Alexander's death he took a personal part in the negotiations which united his party to the Arians. The date of his death is not known. He nominated his friend, John, as his successor. Theodoret mentions very peremptorily Melitian monks who practised Jewish ablations. The Melitians died out after the middle of the fifth century.


H. LECLERCQ.

MELITUS and RAPOLLA, DIACOPE (MELEPHNESI ET RAPOLLENSIS), in the province of Potenza, in Basilicata, southern Italy. Meli is situated on a pleasant hill, on the slopes of Mt. Vulture. The origin of the city is not well known; but the town became famous in 1043, when it was chosen capital of the new military state created in southern Italy by the twelve Norman counts, founders of the Kingdom of Naples. Nicholas II made it a diocese immediately dependent on the Bishop of Salerno, whose seat was Baldisso. Its beautiful cathedral, a work of Bishop Roger, son of Roger Guiscard (1155), was destroyed by the earthquake of 1851. Among its other bishops, mention should be made of Fra Alessandro da San Elpidio, a former general of the Augustinians (1328), and a learned theologian. In 1528, Clement VII, in view of the scarcity of its revenues, united the Diocese of Rapolla to that of Meli, “seque principalius”. Rapolla is a site founded by the Lombards, on the banks of the Olivento River. The Normans took it from the Greeks in 1042, and fortified it with works still to be seen. The town, which has a beautiful cathedral, was an episcopal see, suffragan of Pistoia, in the time of Gregory VII. Other bishops were Cardinal Giovanni Vincento Acquaviva (1357), who gave a noble organ to the cathedral, and Lasso Caraffini (1622), founder of the seminary. Several councils were held at Meli: one in 1048; another 1059, under Nicholas II, important on account of the prohibition of the marriage of priests, on the deposition of the Bishop of Trani, on the removal of the imperial legate, and the investiture of Robert Guiscard of the Duchy of Apulia and Calabria; the council of 1087; the one of 1089, against simony and the concubinage of priests, and for the freedom of the Church; lastly, the council of 1100. The united sees have 14 parishes, with 40,000 inhabitants, 66 priests, 5 religious houses of women, and 1 school for boys and 1 for girls.

GAPPELLETI: Le Chiese d'Italia, XXXI (Venice, 1887); U. BENIGNI.

MELITUS, GIOVANNI, Sicilian poet, b. at Palermo, 4 March, 1740; d. 20 Dec., 1815. He was the son of a goldsmith of Spanish origin, and received his first education from the Jesuits. He afterwards studied natural science and medicine, and practised as a physician in the hamlet of Cinisi and later at Palermo itself, where for nineteen years he held the chair of chemistry at the university. Towards the end of his life he took minor orders. In childhood he had been led to poetry by reading Ariosto, and in poetical composition found relief from domestic unhappiness. His poems are written in the Sicilian dialect, and as a vernacular poet of this kind he has no rival in Italian literature. His longer works, "La Fata Galante", "Don Chisciotte e Sanci Fancas", "L'origini di lu Mumm", are fantastic pieces on subjects of popular tradition; "La Festa dell' Amapa", "La Melittonica", "La Florica", "L'Asino" are elegies and idylls of the four seasons of the year, is full of Sicilian colour, and has won him the title of "the modern Theocritus". Meli was a staunch supporter of the Bourbon regime, and among his lyrics "Anacreontiche" and "idi", is an ode in honour of Nelson, which however, he is said to have suppressed after the latter's execution of the Neapolitan patriots. His last work, the "Favuli morali", is a collection of Epispan fables in verse with an underlying allegorical or satirical meaning.

OPERA DI G. JOVANNI MELITUS (Palermo, 1837); La Bucolica, La Florica, Le feste Dell'Amapa, E l'Elegie di L'Asino e Melittonica, in italian in da AGOSTINO GALLO (Palermo, 1838); NAVANTI, Studio critico su Giovanni Meli (Palermo, 1904).

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

MELIUS, PIUS, Italian theologian, b. at Rome, 12 Jan., 1800; d. in London, June, 1883. He entered the Society of Jesus on 14 Aug., 1815, taught literature at Reggio, and afterwards was engaged in preaching. He left the Society, on the death of H. M. Benigno in 1823, "Alcune ragioni del P. Pio Melia della C. di G." (Lucca, 1847), a defence of the Society of Jesus, and "Alcune afirmazioni del Sig. Antonio Rosmini-Serbat" (Piss, a.d.), an attack upon Rosmini (q. v.). In his "Life of Rosmini", Father Lockhart merely declares that the latter work was written by a certain Italian Jesuit; the Jesuits, in "Matrice del Concilio di Trento" (1654), attributed it to Passaglia, but his "Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus", re-edited by Sommervogel, follows Beorchia, who attributes it to Melia. Melia, who attacked especially Rosmini's doctrine on original sin, was answered by Rosmini (Milan, 1841) and Pagani (Milan, 1842); then followed a bitter controversy which had to be ended by a direct command of Pius IX.


WM. T. TALLON.

MELISSUS OF SAMOS, a Greek philosopher, of the Eleatic School, b. at Samos about 470 B. C. It is probable that he was a disciple of Parmenides, and that he is identical with Melissus, who according to Plutarch (Pericles, 26) commanded the Samian fleet which defeated the Athenians off the coast of Samos in 442. He wrote a work which is variously entitled υπο το κοσμο κοσμον υπο φωτεινο, etc., and of which only a few fragments have come down to us. In attempting to combine the doctrines of Parmenides with those of the earliest philosophers (the Academy and the SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY), Melissus, though he fell into many contradictions, forestalled, in a sense, Aristotle's more successful effort to define the infinite and the incorporeal. Like Parmenides, he depreciated sense-knowledge, and held that change, motion, and multiplicity are illusions. At the same time, he was influenced by the Ionian philosophers, and in a manner attached value to the question of origins. He definitely predicates infinity of being, and asserts that reality "has no body". By the infinite he understands "that which has neither beginning nor end", and in his conception of "that which has no body", he does not, as Aristotle points out (Metaph. 1, 6, 86b b.) attain a logically consistent understanding of the transcendental doctrines ascribed to Melissus by Philonousus, Stobaeus, Epiphanus, and others do not seem to have been held by him. There is, however, a possibility that, as Diogenes Laertius informs us, Melissus avoided all mention of the gods because we can know nothing about them. Like Plato, Aristotle, and some of the other Greek philosophers, he probably thought it wisest to take refuge in a profession of ignorance regarding the gods, so as to avoid the imputation of hostility to the popular mythology.

FAIRBANKS, FIRST PHILOSOPHERS OF GREECE (New York, 1869), 120 sqq., gives fragments of Melissus's work, with translations of references to him in Aristotle, Epiphanus, etc.; PARRAB, DE MELISSIUS fragmentis (Bonn, 1880); KERN, Zur Woürdung des MEISSIUS (Stuttgart, 1880); W. A. ALLEYN, I (London, 1881), 527 sqq.; TANNERY, Pour l'histoire de la science hellene (Paris, 1887), 282 sqq.; TURNER, HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY (Boston, 1903), 84 sqq.

WILLIAM TURNER.
MELITENE, residence of an Armenian Catholic see, also a titulary archbishopric. According to Pliny (Nat. Hist. VI, 3), the city was founded by Queen Semiramis at a little distance from the Euphrates; the earliest mention of it is found in Tacitus, Ann. IV, 21; and Strabo (XII, 3, 4; see also XI, xii, 2; XI, xiv, 2) make it one of the ten provinces of Cappadocia. Justinian fortified it and filled it with magnificent monuments (Procopius, De Aedificiis, III, 4), which have all disappeared. In 577 the Romans gained a great victory over the Persians in the vicinity of Melitene; two years before the city had been burned by the Shah Choerosoe. Towards the middle of the seventh century Melitene again became Byzantine; it was afterwards taken by the Arabs and later recaptured by Emperor Constantine Copronymus in 751. The latter transported the Christian population to Thrace, dispersed the Musulmans of the province, destroyed the city and burnt the walls; the Persians took possession of it and restored it to something of its former importance. In the tenth century the Byzantines re-established their domination and in 965 the Emperor Nicephorus Phocas successfully undertook to colonize the region. The Greek Government had faithfully promised not to molest the Monophysites, and after first promising to leave them in peace, it promulgated a decree (972) that they should be expelled from the city, and this decree was carried out in 977. The Monophysites had at that time seven sees in the vicinity of Melitene (Barhebrues, H. E. II, 460). The city fell afterwards into the power of the Seljuk Turks of Iconium; then of the Mongols in 1235; of the Osmanlis in 1396; of Timur in 1401; then of different Turkish princes. Finally, at the beginning of the 15th century it was annexed to the Ottoman Empire, of which it is still a part. Christianity seems to have reached Melitene very early. The Roman soldier, St. Polyeuctus, immortalized by Corneille, was martyred there in 254 or 259. Another third century martyr is known, St. Eudoxius, whose relics were found in 966, and inscribed with this inscription carved on the door of a church. St. Melitius, the celebrated Bishop of Antioch, was a native of Melitene, as was also Saint Euthymius, to whom was chiefly due the organization of monastic life in Palestine during the fifth century. A council against the Arians was held there in 363. Le Quien (Oriens Christianus, 461) gives a list of bishops, the last of whom belongs to the year 1193. Among them are St. Acacius, who died about 438; and Saint Domitian, first cousin to the Emperor Maurice, who played a most important rôle in the religious and political life of the second half of the sixth century. For its Jacobite bishops see Le Quien (II, 1451–58) and "Revue de l'orient chrétien" (VI, 201). To-day the city of Malatia forms a sanjak of Mamuret-ul-Aziz; it numbers about 30,000 inhabitants of whom 16,000 are Turks; 4500 Kurds, 6500 Kiril Bach (a Musulman sect); and about 3000 Armenians. Among the last mentioned are 800 Catholics. The Capuchins have established there a mission, and a correctional asylum. The city, which was disturbed by an earthquake in 1893, was still more sorely troubled by the massacres of 1895, during which 500 houses were burned and 1000 Christians massacred. About five miles from Malatia is the village of Esli-Malatia on the site of the ancient Melitene; a part of the walls is still preserved. The whole region is like an immense fruit garden in a delightful climate and a well-watered land. The Catholic Armenian diocesan numbers 5100 souls, 9 priests, 10 churches and chapels, 7 stations, 9 primary schools, and an establishment of Armenian Sisters of the Immaculate Conception. The schismatic Armenian diocese is under the Catholicos of Sis. There is also established there a Protestant mission.

S. VAILLÉ.

MELITO, Saint, Bishop of Sardis, prominent ecclesiastical writer in the latter half of the second century. Few details of his life are known. A letter of Polycrates of Ephesus to Pope Victor about 194 (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.", V, xxiv) states that "Melito the eunuch (this is interpreted "the virgin") by Rufinus in his translation of Eusebius), whose whole walk was in the Holy Spirit", was interred at Sardis, and had been one of the great authorities in the Church of Asia. He held the title of the archdeacon. He is also cited in the "Labyrinth" of Hippolytus as one of the second-century writers who taught the duality of natures in Jesus. St. Jerome, speaking of the canon of Melito, quotes Tertullian's statement that he was esteemed a prophet by many of the faithful.

Of Melito's numerous works almost all have perished. It is thought that the name of the majority and given a few extracts (Hist. Eccl., III, xii, xxvi). They are (1) "An Apology for the Christian Faith", appealing to Marcus Aurelius to examine into the accusations against the Christians and to end the persecution (written apparently about 172, or before 177). This is a different work from the Syriac apology attributed to Melitene by Cureton from a British Museum MS. The latter, a vigorous conflation of idolatry and polytheism addressed to Antoninus Pius, seems from internal evidence to be of Syrian origin, though some authorities have identified it with Melito's Epis to the Christian in Asia. (2) "Epist o to the Christians in Asia". A fragment of it is preserved in the so-called "Melitinae clavini sanctae scrip turum" which is now known to be an original Latin compilation of the Middle Ages. (5) "Epist o to the Christians in Asia", on the cor pority of God, of which some Syriac fragments have been preserved. It is referred to by Origen (In Gen., 26). Melito's list of the sacred books is identical with that of the Marcionites. Routh (see below) has published four scholia in Greek from a Catena on the Sacrifices of Isaac as typifying the Sacrifice of the Cross, probably taken from a corrupt version of the "Exeget arum". Four Syriac fragments from works on the Body and Soul, the Cross, and Faith, are apparently composed by Melito, though often referred to Alexander of Alexandria. Many spurious writings have been attributed to Melito in addition to the "Melitinae clavini sanctae scrip turum" already mentioned—e. g., a "Let
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acter to Eutrepian", "Catena in Apocalypse", a manifest
forsery compiled after A.D. 1200; "De passione
Joannis Evangelista" (probably not earlier than the
seventh century), "De transitu Beatae Marie Virgini-
" (see Apocrypha in I, 607). Melito's feast is celebrated
Barthélemy, "Melline," tr. S. ABAYAN (St. Louis, 1908), 62-3,
contains a bibliography of the printed fragments: Salmon in
Clarke, I (Edinburgh, 1894), 310-12; Currer, Speculacum
Scripturum (London, 1885); Routte, Reliquia Sacra, I (Oxford,
1884), 56; Kipping, "Melit", in the Projectes
xxvii, ixv; Tillemont, Memoires, II (Paris, 1864), 507, 663.
Aeta SS, April, 1-10; Melito of Sardis and his Remains in
Basilian Ann. of Sacred Lit. (1835-6), XV, 121; XVI, 434;
XVII, 121.

A. A. McCauley.

MELK (MOLCK, MELLICM), ABBEY AND CONGREGATION OF.
Situated on an isolated rock commanding the Danube, Melk has been a noted place since the days of
the Romans. A Slav settlement, Magaliacha, replaced the
Roman fort, and in its turn was destroyed by a
Magyar invasion about 955, when it received the name
Eisenburg. The Magyars, however, were driven out
by Luitpold the Illustrious, first Margrave of Austria,
who here fixed his capital and founded a church for
secular canons. These having become lax, were replaced
by twelve monks of Subiaco, whom Luitpold II
appointed, Lambert and Stilicho, as their abbot and
in 1089. Melk was much favored by St. Luitpold
III, and the new foundation rapidly grew and flourished,
its corn tithes being so abundant that the
famil name for Melk was "at the full bushel." It became
a place of pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Coloman, and
was famed for its great relic of the Holy Cross. By
the fifteenth century immense observance at Melk had
begun to decline, and in 1418, at the request of
Albert V, Archduke of Austria, Martin V sent the
Ven. Nicholas of Magen with five other monks of
Subiaco from the Council of Constance to begin a
reform of the monasteries of Lower Austria. The
Abbot of Melk, John of Flemming, voluntarily resigned,
and Nicholas, elected in his stead, soon reformed
the observance in accordance with the constitutions of
Subiaco that the abbey became a model for other houses
in Austria. Several monasteries followed its
example, among them Obenburg, Salzburg, Marizell,
the Scottish abbey at Vienna, Kremsmunster, Ratis-
bon, and Tegernsee. All these houses followed the
system of Subiaco, and were called Observant Abbey of
Melk. They in no way depended, however, on
Melk, nor had they any general superior, soliciting
visitors when needful from the pope. The Abbey of
Melk continued in its first fervour of reform, and
several attempts were made from 1460 onwards to
effect a more formal union. In 1470 seventeen ab-
bots of various neighbouring dioceses met at Erfurt
and decided to establish in their monasteries the com-
mon observance and ceremonial of Melk. Nothing
more definite occurred until Gaspar, Abbot of Melk, in
1618 invited the abbots of Austria to meet at Melk and
form a congregation. The negotiations continued un-
til 1623, when the Abbots of Melk, Kremsmunster,
Gosau, and Stiftsamt were flourishing, they
Gottweich and Marizell signed the constitutions
agreed upon for the new congregation. These were
confirmed by Urban VIII in 1625. In addition the
congregation included the houses of Lambach, Monee,
Leitnstenaden and Kleinck. It was governed by a
superior general, elected every two years, who acted as
visitor and domeect the house. Each province also had its own visitor. In 1630
there was an attempt to form a united congregation of
all the monasteries of the empire, but the Swedish in-
vasion frustrated this project, though many of the
German monasteries thereon observed the con-
stitutions of Melk. In the fourteenth century Melk,
by permission of Duke Frederick I, had been fortified,
and was thus able to resist successive sieges by Matthias
Corvinus, by the revolted peasantry, by the Prot-
Protestant States of Austria and by the Turks, though on
each occasion the property of the abbey suffered.
Great losses, too, were sustained at the hands of Na-
poleon's troops. In 1809 the Abbey of Melk was ini-
tially occupied by Leo XII and later by Pope Pius
on the Immaculate Conception. In 1905 the congrega-
tion numbered 85, of whom 75 were priests. The
present abbot, Joseph Charles (b. 1824, appointed 1875),
exercised jurisdiction over 29 parishes, with
45,145 souls.

Ger. Hist. Script., IX (Hanover, 1851), 480-515; Berliquat,
La reforme de Melk au XVSiecle en Revue Bud.ist, XII
(1860), 204-13, 290-409; Reform der Katholischen Kirche, I
(Palermo, 1807), 185-94; Huyot, Dictionaire des...; origines religieuse, II (Paris,
1850-53-39); Katsch, Melk in der Geschichte der heiligen
Linde, Geschichte des Benediktinerstifts Melk (Vienna, 1851-69);
Knoepfli, Bibliotheca Melliccmiana (Vienna, 1747); Mabillon,
Ann., VIII, 170, xiii, 176-87; Schramm, Chronicon Melliccmiana
(Vienna, 1762); Wolkonsky and Herl, Abten und Kloster in Osterreich
(Vienna, n. d.).

L E S A. S. L. TOKE.

MELLERY (MELLERIUM), situated in Brittany
(Loire-Inférieure), Diocese of Nantes, in the vicinity of
Chateaubriand, was founded about the year 1134.
Foulques, Abbot of Pontron, in Anjou, founded from
Melk (a daughter of Chateaubriand) the abbey of
foundation of a monastery in Brittany. They were
welcomed with the solitude of a place near Old Meller-
ay, shown them by Rivallon, pastor of Auvonc,
which Alain de Moisdon, proprietor of the place,
donated to them. Guitern, the first abbot, erected
the original monastery in 1145, but the church was not
completed until 1183, under Geoffroy, the fourth
abbot. Melleray, a small monastery built for about
twelve religious, remained regular until during the
sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when relaxa-
tion prevailed as a result of the acquisition of great
wealth and the introduction of the system of com-
mendatory abbots. But so successful was the
monastery, and so perfect was the system, that it was
the first commendatory abbey, and from his time
both spiritual and temporal welfare declined, until
about the middle of the eighteenth century when,
through the efforts of Dom Jourand, vicar-general of
the order, the rule of St. Bernard was reintroduced,
and the monastic buildings restored. In 1791 it was
abolished, and its property was divided among the
wealthy of Laval. This, however, was not the end of Melleray.
The Trappists, expelled from France, took refuge at Val
Sainte, Switzerland; from there, urged by their rapid
increase, and for fear of the spread of the revolution,
Dom Augustine de Lestrade established them in
various parts of the world. Through the generosity of
Sir Thomas Weld, a wealthy English Catholic, the
father of Cardinal Weld, they settled (1795) at Lul-
worth, Dorsetshire, England. Their monastery was
soon created an abbey, and Dom Antoine was elected
the first abbot (1813). In 1817, with changed condi-
tions and the restoration of the Bourbons, the monks
of Lulworth returned to Melleray. The restored ab-
by was dedicated in 1830, with five hundred and
ninety-two members in twelve years. During the Revolution of 1830 they were again perse-
cuted, especially those of foreign birth, of whom they
had a great number. To make homes for these they
founded Mount Melleray (1833) in Ireland and Mount
Saint Bernard (1836) in England. Dom Antoine (d.
1839) was succeeded by Dom Melleray, second Dom Antoine, and finally by Dom Eugène
Vachette, the present abbot. Under Dom Antoine II
several monasteries were established, among them
Gethsemani, in the United States. Dom Eugène,
elected in 1875, was for many years the vicar-general of
the Congregation of La Grande Trappe, and was
instrumental in effecting the union of the three con-
gregations into one order (1892). Since then he has
been vicar to the Most Reverend General of the Reformed Cistercians. Recently he has established an annex to his monastery in Woodbarn, Diocese of Plymouth, England.

MELLERAY, Mont.—Situated on the slopes of the Knockmealdown Mountains, near Cappoquin, Diocese of Waterford, Ireland, was founded in 1833. Father Vincent Ryan was chosen leader of the religious sent by Dom Antoine, Abbeth of Melleray, for this foundation. After many efforts to locate his community he accepted the offer of Sir Richard Keane, of Cappoquin, to rent a tract of barren mountain waste, some five hundred acres, subsequently increased to seven hundred. In the work of reclaiming the soil, they were assisted by the country folk; entire parishes, led by their pastors, came, each in turn, to give free a full day's work. In 1833 the corner-stone was laid by Sir Richard Keane, in the presence of the bishop and a large concourse of clergy and people. In 1835 the monastery was created an abbey, and Father Vincent, unanimously elected, received the abbatial blessing from Dr. Abraham, bishop of the diocese, this being the first abbatial blessing in Ireland since the Reformation. Abbeth Vincent vigorously undertook the work of completing the abbey, but died 9 Dec., 1845. Under the short rule of his successor, Dom M. Joseph Fagan, Venerable Malachi Keane, a prior, ruled for only two years. To Dom Bruno Fitzpatrick, who succeeded as abbeth in September, 1848, it remained to consolidate and perfect the work so well begun. He also founded, in 1849, the monastery of New Melleray, near Dubuque, Iowa, U. S. A., and, in 1875, Mount Saint Joseph, Rosera, Co. Tipperary, Ireland. But the most conspicuous of Abbeth Bruno's labors was the founding of the Ecclesiastical Seminary of Mount Melleray. Originating in a small school formed by Abbeth Vincent in 1843, it was developed by Abbeth Bruno and his successors, until it attained its present rank. Abbeth Bruno died 4 Dec., 1893, and was succeeded by Dom John, Cartha, D.D., Canadian, Ireland. On 5 Jan., 1894, and presided over Mount Melleray for thirteen years; his successor, Dom Maurus Phelan, solemnly blessed by Dr. Sheahan, Bishop of Waterford, 15 Aug., 1908, is the present abbeth. The community numbers thirty-eight choir religious (of whom twenty-nine are priests) and twenty-nine lay brothers. When a grand gathering in having Josaphat in its crowded, it was decided to attempt a new foundation. While plans were being discussed, Bishop Loras, of Dubuque, Iowa, visited the abbey (1849). He expressed a strong desire to have a colony of Trappists in his diocese, and offered a tract of land about twelve miles from Dubuque. Abbeth Bruno immediately sent two of his religious to inspect the land, and receiving a favourable report, he accepted the offer. Later in the same year he laid the foundation of New Melleray Abbey, appointing, as its first superior, Father James O'Gorman (later consecrated first Bishop of Omaha, Nebraska). Father Clement Smyth, the third superior, was also elected bishop, bishop-elect in charge of the Diocese of Dubuque. In 1859 the monastery was made an abbey, and Father Ephraim McDonald elected its first abbot. The second abbeth, still in office, is Dom Alberic Dunlea, whose community now numbers thirty-six members.

MELLITUS, Saint, Bishop of London and third Archbishop of Canterbury, d. 24 April, 624. He was the leader of the second band of missionaries whom St. Gregory sent from Rome to join St. Augustine at Canterbury in 601. Venerable Bede (Hist. Eccl., II, vii) describes him as of noble birth, and as he is styled abbot by the pope (Epp. Gregori, xi, 39), it is thought he may have been Abbeth of the Monastery of St. Andrew on the Celian Hill, to which both St. Gregory and St. Augustine belonged. Several commendatory epistles of the pope recommending Mellitus and his companions to various Gallic bishops have been preserved (Epp., xi, 54-62). With the band he sent all the Vulgate in book form to Dublin, where it was used in the Church's service, viz., sacred vessels and altar cloths, vestments for priests and clerics, and also relics of the

MELLITUS, Abbay of, three miles from Drogheda, Co. Louth, Diocese of Armagh, was the first Cistercian monastery established in Ireland. In the year 1140, St. Malachi, en route for Rome, visited St. Bernard at Clairvaux, and was so edified that he resolved to establish a similar monastery in his own diocese, Armagh. He therefore left several of his companions at Clairvaux, to make their novitiate under the direction of St. Bernard. In 1142 they returned to found Mellifont under Christian O'Conarchy, who had been Archdeacon of Down, and who became the first abbot. A French monk, Father Robert, an able architect, directed the building of the church, according to the plans of the Abbey of Clairvaux. The consecration of the church in 1157 was the occasion of great religious celebrations. So numerous were the postulants that six important monasteries were founded during the first ten years: Bective (1146); Boyle (1148); Monasterernagh (1149); Ballyling (1149); Schrule (1150); Newry (1150). In 1150 the venerable Abbath Christian was appointed Bishop of Lismore, and Pope Eugene III, who had been his fellow-novice at Clairvaux, named him legate for Ireland. Soon after his death (1186) his name was inscribed in the calendar of the saints, and he has long been venerated as one of the most powerful protectors of his country. Under his brother, the Abbot Mathew, the abbey was still further extended in size and sanctity, succeeded him. For sixty years Mellifont rejoiced in greater prosperity, and when the English invaded Ireland there were already twenty-five great Cistercian abbeys. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the rivalries between the English and Irish exerted a baneful influence, pues, gaining to disband the monasteries, and in 1310 the general chapter, and even the sovereign pontiff, were forced to intervene. Not until the fifteenth century did Mellifont regain its ancient prestige, which was maintained until its suppression by Henry VIII on 23 July, 1539, when one hundred and fifty monks were compelled to leave it. Richard Coxour, the last Abbeth, died in 1550. The king seized the treasures of the abbey, and the annals were either lost or destroyed, and with them the names of many remarkable men. Several religious continued to live in the environs, which explains why, in 1623, the title of Abbeth of Mellifont was granted, by Apostolic Brief, to Patrick Barnewall, who was called Dom, and by papal Bull, to Drogheda. In 1566 the abbey, with its dependencies, was given to Edward Moore, chief of the family Drogheda, and passed, in 1727, to Balfour of Townley Hall, during whose term of ownership all fell to the speedy decay and desolate ruin of the present day.

EMOND M. OBRECHT.
holy apostles and martyrs, with many books" (Bede, "Hist. Eccl.", I, 29).

The consecration of Mellitus as bishop by Augustine took place soon after his arrival in England, and his first missionary efforts were among the East Saxons. Their king was Sabert, nephew to Ethelbert, King of Kent, and who, by his will, had established his see in London, the East Saxon capital, and build there the church of St. Paul. On the death of Sabert his sons, who had refused Christianity, gave permission to their people to worship idols once more. Moreover, on seeing Mellitus celebrating Mass one day, the young princes demanded that he should give them also, because he had been wont to give their father. When the saint answered them that this was impossible until they had received Christian baptism, he was banished from the kingdom. Mellitus went to Kent, where similar difficulties had ensued upon the death of Ethelbert, and thence retired to Gaul about the year 616.

After an absence of about a year, Mellitus was recalled to Kent by Laurence, Augustine's successor in the See of Canterbury. Matters had improved in that kingdom owing to the conversion of the new king Eadbald, but Mellitus was never able to regain possession of his own See of London. In 619 Laurence died, and Mellitus was chosen archbishop in his stead. He appeared at the synod at Dium, which had been called for five years—a fact which may account for his not consecrating any bishops. During this time he suffered constantly from ill-health. He consecrated a church to the Blessed Mother of God in the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul at Canterbury, and legend attributes to him the foundation of the Abbey of St. Augustine's Canterbury; but this is almost certainly incorrect. Among the many miracles recorded of him is the quelling of a great fire at Canterbury which threatened to destroy the entire city. The saint, although too ill to move, had himself carried to the spot where the fire was raging and, in answer to his prayer, a strong wind arose which bore the flames southwards away from the city. Mellitus was buried in the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul, afterwards St. Augustine's, Canterbury. Some relics of the saint were preserved in London in 1298. The most reliable account of his life is that given by Bede in "Hist. Eccl.", I, 29, 30; II, 3, 7. Elmhirst in his "Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Canterbury," edited by Hare, with a valuable appendix, adds that the authenticity of these is more than questionable. His feast is observed on April 24.


G. Roger Huddleston.

**Melo, DIOCESE OF, in URUGUAY.** It was decided in 1897 to erect two sees suffragan to Montevideo, one of which was to be Melo, but, owing to political causes, no appointments have been made as yet. However, negotiations for a renewal of diplomatic relations between the Republic and the Holy See are now in progress, and as the recognition of the new diocese is in the hands of this resurrection, this probably will be shortly accorded. The Diocese of Melo is to embrace the north-eastern part of Uruguay and so will include, in part or in whole, the Departments of Cerro Largo, Rivera, Tacuarembó, and Treinta y Tres. This region has an area of about 19,600 square miles; the population, practically all Catholic, barely numbers 145,000 (1906). The district is very fertile, but there is little agriculture, most of the inhabitants, a large and the most important element of whom are Brazilians, being engaged in cattle breeding. The town of Melo, founded in 1798, is the capital of Cerro Largo and contains about 7,000 persons. It is situated near the Tacumari River about 315 miles north of Montevideo. It has a fine church and also a pretty chapel of our Lady of Mt. Carmel. Artigas (2,500 inhabitants) lies 60 miles north of Melo, on the Brazilian frontier. San Fructuoso, the capital of Tacuarembó, has about 3,000 inhabitants. The other centres of population are little more than hamlets.

**Handbook of Uruguay, Bur. of the Amer. Rep. (Washington, 1899); Beyruth, La Religion en Amérique (L'Organisation publique du gouvernement de l'Uruguay); Muller, Handbook of the River Plate Republics (London, 1895).**

A. A. MacErieane.

**Melos, a titutar see, suffragan of Naxos in the Cyclades.** The name seems to have been derived from a Phoenician navigator, Mêsos, though others ascribe it to its rounded or apple shape, Melos. The island has had different names: Zephyris, Membris, Mimallia, Siphis, Acyton, Byblis, etc. The Phoenicians seem to have been the first to colonize the island; then came the Dorian from Laconia in the twelfth century B. c. This Doric colony lasted for seven hundred years, when the Athenians, jealous of their facility to the west, expelled the Greeks, took possession, and founded Melos in 596 b. c. All the men were massacred and replaced by five hundred Athenian colonists; the women and children were carried captive to Attica. Later on, when these children were grown, they returned to occupy the island. Melos then passed under the domination of the Macedonians, then under that of the Romans, and finally under that of the Byzantines, who retained possession of it until 1297, when Marco Sanudo annexed it to the Italian Duchy of Naxos. In 1537 it was taken by the corsair Barbarossa and joined to the Ottoman Empire. The island continued to prosper, serving as a market and even as a refuge to the corsairs of the West, especially the French; it was so long until the island began to decline because of a volcano which arose in the vicinity. From 20,000 inhabitants the population decreased to about 2000; united to Greece in 1827 the island now contains 5000 souls. The chief town, called Plaka, possesses a very fine harbour; nearby are the ruins of ancient Melos, with a cemetery, two citadels, a temple of Demeter, and a theatre. Near the theatre was found in 1820 the celebrated Venus of Melos, now at the Museum of the Louvre at Paris, the work of a sculptor of Antioch on the Meander, in the second century B. c. The earliest known Bishop of Melos, Eutychius, assisted at the Sixth Ecumenical Council in 681. Le Quien (Orient Christ., 141, 145) would have given this see to a Greek titular, especially at the beginning of the sixteenth century, after the expulsion of the Venetians. The Greek diocese was a suffragan of Rhodes. A very long list of the Latin residential or titular bishops is found in Le Quien, op. cit., III, 1055-56, and in Eutël, "Hierarchia Catholica mediæ ævi", Munich, I, 355; II, 211. Melos had Latin bishops until 1700, in which year John Anthony de Camillis died. The see was then joined to that of Naxos until 1830, when the island was made a part of the Diocese of Santorin. The Bishop of Santorin now ministers to the few Catholics who live there.

**Melozzo da Forli, an Italian painter of the Umbrian School, b. at Forli, 1438; d. there 1494. Lanzi's suggestion that Melozzo studied under Antonio da Forli appears to rest on no foundation. Little is known of this Melozzo, save the slight part he took in the frescoes of the Eremitani Chapel at Padua, which were finished prior to 1460. He would thus have brought to his pupil the teachings of Mantegna, but it
is more probable that Melozzo fell under no influence other than that of Piero della Francesca. Piero was always engrossed with perspective, and has even left us a treatise on it; therefore it is to him that Melozzo owes his mastery of the subject, as well as his love for large tableaux and the heroic character of his work. Melozzo was the artist who was introduced to the Court of Urbino by the magnificient Signor Federigo da Montefeltro, to whom perhaps he was Giovanni Santi, the father of Raphael. None of the work he did there has reached us. However, the Barberini Palace (Rome) contains a part of the Urbino series, and among them a few pictures that seem to suggest, like the inscriptions, date from 1476.

The "Federigo in armour, with his Son Guidobaldo" is attributed to Melozzo. A charming bust "Guidobaldo, when a child", in the Colonna Palace, is attributed by some to Giovanni Santi, but Berenson thinks it a Melozzo, (two paintings in Berlin and two in London) and the busts of the "Philosophers" (in the Louvre and in the Barberini), formerly in Federigo's palace, are probably not by Melozzo but by the Fleming, Justus of Ghent. It was doubleness through Federigo that the artist was recommended to Sixtus IV. The importance of this pope's part in the history of art is well known, for he was the first of the Renaissance popes, the herald of Julius II and Leo X, and the founder of the Sixtine Chapel and the Vatican Library. Melozzo became more or less his official painter. With him he opened the Academy of St. Luke.

The Sixtine chapel was already decorated when Melozzo arrived, but the pope associated him with two other great undertakings. In 1477 he ordered him to paint a picture commemorating the inauguration of the Vatican. This fresco, now in the Pinacoteca of the Vatican, shows the jurisconsult Platina venerating before the pope and receiving from him the keys of the library. Grouped around are the pope's four nephews, among whom are the prothonotary, Giulio Riairo, in a monk's robe, and Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, the future Julius II. The scene is set in a hall of marvellous Renaissance style. The beauty of the architecture, the splendour of the decoration, the vigour of the portraits, the calm and dignity of the composition, and the importance of the persons it deals with, make this magnificent work an incomparable page of history.

Art has no creation of more unconstrained majesty, so realistical and nobly alive. It is a perfect picture of the papacy of those days, a vision of the court life of the pontiff, who was the first to make Rome the capital of the arts, and the intellectual metropolis of the world, to crown it with the sciences and the masterpieces of art and to invent nepotism. Sixtus IV also commanded Melozzo to paint an "Ascension" for the ceiling of the Church of the Sacred Wells. It was a remarkable painting and Vasari speaks admiringly of it, but unfortunately it was destroyed in 1711 when Clement IX enlarged the choir. He was unwilling, however, that such a work of art should be completely lost, so a few detached figures from the group were saved, of which that of "Christ Triumphant" may be seen on the Quirinal staircase. It is one of the earliest examples of perspective applied to the human figure on roof or ceiling decoration; that is to say, a figure viewed from below. This foreshortened method, a great novelty at that time, has been surpassed a hundredfold, and by third-rate painters, since the day of Correggio.

Melozzo's chief merit is that he created a type of supple and nobly sensuous juvenile beauty, and gave expression to it with inspired ease and lyric swing. This quality stands out more prominently in other fragments of the same fresco, preserved in the larger sacristy at St. Peter's, especially in the choral angels, whose faces are irresistible. No artist of that period, and very few since, would have been able to conceive these poetical and vigorous forms, in which womanly charm blends with virile strength, which are so full of health, joy of life, movement, and passion. This wonderful work was executed in 1482. A less important one (1478), of "Christ as Judge of the World", can be seen in the Minerva. This power of giving pleasing expression to a life full of richness and harmony, this incomparable gift of plasticity, claims for Melozzo a place apart. Not so great and, especially, not so profound as Mantegna or Signorelli, he has nevertheless a true Italian character, and a style which is a synthetic product of the two masters, in which the other two masters are lacking. This charm he knew how to utilize even in depicting the everyday occurrences of life. To illustrate this, Vasari cites in the fresco work of the church of Forlì which shows a druggist's apprentice ("Pesto, Pepe") pounding sugar in a mortar. Never was the joy of living expressed in such bewitching a manner. The paintings in the Treasury Chapel at Loretto were merely outlined and begun by Melozzo; their execution is almost entirely the work of his pupil Palemezzano.

Melrose, Abbey of, in Roxburghshire, founded in 1136 by King David I, was the earliest Cistercian monastery established in Scotland. Its first community came from Rievaulx, the Yorkshire house colonised from Citeaux. In less than ten years St. Mary's Abbey, Melrose, had been completely built. It stood in a broad glen south of the Tweed, two miles distant from the Celtic monastery of Old Melrose, where St. Cuthbert had lived five centuries before. The abbey suffered greatly from hostile incursions of more than one English monarch; the soldiers of Edward II desecrated, pillaged, and burned the church; Richard II in 1385 laid waste the surrounding country and set fire to the abbey. Mainly through the generosity of Robert Bruce, a more stately church was begun in 1326, and scarcely completed by the sixteenth century.

Melrose, Abbey of, in Roxburghshire, founded in 1136 by King David I, was the earliest Cistercian monastery established in Scotland. Its first community came from Rievaulx, the Yorkshire house colonised from Citeaux. In less than ten years St. Mary's Abbey, Melrose, had been completely built. It stood in a broad glen south of the Tweed, two miles distant from the Celtic monastery of Old Melrose, where St. Cuthbert had lived five centuries before. The abbey suffered greatly from hostile incursions of more than one English monarch; the soldiers of Edward II desecrated, pillaged, and burned the church; Richard II in 1385 laid waste the surrounding country and set fire to the abbey. Mainly through the generosity of Robert Bruce, a more stately church was begun in 1326, and scarcely completed by the sixteenth century.
Melrose Abbot

Cruciform in shape, built in English Perpendicular, Decorated, and Flamboyant styles, two hundred and fifty feet in length, Melrose was distinguished for the fairy-like lightness of its carvings and window-tracery, finished with exquisite care. Not only the royal founder, but succeeding sovereigns, and countless benefactors, nobles and commoners, so richly endowed Melrose with lands and possessions that its annual revenue is computed at one hundred thousand pounds of present money value. One example of the application of such revenues is told in twelfth century records. During a time of famine four thousand starving people were fed by the monastery for three months. Many of the abbots were men of distinction: Abbot Waltheof (1148), stepson of David I, and honoured as a saint; Abbot Jocelin, afterwards Bishop of Glasgow (1175), took a prominent part in the erection of the fine cathedral of that city, as a shrine for the body of St. Mungo; Abbot Robert (1268) had been formerly Chancellor of Scotland; Abbot Andrew (1449) became Lord High Treasurer; many others were raised to the episcopate. The English troops of Henry VIII burned Melrose in 1544. Although the monks once numbered two hundred, and there were one hundred and thirty as late as twenty years before the Reformation, eleven only received pensions at the dissolution, so quickly must they have been dispersed. After many vicissitudes, the possessions of the abbey came finally to the Buccleuch family. The ruins were further devastated by a fanatical mob in 1569, when statues and carvings were ruthlessly destroyed; but more wanton still was the subsequent carting away of the sacred stones in great numbers to serve as building materials. The result is seen in the carved religious emblems still appearing upon surrounding houses. The ruins of the once noble abbey form a strikingly beautiful picture from the North British Railway, about thirty-seven miles south of Edinburgh.

Michael Barrett.

Melrose, Chronicle of (Chronica de Mailros).—It opens with the year 785, ends abruptly in 1270, and handwriting show that it is generally, if not always, contemporaneous. The Manuscript, now in the British Museum, was probably carried off from Melrose at the time of the Reformation. It was edited in 1835 by J. Stevenson, S.J., for the Bannatyne Club. The Oxford edition issued in 1884 by Fulman is by no means satisfactory, as the editor had no opportunity of collating the Oxford transcript with the original. Besides its chronicle, Melrose has handed down hundreds of charters and royal writs, dating from the reign of David I to that of Bruce, and forming a most valuable collection, rich in illustrations of the social life and economy of the period. They were edited by Cosmo Innes.

Stevenson, Chronica de Mailros (Edinburgh, 1835); Innes, Liber de S. Marie de Melros (Edinburgh, 1837); Douglas, History of Roxburghshire.


Melzi, Francesco, b. at Milan, about 1490; d. 1568. He was a mysterious personage. He was a friend of Leonardo da Vinci, and Vasari tells us that he was a Milanese nobleman, an exceedingly handsome young man, and that he possessed the principal part of the anatomical drawings of Leonardo. He inherited Leonardo's manuscripts, instruments, books, and drawings; he furnished both Vasari and Lomazzo with
princesses. He endows them with slender figures, white and graceful necks, sweet and long profiles, long drooping eyelashes, pure brows and clear temples, with that immaterial something which tolerates in its vicinity only virginal dreams and chaste thoughts. Whatever is too worldly in their grace he corrects by an ideal but natural atmosphere, by the serenity of their looks, all the grace of nature. A delicate symmetry lends a mysterious rhythm to these peaceful compositions and dominates them with the harmony of unheard music. Angel lute players with blue and rose-coloured wings seem the expression of this unuttered song, the personified voice of the choir. Grace of figures, nobility and richness of decorativeness, serenity of demeanours, of his highest art. A melody of colours, lines, and sentiment all unite to produce a masterpiece of mystical poetry, pious romance, and supernatural beauty.

But all these things, it must be repeated, are almost inexplicable in the Flemish school, at once the most natural and the most commonplace. These characteristics have their origin elsewhere, and the very legend concerning Memling, the story of a man coming as a stranger to art by a special vocation, is an unhistorical attempt to account for this singularity. Mr. James Weale had already conjectured that Memling's name contained the key to the enigma and concealed the clue to the painter's origin; he then proceeds to show the connection of the language of the Middle Ages, the name of a country. As a matter of fact there was a borough called Memelynck near Alkmaar in Holland, and in the neighbourhood of Aschaufenburg in Germany there was another called Mummel or Mömling. For a time it was difficult to decide which of these two was the painter's birthplace, but by an amusing process of elimination Weale's hypothesis has carried out all uncertainty. The solution of the problem is that Memling was a German from Mains, as is shown by his exclusively German Christian name, Hans. Before taking up his residence at Bruges he studied art at Cologne for northern Europe the home and fatherland of Christian art. Vasari and Guicciardini relate that Memling was the pupil of Roger Van der Weyden, but the only work of Memling's with a trace of Roger's influence is after a Pietà in a church of Cologne. His "Reliquary of St. Ursula" again proves that he lived a long time in that city; the views of Basle and Rome are fancifully depicted, whereas in those of Cologne the slighting of the central then the external is in evidence. In connexion with the German spirituality with Flemish technic, this infusion of soul, of the spiritual, the immaterial, into the school best able to paint the real, constituted the genius and the rôle of Memling. Through him the Flemish school was rescued from the shallow naturalism where for fifty years it had grown barren. Memling's influence on his contemporaries was immense. When we compare the early works of Gérard David so harsh and brutal, such as the "Justice of Otto" and the "Marriage of Cana" of the Louvre, with those which were later executed under Memling's influence, we can estimate the service which the stranger, the "duischer Hans", rendered to the country of his adoption. There is no doubt that he owes it to a practical skill which he would not otherwise have had, but in return he brought it the spirit which revived it. The works of the next generation show this more clearly; the "Mystical Marriage" of the Museum of Brussels and the "Deposition" of Antwerp by Quentin Metsys. And when we remember that of all the masters of his country it was Metsys whom Rubens esteemed most, the change which Memling brought about in the spirit of the rôle played in the destinies of the Flemish school by the young painter from Aschaufenburg who taught him poetry and idealism.

CABEL VAN MANER, Letters des Peintres (1846), ed. H. THREE (1884); DESCamps, "Les anciennes peintres flamands," with notes and additions by RUBENS and PHINCHART (1863); FRETTE, Estudi de l'Art, III (1908); WEALE, Hans Memling (1867); KRAMMERN, Memling (Bielefeld, 1890); JAMES WEALE, Hans Memling (London, 1901); WEALE, Peintres de jadis et d'aujourd'hui (1903).

LOUIS GILLET.

Memmi, Simone. See Martini, Simone.

Memory (Lat., memoria), is the capability of the mind, to store up conscious processes, and reproduce them later with some degree of fidelity. Strictly speaking, however, a revived conscious process is not remembered, unless it is, at the same time, recognized as something which occurred before. Memory, therefore, involves recognition. Conscious reproduction of mental processes is frequently spoken of as recollection, and involuntary, as recall.

Divisions of Memory.—St. Thomas distinguishes two kinds of memory, sensory and intellectual. He excludes, however, from the former the function of merely storing up the mental image; this he assigns to imagination. Sensory memory preserves that which can not be received by the special senses and yet is individual, and therefore does not belong to the intellectual memory, which takes cognizance of nothing but the universal. For instance, the utility of an object and its setting in past time; by the utility of an object must not be understood any abstract concept of its purpose, but only the sensory experience which all animals acquire, that certain things are beneficial or harmful. Sensory memory is located by St. Thomas in the bodily organism (I, lxxviii, a. 4). The intellectual memory receives and stores up the abstract and universal. Its seat is the passive intellect, a division, or perhaps only an aspect of the faculty of understanding. The operation of the passive intellect is the intellectus agens, which is conceived of as actively working over the data of sense, abstracting from them the universal (species intelligibilia) which they contain and impressing it on the passive intellect. St. Thomas argues that there must be an intellectual memory, because that which is acted upon must retain the effect of the agent all the more perfectly in proportion to its own stability. Since the impressions of sense leave lasting traces on the bodily organism, which is subject to decay,—a fortiori the universal must, in some way, be stored up in the passive intellect, which is a spiritual faculty, permanent as the soul itself (I, Q. lxxix, a. 6-7).

This argument assumes that there are cognitive processes specifically different from those of sensation, a doctrine which has received scant recognition in modern psychology until quite recently. The tacit or expressed assumption of many experimental psychologists has been the very opposite, viz.: that all our cognitive processes are sensations or sensory complements. Recently, the hypothesis has been made to demonstrate experimentally the existence of abstract thought, totally distinct from mental imagery (phantasms). Along with this admission of a difference between sensation and thought, and experimental psychology is beginning to emphasize the distinction between sensory and intellectual memory.
Sensory memory has long been subdivided by psychologists into several "types", chief among which are the auditory, visual, and motor. Anyone may remember at times by visual, auditory or other sensory impressions; but there is evidence to show that it is in part determined by anatomical or physiological conditions of the brain. "This, however, does not exclude the modification of images by any exercise of memory in which they function; for the type is quite elastic" (Watt, "Experimentelle Beiträge zu einer Theorie des Denkens" in "Archiv für die Ges. Psychol.", 1905, IV, 367-8).

Besides sensory and intellectual memory, a third division, affective memory, is often mentioned. Meumann ("Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die experimentelle Pädagogik", I, 174) recognizes it as a distinct form, because in children under thirteen, it is but little developed; whereas other forms of memory are already far advanced. Meumann's view is based on the experiments of Netsechajev and Lobatsch. Ribot, who was the first to make a special study of affective memory, maintained that to the visual, auditory, and motor types, we must add another, which is just as well developed, the "affective type" ("Phren. review", IV, 1895), objected to the type theory of affective memory, on the ground that affections, unlike mental images, are recalled in company with ideational mental processes. They are not independent but dependent mental processes, and cannot be attended to, or recalled independently of the representative processes of which they are but qualities or tones. Conclusive evidence is at present lacking to decide whether or not feelings are dependent or independent processes. But the settlement of this problem is not necessary for the recognition of an affective memory of some kind. The expression "affective memories" is less significant, because the processes are distinct from sensory and intellectual.

The Development of Memory.—The growth of memory from childhood to maturity is dependent upon the development of many mental faculties, and is therefore a very complex affair. It is a growth of many memories, rather than of a single faculty. For purposes of discussion, the forms of memory have been distinguished: (1) memory for special sensations, (2) for impressions of space and time, (3) for numbers and abstract concepts, (4) for emotional states of mind. Each shows a period of rapid growth, followed by a standstill or even a retardation. The forms of memory which throughout childhood are especially unfavourable for the development of all kinds of memory. The order in which these forms of memory undergo their period of rapid development, is for boys: (1) external objects, (2) words of visual content, (3) words of auditory content, (4) tones, (5) touch and sensations of movement, (6) numbers and abstract concepts, (7) emotions of the body. For girls, the order is: (1) words of visual content, (2) words of auditory content, (3) emotions of the body, (4) numbers and abstract concepts, (5) touch and sensations of movement. It is not true that the memory of children is better than that of adults. Except for a retardation at the ages of fourteen and fifteen, memory grows continuously, reaching a maximum between twenty and twenty-five. After that, for those in learned pursuits, it declines very slowly, until about the fiftieth year, when it commences to fall off more rapidly. Ebbinghaus, who made continual tests of his powers of retention, could say at the age of eighty, "I cannot climb up the depths of consciousness unless it is by the aid of memory."

The Method of Memorizing.—The experimental study of memory has not been barren in results of practical value. It is now possible to give suggestions for the practical work of memorizing that are based upon very definite data. These suggestions refer primarily to the mechanical part of memory. Practical experience tells us that if we want to memorize or construct any kind of connected narrative, we are greatly helped if we first analyse its logical sequence of thought. Memory systems for translating dates into words and memorizing the words which can be re-translated into dates, are so cumbersome that their value is doubtful. The results of experimental work aid us chiefly in the drudgery of memorizing—just when we conjecture about the best method is most likely to fail. In learning a poem by heart, the usual method would be to read the first few lines several times, then read from the beginning on down a few lines further and so, little by little, commit the whole to memory. Another method would be to read it each time, from beginning to end, until it was perfectly memorized. Although there is a prejudice in favour of the first method, it is the one that consumes the greatest amount of time.

Several pieces of experimental work have shown that memorizing by reading from beginning to end, is the quicker and more permanent method. The reason is to be sought in the mechanics of association, which one word more makes the memory of the one word before it more sure. When a series of words is memorized, it may be shown that a word is not merely associated with the one that precedes and the one that follows it, but also with every other word of the series. Consequently the "total" method, avoids the trouble of connecting the separate sections of the partial method, makes the association of the parts and gives to all the parts a certain equality of value by which the whole is better united. (Steffens, "Experimentelle Beiträge, etc." Ch. iii.) One will, of course, combine at times the two methods. When certain portions of a piece present special difficulties, these parts will be more deeply impressed by a few more careful readings. Finally, the "free" method of memorizing. It is better to read half aloud than entirely to oneself. In memorizing poetry, it should be read with the rhythmical swing of the metre. As to the rate of reading, it has been found that, if one wants to learn a piece so as to be able to repeat it, as soon as he has memorized it, he will save time by reading it slowly. But he who wants to learn a piece for reciting, he may read leisurely. Since one generally wants to remember what he has learned for some hours at least, it is better to read through the material at a leisurely rate. Meumann recommends that in the first part of the memorizing, one should read slowly, and more rapidly later on, as the material becomes familiar.

As a physiological process, memory includes three elements: (1) retention, (2) reproduction, (3) recognition. The process of recognition is usually treated more or less as a separate problem, so that the discussion of the theory of memory has centred around the question, how it is possible for ideas to be retained and reproduced. What becomes of the idea, after it has left consciousness? Does it continue to exist, preserving its own peculiar being, somewhere in the depths of the mind, and reappear when the occasion is propitious? Such was the opinion of the German philosopher and pedagogue Herbart (1776-1841). This would only be possible, if the idea were a substantial being, which rose up from the depths of consciousness whenever the mind became aware of it, disappearing when it was forgotten—a theory more picturesque than true. If the idea is not a substantial entity, it must be a kind of accident—a transient something that continues to exist only in the traces that it leaves in passing. This is the common theory of memory, which takes on clearer forms, as more facts are explained. Desretes located the trace primarily in the bodily organism. In remembering, the soul has
to drive the “animal spirits” hither and thither in the brain, till they encounter the trace of the idea it wishes to recall. But, besides the cerebral traces, there are also, according to Descartes, vestiges left in thought itself. Leibnitz located the trace in the monad of the soul and conceived of it as becoming vanishingly small, but never equal to zero. For others again, the trace is entirely material. Some even go so far as to locate each image in a special ganglion cell of the cortex. On account of its definite character and picturesqueness, this theory has found many popular expositions. But there are facts that seem to make it untenable. For instance, disturbances of vision caused by unilateral lesion in one visual area of the cortex of a dog, wear off after about six weeks. This was noticed by Opposing traces are deposited in the surrounding area. But it was shown by Loeb, that when dogs are kept in complete darkness after the operation (so that the acquisition of new visual images would be impossible), on being released after a period of six weeks, they are, nevertheless, entirely normal (Loeb, op. cit. infra, xvii).

More recently, it has been maintained (Robertson, “Sur la dynamique du Système nerveux etc.”, 438), that the trace is a chemical condition left in the brain by the passing activity of the original impression. This contention is not pure speculation, but is based upon experiments which aim to show that sensory processes are connected with the liberation of acids in the cerebro-spinal fluids. It leads to the assumption that “the extent of the memory-trace is proportional to the amount of material transformed in a self-catalysed chemical reaction, that the number of syllables memorized must be connected with the number of repetitions (or time of learning) according to the following function: \( \log n = K + b \), where \( n \) is the number of repetitions, \( K \) and \( b \) are constants, and \( K \) is not varying when \( n \) and \( r \) vary” (“Monist”, 1909, XIX, 383). The quantity \( a \) also corresponds to the amount of substance transformed in the chemical reaction, and \( r \) to the time during which it goes on. Calculations based on this equation, compared with observed results, gave very small percentages of error: 0.46 per cent. to 2.5 per cent. Such results seem to indicate that the term “sensory trace” will eventually receive a definite explanation, but they are far from affording us the basis of a complete explanation of memory. The insufficiency lies in the fundamental defect of all materialistic theories. They fail short of that which they set out to explain: the nature of memory. It is not sufficient to show that there are cerebral traces. This has long been a priori evident, and it is to be supposed that such traces will obey a definite law. Over and above this, a complete theory of memory must show how these cerebral traces recall definite conscious processes. This problem remains a fact which must be taken account of in any theory of memory. St. Thomas postulated the existence of physiological traces in the organism. But he also pointed out that there must be some kind of residue of the ideas left in the soul itself. Since the ideas are but acts of intelligence, and not intelligent substances—transient activities of the soul—some fault may be age a long time to survive, they can only live on, as dynamic traces in the passive intellect, awaiting the time when they will exert their influence on some future process of thought—apparently rising from the depths of consciousness, in the act of memory.

The function of memory is furthermore said to evidence for the substantial nature of the soul. Since ideas are transient processes, there must be a permanent something in the mind to account for their retention and reappearance; and since they are recognized as ideas that were formerly in consciousness there must be something that identifies them and that consequently persists during their absence from consciousness (see the discussion of sense-perception by means of psychical dispositions distinct from cerebral traces, is obviously futile unless it postulates a substance of mind in which such dispositions are preserved.


Thomas V. Moore.

Memphis, ancient capital of Egypt; diocese of the province of Arcadia and Heptanomos, suffragan of Oxyryinus. Memphis was called in Egyptian Menophir, “the good place”. This name, at first reserved to the pyramid of Pharaoh Pepi I (sixth dynasty) afterward passed to the surrounding quarter, and then to the name of the city itself. It is common to give it other names, several of which properly indicate quarters of the city. It is called Aneb or Aneb-ub, “the city of the wall” or “of the walls”; Aneb-hadj, “the white wall”, an appellation properly signifying the citadel (Herodotus, III, 91); Hā-ka-Ptah, “the dwelling of the person of Ptah”, an expression first applied to the temple of Ptah, then to the city and which according to certain authors became in the Greek tongue Ἀγωντες, Egypt; Kha-nofer, “the good crown”; Khu-to-ui, “the light of the two countries”, i.e. of Upper and Lower Egypt; Hā-ka-knum-nuteru, “the house of the worship of the divine architect”; Mā-kha-to-ui, “the balance of the two countries”, i.e. the dividing point between Upper and Lower Egypt. Memphis is considered to have been founded by Menes, a native of Thinis (Herodotus, II, 99; Diod. Sic., I, 50, 51, 67). It was the capital of several dynasties (third, fourth, sixth, eighth, twenty-fourth). It was after Thes, says Brugsch, the city “concerning which the epi-graphical monuments and the papyri have most to teach us”. Of all the Egyptian cities, it alone remained in the Bible under the name of Mōf or Nōf (Oese, ix, 6; Is., xix, 13; Jer., ii, 16; xlv, 14, 19; Eschel., xxx, 13, 16). The Prophets predicted in strong terms the destruction of this city, and the prophecies were so well fulfilled that the scholars of the French expedition could scarcely discover the true site of Memphis. Memphis has often been identified with the ancient Cairo, the Babylon of Egypt. It is now certain that Memphis extended into the plain where stand the villages of Bedrawit and Mit-Rabiet, on the west bank of the Nile, about twelve and a half miles from Cairo. Its size must have been considerable. In this plain are sometimes exhume some of its ancient buildings. It is still to be identified with the ancient Cairo, the Babylon of Egypt. It is now certain that Memphis extended into the plain where stand the villages of Bedrawit and Mit-Rabiet, on the west bank of the Nile, about twelve and a half miles from Cairo. Its size must have been considerable. In this plain are sometimes exhume some of its ancient buildings.
his own poem "La Coronacion". His minor lyricism was found in the Cancionerios of slight importance.


**J. D. M. FORD.**

**Menachry, John.** See **Tríchurus, Vicariatus Apostolicus of.**

**Menahem.** See **Manahem.**

**Menaelon (μεναέλων from μῆν, "month") is the name of**

**Menaeon** (μεναίον), see in his deification of**

**Menaeon** (μεναίον) was the name of**

**Menaeon** (μεναίον) was the
days, the days of the ecclesiastical year turning around Easter (proprium de tempore); overlying this, as it were, are the feast days of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints that are fixed on certain days of the month of the civil year. The offices for these feast days are contained in the menaia, which therefore correspond to the proprium sanctorum in the Roman breviary.

The origin is first compilation of the menaia is obscure. Apparently the various elements that make up the collection were put together gradually. It is said that the Synaxarium (now called the menaia) was compiled first. The Synaxarium contains only short accounts of the saints' lives, the history of the feast and so on, like the lessons of the second nocturn in the breviary. These lives of saints are attributed to Symeon Metaphrastes (q. v.). The menaia include the Synaxarium and supply also all the other texts and poems (the Canon, their heirloom, troparia, stickers, kontakia, and so on) required to complete the office. A great part of these poems are ascribed to Romano, the chief hymn-writer of the Byzantine Church (fifth century). The menaia do not affect the holy liturgy (which is hardly influenced by the calendar), being used only in the Divine Office. The Byzantine ecclesiastical matter is not gotten. They are found in the other books (Triodion, Parakletike, Oktoechos).

The churches of the Byzantine rite that do not use Greek liturgically have translations of the menaia with additional offices for their special feasts and any other modifications they may have introduced. The Slavonic name for the book is mineja, Arabic, Muwadna. These books were translated into Syriac by the Melchites during the time that they used that language (a list in Charon: "Le Rite byzantin dans les Patriarchats melkites", Rome, 1908, pp. 33–44). The whole has not been translated into Arabic. The Orthodox and Melchites of Egypt and Syria use instead a selection from them called in Greek Προεκλησία (but "minor ecclesiastical calendar or a kind of Synaxarium. The first printed edition of the menaia was made by Andrew and James Spinelli at Venice (1528–1536), and reprinted (1596–1607). The latest Greek editions were published at Venice, in 1873 (Orthodox), and at Rome, in 1888 (Uniate).

**ALLATIUN, De libris eccles. Graecorum (Paris, 1645 and 1649); KRAUSCHER, Gesch. der byzant. Lit. (Munich, 1897), 655–659; NIKLE, Kalendarii mensuales (2nd ed., Innsbruck, 1899); MALLI,
MÉNARD, LÉON, writer, b. at Tarrascon, 12 Sept., 1706; d. in Paris, 1 Oct., 1767. When he had completed his humanities under the Jesuits at Lyons, he studied jurisprudence at Toulouse and became counsellor at the Superior Court of Nimes. From 1747 he was busied with Eastern research. His first work concerned the history of his native city and its bishops, and was entitled "Histoire des Évêques de Nîmes" (2 vols., The Hague, 1737). Later he enlarged this work, and between 1750 and 1758 he published at Paris the "Histoire Civile, Ecclesiastique et Littéraire de la ville de Nîmes" in seven volumes with illustrations. An abridgment appeared at Paris in 1790, and one at Nîmes in 1831-33. He also wrote: *Les Amours de Callisthène et de Chariclée*, The Hague, 1740, Paris, 1753 (also Paris, 1765, under the title of "Callisthène ou le modèle de l'amour et de l'amitié"); *Mœurs et usages des Grecs* (Lyons, 1749), a widely-read work which became the model of similar productions. In addition he wrote articles for periodicals, especially on detached subjects of the history of France in Roman times. In 1762 the Magistracy of Avignon sent for him and confined to him the task of writing a history of that city. But after two years of work he was constrained by ill-health to leave it unfinished. He was a member of the Académie des Inscriptions, and several other learned bodhis.

Le Beau, Éloge de Ménard in Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscrip., XXXVI.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

MÉNARD, NICOLAS-HUGUES, of the Congregation of St. Maur, b. in Paris, 1585; d. 21 Jan., 1644. His father was private secretary to Catherine de Medici, his mother was a native of Blois. After a liberal education Ménard entered the Order of St. Benedict on 5 Feb., 1607, at St. Denis, and made his religious profession 10 Sept., 1612. In the next year he joined the reform movement of St. Vannes in Verdun which some years later developed into the Congregation of St. Maur; and he became one of its main helpers. After some time he was called to Paris, where he soon became an important factor in the community and one of the principal pupitars. For sixteen years he taught rhetoric at the College of Cligny. By word and deed he sought to induce his fellow religious to unite an exemplary life with love for study especially of Church history and patrology. On account of failing health he was placed by his superiors in the abbey of St. German des Prés, where he lived in great seclusion in his small circle of intimate friends the Jeu St. Simon stood foremost. Ménard is much praised for his profound learning, his great modesty and his wonderful memory.

Works: "Martyrologium Sanctorum ordinis St. Benedictii", to which he added several biographies and explanatory notes, which formed the nucleus of the work (Paris, 1629); "Concordia regularum, auctore St. Benedicto Aniane abbate", from a manuscript found in the Abbey of Fleury, which is supplemented by a life of St. Benedict of Aniane (Paris, 1638); "St. Gregorii I Papae Libri Sacramentorum", from a manuscript Missal of St. Eligius (Paris, 1642). This also contains the Gregorian Roman chant of the Litany of the Rosary composed in the year 1705. The commentary on the book is highly praised by Muratori (Dissert. de rebus liturgicis, ch. 6), who states that Tommasi and Mabillon would have preferred the text of Pamelius, but the Maurists, when publishing the notes of Ménard had also to use his text "De unico Dionysio Areopagi Athenarum et Parisi- rum episcopo", a defence of the identity of the Areo-

pagan and first Bishop of Paris, written (at first anonymously) against Launoy, in defence of Millet (Paris, 1643); "S. Barnabæ Apostoli ut tertur Epistolæ Catholica, ab antiqua olim ecclesie patribus sub ejusdem nomine laudata et usurpata" (Paris, 1645). The Greek text had been found by Sirmond at Rome, and Ménard discovered a Latin translation at the Abbey of Corvey.

Kirchenlexikon, s. v.: TAMAR, Congr. von St. Maur (Frankfort, 1773), 1, 27; Theologische Quellenbibliothek, XV, 391, 421; HUNTER, Nomencl. (Innsbruck, 1907), 377.

FRANCIS MERRISHAW.

MÉNARD, RENÉ, missionary, b. at Paris, 1604; d. about 10 Aug., 1661, in what is now Wisconsin. After the usual course of studies he set out from Dieppe in the beginning of May, 1640. Arriving at Quebec he was assigned to work among the Hurons, labouring first, however, among the Nippisians. After the destruction of the Huron missions he went to Three Rivers, and on 17 May started for the Iroquois country. He was sent to the Cayugas, where for the first two months he was brutally treated, but after that he won the affection of the savages. When the Iroquois missions were interrupted, he again went to Three Rivers, but in 1659 started with 300 Ottawas for the Far West. He was then fifty-five years of age. In all probability the post he endeavoured to establish was at Keweenaw, one hundred leagues west of Sault Ste. Marie. The story of his sufferings there forms one of the most pathetic pages of the "Recit de...". For a long while he set out to reach the Dacotahs, who, according to a letter written by him in July, 1661, lived three hundred leagues farther on. With him was a single Frenchman, not Guérin the famous "Donné", but an armourer or blacksmith. They became separated in the forests, and Ménard was never heard of again. He was probably murdered at the first rapid of the Menomonees.


T. J. CAMPBELL.

MENAS, SAINT, martyr under Diocletian, about 295. According to the Greek Acts, published with Latin translation in "Analecta Bollandiana", III, 238 (Surius, XI, 241), Menas, a Christian, and an Egyptian by birth, served in the Roman army under the tribune Firmian. Returning from the eastern campaigns he presented himself to the Emperor Diocletian, and Menas hearing of the impious edicts issued against the Christians by the Emperors, Diocletian and Maximian, left the army, retired to a solitude in the mountains and served God by fasting, vigils, and prayer. During the celebration of a great festival Menas appeared in the midst of the populace in the temple, and fearlessly professed his faith. He was led before the prefect Pyrrhus, cruelly scourged, put to torture, and finally beheaded. His body was brought to Egypt and the martyr was soon invoked in many needs and afflictions. The fame of the miracles wrought, spread far and wide, and thousands of pilgrims came to the grave in the desert of Marotis between Alexandria and the river Nile. In the four centuries Bumma (Karm-Abum-Abu Mina) was a national sanctuary and grew into a large city with costly temples, a holy well, and baths. A beautiful basilica was erected by the Emperor Arcadius. The cult was spread into other countries, perhaps by travelling merchants who honoured him as their patron. As a result of various vicissitudes, the doctrinal disputes and the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs under Omar in 641, the sanctuary was neglected and ultimately forgotten. During 1905 Mr C. M. Kaufmann of Frankfurt led an expedition into Egypt which made excavations at Bumma. He found in a vast field of ruins, the grave, the well and thermal, the basilica, the monastery, numerous inscriptions on the
MENCCIUS

MENDAÑA

wails imploring aid through the intercession of the saint, and thousands of little water pitchers and oil lamps. The rich finds are partly in the Museum of Alexandria and Cairo, and partly in Frankfort and Berlin. The monsignor published an official report of his expedition in 1908, "La découverte des Sauvages dans le désert de Mareotis". His feast is celebrated on 11 November.

Several saints of the name Menas were highly honored in the ancient Church about whose identity or divinity much dispute is raised. Delahaye (Anal. Boll., XXIX, 117) comes to the conclusion that Menas of Mareotis, Menas of Coteysne, and Menas of Constanti-

nople, mentioned in Kallikles, are one and the same person, that he was an Egyptian and suffered martyrdom in his native place, that a basilica was built over his grave which became one of the great sanctuaries of Christendom, that churches were built in his honour at Coteysne and Constantiopon, and gave rise to local legends.

Mencius (Latinized form of Chinese Meng-Tze, i.e. Meng the Sage), philosopher, b. 371 or 372 B.C. He was a disciple of the grandson of Confucius, and ranks next to the great master as an exponent of Confucian wisdom. His work, known as the "Book of Menci-

us", or simply, "Mencius", is one of the four Shuh, or books, given the place of honour in Chinese literature after the "Kung", or classics. Of Mencius' life only a meagre account has been handed down, and this is so like the story of Confucius in its main outlines, that one is tempted to question its strict historical character. He is said to have lived to the advanced age of eighty-four years, being thus a contemporary of the great Greek philosophers, Plato and Aristotle. His father died when he was very young. The care of his training was thrown upon his mother, and so well did she fulfill her task that she has been honoured ever since, among the Chinese of all classes, as the pattern of the true mother. After a thorough instruc-

tion in the doctrine of Confucius, Mencius was honoured with the position of minister of state to one of the feudal princes, Hsuan. But after some years, see-

ing that the prince was not disposed to follow his counsels, he resigned his charge, and for years went about from court to court, explaining the principles of Con-

cfucius. At last he was kindly received by Prince Mencius, and was instrumental in promoting the welfare of his people through his wise measures of reform. After the death of the prince he retired to private life, and spent his last years instructing his disciples, and pre-

paring with them the book that bears his name.

The "Book of Mencius" consists of seven parts or books, and treats of the proper regulation of human conduct from the point of view of society and the state. Religion as a motive of right conduct seems to have concerned him much less than it did Confucius. He is interested in human conduct only in so far as it leads to the highest common weal. One of his recorded sayings is: "The gods come second; the sovereign is of heavier weight." His work abounds in sententious utterances. If we may trust the records, he knew how to speak plainly and strongly. To Prince Hui, whom he found living in careless luxury, while his people were suffering for lack of economic reforms, he said: "In your kingdom there is fat meat, and in your stables are sleek horses, while famine sits upon the faces of your people, and men die of hunger in the fields. This is to be a beast and prey on your fellow men."

Mencius was a staunch champion of the Confucian principle that human nature tends to what is morally good, and only runs to evil by reason of the perverse influences of external environment. His treatise is one of the most noteworthy attempts to teach mortal-

ity independently of religion. The "Book of Mencius" is generally accepted as genuine, though the evidence of its Mencian authorship is of a kind that would not be judged sufficient if it fell within the scope of modern historiographic criticism. In a Chinese history dating from 100 B.C., a short account of Mencius is given, in which he is declared to be the author of seven books that bears his name. There are extant portions of literary works composed as early as 186-178 B.C., containing quotations from the "Book of Mencius". There remains still, somewhat more than a century to bridge over, but the reputation for accuracy of the Chinese annals is taken as a warrant that the work goes back to the days of Mencius and issued from his pen.

A partial acquaintance with the teachings of Menci-

us was obtained by European scholars through the writings of the Jesuit missionaries to China in the eighteenth century. The "Book of Mencius" was translated into Latin by Stanislaus Julien in the early part of the last century. English readers have ready access to the sayings of Mencius in the admirable edition and version of the "Chinese Classics", by J. Legge.


Charles F. Aiken.

Mendaña de Neyra, Alvaro de, a Spanish navigator and explorer, b. in Saragossa, 1541; d. in Santa Cruz, Solomon Islands, 18 October, 1568. Little is known of his early years, but about 1563 he went to Lima upon invitation of his uncle, Lope García de Castro, who was then Viceroy of Peru. At that time the Spaniards were well aware that the Pacific offered an extensive field for exploration and discovery, and García de Castro, wishing to explore that vast region, equipped an expedition of two ships at the head of which he placed his nephew Mendaña. This expedition set out from Callao in November, 1567. In the course of about a year they discovered several islands of Oceania, and returned to Peru in 1568. Mendaña's travels did not awaken much interest at first, so he gave an elaborate and glowing description of the archipelago to which he gave the name of Solomon islands, as it was supposed to be an island state. Mendaña had obtained the gold with which he had adorned the temple at Jerusalem. These reports of the wealth of the islands, some years later, caused the fitting out of a second expedition for the purpose of colonizing them. By order of Philip II, Mendaña was placed in command, and the expedition sailed 11 April, 1565. Several groups of islands were discovered, among them the Marquesas Islands which he so named in honour of the wife of García de Mendoza, Marquís of Cañeque, who was at the time Viceroy of Peru. The explorer Cook, in 1774, gave the name of Nukahiva to this group, that being the native name of the largest island of the archipelago. The expedition continued westward, visiting several of the other groups of islands, but Mendaña died before he reached the end of the voyage. Before his death, he delegated his powers to his wife in whom he had great confidence and who was with him on the voyage. The widow, a very resolute woman, took charge, and led the expedition into Manila, where they arrived safely in February, 1568. Mendaña left behind him a describing both maps and charts, but only four pages of one of his manuscripts were selected after his death by the historian Pedro Gómez de Victoria under the title of "Derrotero de Mendaña de Neyra". The manuscript is now in the National Library in Paris.


Ventura Fuentes.
Mende, Diocese of (Mimatrensis), includes the department of Lozère, in France. Suffragan of Bourges under the old régime, it was re-established by the Concordat of 1801 as a suffragan of Lyons and united with the department of Ardèche. The See of Mende lost this second department in 1822 by the creation of the Diocese of Viviers and became a suffragan of Albi. According to local legends belonging to the Limousin cycle of legends relating to St. Martial, he passed through the territory of the Gabali (Gévaudan) of which Mende is the capital, and appointed as its first bishop, St. Severian his disciple, about the beginning of the first century. (See St. Martial.) The first bishop known by his name is St. Privatus, who according to Gregory of Tours, died in a grotto of Mount Mimat, a victim of the ill treatment he suffered at the time of the invasion of the Alamanni under their king Chroccus. Gregory of Tours places this event about 260; though Fredegarius puts the invasion of Chroccus at 407. Mgr. Duchesne places the invasion of Chroccus and the death of St. Privatus at the beginning of the reign of Constantine, perhaps before the Council of Arles. It is certain that there was an organized church in the country of the Gabali from about 314, since in that year it was represented at the Council of Arles. We do not know the exact date of the diocese of Mende, except from the chronicles of Mende and other church records. The first bishop of the Gabali, who doubtless resided at Javouls, near Mende, was Saint Hilary, present at the Council of Avernæ in 535, and founder of the monastery of Canourgue, and whose personality has been wrongly described in certain traditions concerning Saint Iller, and St. Fréjal of Canourgue (nineteenth-century) assassinated, it is said, under Louis le Débonnaire.

Towards the year 1000 Mende became the seat of the bishopric. Under Venerable Aldebert III (1151–88), Alexander III passed some days at Mende in 1162; Aldebert wrote two works, on the passion and on the miracles of St. Privatus, whose relics were discovered at Mende in 1530 by M. Le Lètoup, and has been esteemed as one of the oldest historians of the diocese. Mende became the see of a bishop, Guillaume Durand (1285–96), the author of “Speculum juris,” and of the “Rationale divinorum officiorum,” who was secretary of the general council of Lyons in 1270, and his nephew, Durand le Jeune (1295–1298), who, by the act of the chapter in 1371, was named dean of M. Le Lètoup. His work, “De bel, definitively settled in Gévaudan the respective rights of king and bishop, and who left a work on the general councils and on the reform of abuses. Guillaume de Grimoard, born about 1260 at the castle of Grisac near Mende, was sickly and deformed, but was restored at the prayer of his godfather, St. Eligier de Sabran, who had come to baptize him. Elected pope in 1362 under the name of Urban V, he administered the Diocese of Mende himself from 1368 to 70, as it had been left vacant by the removal of his nephew to the See of Avignon.

Among the bishops of Mende were: Guillaume de Chanae, who occupied the see but a few months, when he was killed in 1371; his nephew of Sixtus IV and a cardinal; Giuliano della Rovere (1478–83) later pope under the name of Julius II; and his nephews, Cardinal Clement della Rovere (1483–1504) and Francesco della Rovere (1504–24); Castellane (1586–92) massacred at Versailles, 9 Sept., 1793.

Urban II visited the Diocese of Mende in 1095 and had consecrated in his presence the church of the monastery of Saint Sauveur de Chirac or of Monastier founded in 1062 and dependent on the Abbey of Saint Victor. Mende was captured for the first time by the Huguenots in 1562; the celebrated adventurer Merle from 1573–81 led into the region bands of Protestants who were masters of Mende for eighteen months, and destroyed a great part of the cathedral. Urban V had caused to be rebuilt. The Diocese of Mende was one of the regions where the insurrection of the Camisards (q. v.) broke out at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Cardinal Dominique de la Rochefourcauld, Archbishop of Rouen, who presided in 1771 over the last assembly of the clergy of France, was born in 1712 at Saint-Cély d’Ancher, in the diocese. The chemist Chartal (1756–1832) was one of the last of those who profited by the scholarships founded by Urban V for twelve young students at Montpellier.

The following saints are specially venerated in the diocese: St. Louis (thirteenth century); the preacher St. Verain, Bishop of Cavailly, St. Severian of Gévaudan (sixth century); St. Lupentius, abbott of the basilica of St. Privatus, beheaded by order of Brunehaut whom he reproached for the irregularities of her life (sixth century); the nun St. Enimie, daughter of Ciotarie II and sister of Dagobert (seventh century), foundress of a monastery of Benedictine nuns in the present St. Enimie. The principal pilgrimages of the diocese are: at Mende itself, Notre Dame de Mende where the statue of the Black Virgin was brought, perhaps in 1213, by the Crusaders of Gévaudan, and the hermitage of St. Privatus; Notre Dame de la Carce, the origin of the city of Marvejols; Notre Dame de Quincoces, a church in the city of Mende; and Our Lady of Les Vaux de Cernay founded about 1030. Urban V founded a chapter-house of eight canons, and Our Lady All-powerful, at Langogne. There were in the diocese, before the application of the law of associations of 1901, various teaching orders of brothers and several teaching orders of nuns of a local origin: the Sisters of Christian Unity (Union chrétienne), founded in 1896 (monastery of Quincoces); the Order of the Sisters of the Holy Family, founded at Falher in 1750, transferred to Mende in 1824; the Sisters of Christian Doctrine (mother-house at Meyruies) founded in 1837. The religious congregations in 1900 directed in the diocese fifteen infant schools, one orphan asylum for boys, four orphan asylums for girls, nine hospitals and almshouses, twelve religious houses for the care of the sick. In 1905 at the end of the régime of the Concordat, the diocese had 128,866 inhabitants, 26 parishes, 191 succursal churches, and 135 vicarages, supported by the state.


Georges Goyau.

Mendel, Mendelism.—Gregor Johann Mendel (the first name was taken on entrance to his order), b. 22 July, 1822, at Heinzendorf near Odran, in Austrian Silesia; d. 6 January, 1884, at the Augustinian Abbey of St. Thomas, Brunn. His father was a small peasant-farmer, and the pecuniary resources of the family were very meagre, as is shown by the fact that a slave bought (1813) for 15 florins left a debt of 4 florins, and gave up a large part of her dowry in order that the plans which his family had formed for his education might be carried out. The debt was afterwards repaid, and more than repaid, by Mendel. After a period of study at the school of Leipnik, Mendel distinguished himself so much that his parents made a great effort and sent him to the gymnasium at Trepau, and subsequently, for a year, to Olmutz. At the former place one of his teachers was an Augustinian, and, whether post or propter hoc, at the end of his period of study at the gymnasium Mendel applied to be admitted as a novice in the Abbey of St. Thomas at Brunn, commonly known as the "Königskloster". This was in 1843, and in 1847 he was ordained priest and seems to have occupied
himself in teaching until 1851, when he was sent, for a two years’ course of study in physics, mathematics, and the natural sciences, to the University of Vienna. When this course terminated, in 1853, he returned to his abbey, and was appointed a teacher, principally of physics, in the Realschule. He continued in this position for three years and a half, but he had been genuinely devoted to teaching and to have gained the reputation of being extraordinarily successful in interesting his pupils in their work. In 1858 he was obliged to relinquish his educational labours on assuming the position of abbot of his monastery, to which office he was then elected.

When appointed to his important post, Mendel, already engrossed with his biological experiments, hoped that he might have more time for his researches than was possible in the midst of his labours at the Realschule. But this was not to be. The jurisdiction and privileges of the abbey are somewhat extensive, and its abbot must, in ordinary times, find himself with plenty of occupation. Mendel, however, in addition to the multiplicity of his duties as abbot, became involved in a lengthy controversy with the Government which absorbed his attention and em- bittered the last years of his life. The Government had imposed special taxes on religious houses, and these Mendel refused to pay, alleging that, as all citizens were not exempt from the law, it was unjust to ask one kind of institution to pay a tax from which another kind was free. At the commencement of the struggle several other monasteries sided with him, but one by one they submitted, until at last Mendel was left alone in his opposition to the tax. Great efforts were made to induce him to yield, but he refused, and even alleged the right of the abbey to be distrained upon rather than submit. In the end—though not till after Mendel’s death—the obnoxious tax was repealed. The result of all this strain, as may easily be understood, was a complete cessation in Mendel’s scientific work. His appointment as abbot may have been an excellent thing for the monastery, but it cannot be denied that it was a great misfortune for science. The latter years of his life were rendered unhappy, not only by constant strife with the Government, and by the racial controversies which tore that part of Austria at the time in question, but also by constant ill-health due to the chronic nephritis of which he ultimately died.

For the next twenty years, Mendel’s business was to change that sunny cheerful nature, which had secured Mendel many friends, into a somewhat morose disposition and suspicious attitude of mind. A public monument to his memory was unveiled at Brunn, 2 October, 1910.

Mendel’s experiments, on which his fame rests, were commenced while he was still a novice, and carried out in the large gardens attached to his monastery. Dissatisfied with the Darwinian views, then commencing to be known, he undertook a series of experiments on peas which occupied his spare time for eight years. The results of these observations were published in the “Transactions” of the Brunn Natural History Society in 1866, and a further paper on Hieracium appeared in the same periodical in 1869. Two short papers of less importance were published during the period of study at Vienna, and this seems to complete the list of the communications which he gave to the world, with the exception of his annual meteorological records, also published by the society. In 1890, after he had devoted himself to various lines of investigation, bestowing much labour on the heredity of bees. He collected queen bees of all attainable races, European, Egyptian, and American, and made many crosses between the various races. Unfortunately, the notes which he is known to have made on this subject have completely disappeared, and it is not impossible that he may have destroyed them himself in some of the dark hours which he was called upon to endure during the last years of his life.

The Brunn Society was not a wholly unknown organization, but its Journal was scarcely one which could be expected to give the widest publicity to a new discovery of the magnitude of the doctrine. It is to be feared that account that Mendel’s views seemed for a third of a century to have been still-born. Bateson, however, thinks that this would not so long have delayed his recognition, but that “the case is unquestionably to be found in that neglect of the experimental study of the problem of Species which supervised almost the whole of the Darwinian doctrine and Bateson’s opinion, that of the man who has done more than any other to make Mendel’s views known, is worthy of all consideration. Whatever may have been the cause, the fact remains that Mendel’s work was unrecognized until, in 1899, three men of science—de Vries in Holland, Correns in Germany, and Tschermak in Austria—almost simultaneously called attention to his publications and started the interest in his line of investigations which has steadily continued to grow and increase since that date. Mendel himself, though grievously disappointed at the neglect of his views, never lost confidence in them, and was wont to exclaim in his few words: “Meine Zeiten kommen.” Mendel was abundantly justified in his belief.

It now remains to give some account of the theory put forward by Mendel and the influence of his work during the past ten years. Mendel himself confined his experiments to plants, and his most important observations were made on the garden pea, Pium sativum. The peas have developed, not only a large number of other members of the vegetable kingdom, but also with a variety of animals, using that word in the widest possible sense. With the details of their publications it is not possible here to deal, but a short account of Mendel’s own work will suffice to show the lines of his theory. He did not, as others had done and have since done, direct his attention to the entire group of characteristics making up the individual, but concentrated his attention on certain pairs of opposed features observable in certain plants. In the case of the pea, he observed that some were tall, some dwarf in habit; some had round seeds, others wrinkled; some had green endosperm, others yellow. The next step was to select seven such characters and studied their behaviour under hybridization. From what occurred he was led to believe that the progeny of the various crosses behaved in regard to these characters, not in a haphazard manner, but in one which was reducible to the terms of a so-called “Natural Law.” One instance given by Bateson will explain what happens: there are tall and short (or “Cupid”) sweet peas, and in them we have plants showing a pair of marked and easily recognizable opposite characters. The tall and short forms are crossed with one another, and the seeds collected and sown. The resultant plants will be found to belong entirely to the tall variety. If, on the other hand, we have a cross between the short and the tall, if, however, this generation of seeds is sown and the flowers of the resultant plants be self-fertilized the result is that, when their seeds are sown, and have sprung up into plants, it is found that these are mixed, and mixed in definite proportions, for, on the average, it will be found that there are three tall forms for every one of the short. This tallness was not wiped out, but that it was temporarily obscured in the second generation, though present all the time potentially. To the character which alone appears in the first cross is given the name dominant (in this instance tallness is dominant), and to the hidden character that of recessive (dwarfiness, in the example). When the tails and dwarfs of the
third generation are allowed to be self-fertilized, it is found that all the recessive (dwarfs) breed true and, what is more, will go on breeding true as long as uninterfered with. Not so the dominants, which, after self-fertilization, produce both tall and dwarf. Some of the tall and dwarf generation will breed true and continue to breed true; others will not, but will produce a mixed progeny. Hence, out of the first plants, seventy-five will be tall (dominants), and twenty-five dwarfs (recessives), these last being pure. Of the seventy-five tall, twenty-five will be pure and will go on producing tall; fifty will be mixed, and their progeny will consist of pure dominants, mixed dominants, and recessives, as has been stated above.

Davenport thus enunciates the laws underlying these facts: "Of the two antagonistic peculiarities possessed by two races that are crossed, the hybrid, or mongrel, exhibits only one; and it exhibits it completely, so that the mongrel is not distinguishable as regards this character from one of the parents. Intermediate conditions do not occur. Second: in the formation of the pollen, or egg-cell, the two antagonistic peculiarities are segregated; so that each ripe germ-cell carries either one or the other of these peculiarities, but not both. It is a result of the segregation of the genes in the second generation mongrels each of the two qualities of their grandparents shall crop out on distinct individuals, and that the recessive quality shall appear in twenty-five per cent of the individuals, the remaining seventy-five per cent having the dominant quality. Such recessive individuals, crossed inter se, should never produce a mongrel, and any mongrel that does prove to be of the pure recessive variety."

Such, in brief, are the main outlines of Mendel's theory; but in the few years which have elapsed since it first engaged the attention of the scientific world, there has grown up an enormous literature on the subject which has much added to the complexity of the minor developments of the laws above given, and has made more difficult the difficulty of the terminology of Mendelism. With these developments it is impossible to deal here: they will be found very fully treated in Bateson's work (see below). It would, however, be negligent to omit all mention of the estimation in which the theory itself is held by men of science of Dr. Bateson, whose book on "The Science of Life," and whose revision of "The Origin of Species" will doubtless be acknowledged by all students of the subject to be an admirable and exhaustive treatise on the subject of evolution.

As above stated the papers in which Mendel's theories were made public are contained in the "Proceedings" of the Brünn Society. They have been made available for English readers by the translation which appears in Bateson's work (see bibliography below).

Bateson, Mendel's Principles of Heredity (Cambridge, 1909) (this is the most important of the English translations), contains a translation of Mendel's papers and a biography as well as a full account of all recent work on Mendelian lines; Punnett, Mendelism (Cambridge, 1903), a good brief account of the subject; Lock, Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, Heredity and Evolution (London, 1908); Walshe, Catholic Churchmen in the Evolution of Science (New York, 1907);—all these books are from foreign periodical literature on the subject will be found.

B. C. A. WINDLE.

Mendes de Silva, João, better known as Amadeus of Portugal, b. 1420, d. at Milan, 1482, began his religious life in the Hieronymite monastery of Notre-Dame de Guadalupe (Spain), where he spent about ten years. Desirous of joining the Franciscans, he went to Italy, where after some delay he was received into the order and, living in various convents, chiefly at Milan, attracted attention by his virtue and miracles. Under the protection of the Archbishop of Milan, he established the convent of Notre-Dame de Guadalupe in 1469 which became the centre of a Franciscan reform. The minister general of the order, Francesco della Rovere, later pope under the name of Sixtus IV, extended his protection to him. Other foundations were made in Italy, among them one at Rome. Supernatural favours obtained through his intercession aided in the spread of his cult, and the Bollandists testify to the authenticity of the title "Blessed" bestowed on him. He composed a yet unpublished treatise entitled "De revelationibus et prophetiis," two copies of which are mentioned by Nicholas Antonio. The work of another Amadeus, "Homilies on the Blessed Virgin", has been erroneously attributed to him. The controversies he founded between the Scolastics and the Franciscans, the friars of his order, led to the loss of the benefices of the Franciscans; the friars were called the Amadeans or Amadists, and they had twenty-eight houses in Italy, the chief one, Saint Peter de Montorio, in Rome. Innocent VIII gave them the convent of Saint Genesio near Cartagena in Spain (1493). The successors of Blessed João, Georges de Val-Camonom, Gilles de Monfray, Jean Allemand, and Charles de Coigny, preserved his foundation in its original spirit until Saint Pius V suppressed it along with similar branches of the Franciscan Order uniting them into one great family of Friars Minor Observants (1668).

Méndez and Gualaquiza, Vicariate Apostolic or, established by Leo XIII on 3 February, 1893, in the southern part of the province of Oriente, Ecuador. It depends directly on the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. The vicar Apostolic is Mgr Giacomo Costamagna, Salesian, titular Bishop of Colonisa, elected, 18 March, 1893. The mission was entrusted to the Chane, who sent his three fathers, two scholastics, and one catechist. They were all expelled under the anti-clerical regime in 1895. The province of Oriente is populated almost exclusively by Indians of the Jibaro (q. v.) stock. In the eighteenth century many of the tribes had been converted by the Jesuits, but on the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767 the foundations of the missions were neglected, and the little that remained was lost when the Maximilian regime came to an end. The converts were not gathered under the Church, but rather under the tutelage of the mission, and the Church began to work for the conversion of the natives. The mission was reestablished in 1867, and the natives were gathered into the missions. The number of the natives was estimated to be 150,000 Indians.

A. A. MacEwan.

Mendiburu, Manuel de, b. at Lima, 29 October, 1805; d. 21 January, 1885. He was educated in the University of S. Marcos del Rímae under the direction of Dr. Javier de Llama Pizarro, and in 1818 was appointed assistant of the College of San Martín. Upon the declaration of Peruvian independence he entered the army as an ensign and was afterwards promoted by General San Martín to the rank of lieutenant. Having been present at the battles of Calana, Locucuba, Tocanca, and Miquesuca, captured by the Spaniards, and then set at liberty, he rose to be captain in 1830. A year later he was sent on special commissions to Brazil and thence to Spain. Early in 1834 he became known in politics, and in 1851 was promoted to brigadier general. After serving as prefect of several departments in succession, he was appointed in 1870 director of the School of Arts and Trades at Lima. He also held at various times the portfolio of agriculture, foreign affairs, war, and marine, served several terms as a member of the Chamber of Deputies, became general-in-chief of the army, vice-president of the constituent Assembly, and diplomatic representative of Peru in Great Britain, Bolivia, and Chile, in which last post he won general esteem by his uprightness and kindness. More intrusted to mental work, the "Distintivo histórico biográfico del Perú", a model of its kind in America, cost him long years of constant labour. It relates the principal achievements of those who did good service to Peru, and is an historical thesaurus of great utility to those engaged in the special study of Peruvian history during the rule of the Incas and the Inca period. He also reorganized the library and national archives at Lima.

Dicc. Enciclop. Hispano-Americana, IX (Barcelona, 1892).

Camillus Crivelli.

Mendicant Friars are members of those religious orders which, originally, by vow of poverty renounced all proprietorship not only individually but also (and in this differing from the monks) in common, relying for support on their own work and on the charity of the faithful. Hence the name of begging friars. The friars are divided into three main groups: (1) the Mendicant orders, recognized as such by the Second Council of Lyons, 1274, Sess. 23 (Mansi, XXXIV, 96), the Order of Preachers, the Friars Minor, the Carmelites, and the Hermits of St. Augustine. Successively other congregations obtained the privilege of the mendicants. The Council of Trent (Sess. XXV, cap. iii) granted to all mendicants the right to beg. Thus do the Friars Minor and the Capuchins, the liberty of corporate possession (see Friar). The object of the present article is to outline I. the origin and characteristics of the mendicants; II. the opposition which they encountered.

1. Historical reasons for the origin of the mendicants are obvious. Since the struggle regarding investitures a certain animosity against church property had remained. Arnold of Brescia (q. v.) preached that monks and clerics who possessed property could not be saved. A little later John Valdes founded the "Poor Men of Lyons", soon followed by similar sects. The movement thus started in France and Italy had spread among the richer classes at the beginning of the thirteenth century and threatened to become dangerous. For this reason the Church decided to inhibit the orders and to induce the new mendicant orders to yield to the Church the possession of property. Thus the mendicants are characterized by an utter poverty, and the entire subjection towards the Church, St. Francis became with St. Dominic the bulwark of orthodoxy against the new heretics, and the two orders of Friars Minor and Preachers proved themselves a great help both to the inner and to the external life of the Church. Nor was absolute poverty the only characteristic of the mendicants. They were not formed to the sanctification of their own members; their maxim was non sibi soli vivere sed et alia proficere (not to live for themselves only, but to serve others). At once contemplative and active, to the complete renunciation of all things they joined the exercise of the apostolic ministry, devoting themselves to the evangelization of the masses, and thus introducing another element into monastic life. A necessary consequence of their close contact with the people, the converts of the mendicants, unlike those of the Benedictines, Cistercians and of the monks generally, were situated in the towns, in which, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, communal life was rapidly developing. The work of the mendicants in the pulpit, in the confessionals, in the service of the sick and the socially weak, in the foreign missions, had no parallel in the Middle Ages. This same apostolical activity had two consequences which form further characteristics of the mendicant friars, a new organization of confraternal life and the adoption of a special means of providing subsistence. The mendicants, unlike the monks, were not bound by a votum stabilitatis (vow of permanency) to one convent but enjoyed considerable liberty. Not only could they be called to other countries but also within the limits of a province, but, with permission of the general, they could be sent all over the world. The form of government itself was rather democratic, as for the most part the superiors were not elected for life and were subject to the General Chapter. From their apostolical ministry the mendicants derived the right of support from all Christian apostolic work: dignus est operarios mercede sua. (The labourer is worthy of his hire.) It was only just that having left everything in the world in obedience to Christ's counsel (Matt., xix, 21; xvi, 24; Luke, i, 1-6) in order to devote themselves to the well-being of the people, they should look to the people for their support. And in fact those alms were regarded as the fruits of their work within the limits of a province, but, with permission of the general, they could be sent all over the world. The form of government itself was rather democratic, as for the most part the superiors were not elected for life and were subject to the General Chapter. From their apostolical ministry the mendicants derived the right of support from all Christian apostolic work: dignus est operarios mercede sua. (The labourer is worthy of his hire.)
others, even Catholic countries, it is forbidden by law, as in some parts of Austria-Hungary.

II. This new form of conventual life was not introduced without opposition. With what feeling, the older orders occasionally regarded the rapid spread of the mendicants may be gathered from the bitter words of Matthew of Paris, "Chronica majora," ed. Luard, IV, London, 1877, 279, 50; "ad. an. 1246," ibid., 511-17. Still it is well known that St. Francis was indebted to the Benedictines for the "Fortunian," the first church of his order. The chief opposition came from elsewhere; from the universities and from the bishops and secular clergy. 

The mendicants did not confine themselves to the sacred ministry, but had almost from the beginning learned members who claimed equality with other doctors at the universities. The Dominicans were the first religious order to introduce the higher studies as a special point in their statutes and if they probably owe their mendicancy to the influence of St. Francis over St. Dominic, the Friars Minor are probably indebted for their higher studies to the influence or at least to the example of the Preachers. On the other hand the Church appreciated the work of the new order, bestowed them the rights of jurisdiction over the bishops, granting them extensive faculties for preaching and hearing confessions, together with the right of burial in their own churches, rights reserved hitherto to the secular clergy. It should be stated here that this opposition was not inspired merely by envy or other mean motives, but rather from a feeling that the mendicants were encroaching in great part for their income on the offerings of the faithful, which threatened to diminish through the great popularity enjoyed by the mendicants. On the whole it might be said that the Church protected the regulars against unjust attacks, while on the other hand she found means to redress abuses, tending to replace the real interest of the Church with the mendicants. The opposition to the mendicants was particularly strong at the University of Paris, and in France generally, less violent at the University of Oxford and in England. Isolated cases are to be found also in other countries. As early as 1231-2 Gregory IX had to protect the mendicants against the pretensions of the University of Salamanca, who, in the name of Joachinite errors, to their jurisdiction like the ordinary faithful. See different forms of the Bull "Nimis iniqua" (Bull. Franc. I, 74-77), repeated by Innocent IV, 1245 (op. cit., 388). Although this Bull speaks in a general way and is addressed to different countries, the abuses denounced by it were probably of local character.

The cause of the mendicants broke out in Paris, where the Dominicans had opened their schools (1229-30) and erected two chairs of theology; the Friars Minor followed them (1231). At first (1252) the opposition was directed against the Dominicans, the university wishing to grant them only one professorship. Denifle, "Chartularium" (see below), I, 226. The university sought allies, and drew the secular clergy into the struggle (Chartularium I, 252), with the result that Innocent IV, at first favourable to the mendicants (Chartularium I, 247), took away their privileges with regard to preaching, confession, and burial rights in the Bull "Esti animorum," 21 Nov., 1254 (Chartularium I, 1267). This sudden change of attitude towards the mendicants in Innocent IV has not yet been sufficiently explained. The first step of Alexander IV was to suspend the dispositions of his predecessor, Bull "Nec insolitum," 22 Dec., 1254 (Chartularium I, 276), in which he promised new dispositions and forbade meanwhile to act against the mendicants. In these critical circumstances it was naturally unfortunate that Gerard of Borgo S. Donnino should publish his book "Introductorius in Evangelium eternum" (1254), which, besides many other Joachinite errors, attributed to the mendicants a special vocation, to take the place of the secular clergy in the near future (1260). The answer was not long delayed. William of St. Amour, the leader of the opposition against the mendicants, publicly attacked the treatise in his sermon "Qui amat" (ed. Brown, "Fasciculus rerum expetendarum", London, 1690, II, 51; Guil. A.S. Amore, "Opera omnia," Constancia, 1632, 491). It has been made evident of late that the professors extracted from Gerard's treatise and from Joachin's "Concordia" the thirty-one propositions, partly falsifying them, as Martin Parsimons, first ed., VI, London, 1882, 339-39; "Chartularium," I, 272), and denouncing with them the book to Innocent IV. William went farther and wrote his famous treatise against the mendicants. "De periculis novissimorum temporum" ("Opera om.", op. cit., 17-72; Brown, op. cit., II, 18-41, here under a false title). The author starts from II Tim. iii, 9 etc., and sets the fulfillment of those words in the rise of the mendicant friars, who however are not specified, though everybody knew the significance. The whole list of woes enumerated by the apostle is applied to the mendicants, whom William blames on all the points which formed their characteristic note. The danger, he goes on, is not at present, but a future danger, and in order that some impostors and pseudo-preachers may be the more easily detected, William draws up forty-one signs, by which they are to be recognized. This treatise made an enormous impression.

Alexander IV, however, in the Bull "Quæsi ligum" 24 Apr., 1255 ("Bull. Franc.", II, "Bull. Tred.", I, 275), etc., condemned the propositions and questions at issue between the university and the mendicants, independently of the case of Gerard di Borgo S. Donnino. The pope annulled the statutes of the university against the mendicants, who were authorized to continue their public schools, even with the two chairs of the Dominicans, as a part of the university. The secular clergy of the Dominicans wrote from Milan, May, 1255, to his brethren to be careful and not to provoke the secular clergy against the order ("Chartularium," I, 259; Reichert, "Monumenta Ord. Frat. Predicatiorum," V, Rome, 1900, 21). At the same time the common interest of the Preachers and Friars Minor inspired the beautiful letter of a count of Joldi to the mendicants, granting them, in the spirit of the Bull, "Liber de anti christo et eiusdem ministri") (ed. under a false name by Marténe-Perand, "Vet. Scriptor. amplissima collectio," IX, Paris, 1733, 1271). This redoubtable attack against the mendicants, conducted by the most famous university, was met by the ablest writers from among the friars. St. Thomas Aquinas wrote "Contra impugnantes Dei cultum"; St. Bonaventure, "Questio disputata de paupertate" (Opera omnia, ed. Quarcoci, V, 1255); "Apologia pauperum" (VIII, 223), "De tribus questionibus" (VIII, 331). Directly against William's "De periculis" another Franciscan, Bertrand of Bayonne, or perhaps Thomas of York, wrote the treatise, " Against Gerard of Bordeaux" ("Chartularium," I, 415). John of Peckham, later Archbishop of Canterbury, took part in the controversy with his "De perfectione evangelica," partly ed. by Little in
"Fratis Johannis Pecham... tractatus tres de paupertate" (British Society of Franciscan Studies, II, Aberdeen, 1910). The seculars continued the fight, even with popular compositions, of which the best known is the "Roman de la Rose". At the second Council of Lyons near Genoa attempted to appeal to the example of the friars. Several bodies, some of which were of objectionable form, as the "Apostolica" and the "Friars of the Sack" (Saccati) (see Salimbene, "Mon, Germ, Hist. Script.", XXXII, 245 sqq.) All mendicants were abolished, but the four great orders were excepted on account of the manifest good they wrought. Martin IV, in 1256, extended to the Dominicans and Franciscans the privilege of preaching, confessions, censures, a measure which caused much opposition among the bishops and clergy, especially in France. Only in late years have we come to know of the existence of a great transaction on this subject, at Paris, 1250, where Cardinal Gaetano, later on Boniface VIII, skillfully defended the regulars (see bibliography). Boniface VIII revised the legislation regarding the privileges of the mendicants in favour of the clergy. His Bull "Super Cathedram", 18 Feb., 1300 (c. 2 in "Clem.", III, 7; "Extravag. com.", cap. 2, III, 6; "Bull Franc.", IV, 498) is in substance even now.

The controversies between the mendicants and the secular priests in England and Ireland took an acrimonious form in the fourteenth century. We have a peculiarly interesting instance of this in the case of Richard Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh (q. v.), who preached seven or eight times in London against the mendicants, partly because of their poverty and their privileges interfering with parochial rights. Denounced at the papal court of Avignon, he was cited by Innocent VI and defended himself in a treatise, which he read in a public consistory, 8 Nov., 1357, printed under the title "Defensiorium Curatorum" in Goldast, "Monarchia S. Romani Imperii..." II, Frankfort, 1614, 1391-1410, and in Brown, "Fasciculus rerum" II, 466-487. There is a compendium of the nine propositions in Old English in Howlett, "Monumenta Franciscana", II, 76-77. This curious document might be called a negative exposition of the Rule of the Friars Minor. An English Franciscan, Richard Conway, defended the friars in a treatise entitled "Super Cathedram" in Goldast, op. cit., II, 1410-44. Innocent VI gave a Bull, 1 Oct., 1358, in which he stated that a commission had been appointed to examine the differences between the Archbishop of Armagh and the mendicants and forbade meanwhile the prelates of England to hinder the four mendicant orders from exercising their rights. Bull Franc., III, 606; cf. Wielif, the following year a Bull requiring the observance of the Decretal "Super Cathedram" of Boniface VIII was directed to different bishops of the continent and to the Archbishop of York, 26 Nov., 1359 (Bull. Franc., VI, 322).

Towards the end of the fourteenth century the mendicants in England were attacked more fiercely and on a broader scale by the English Friars. If in France, at first, was not on bad terms with the friars; his enmity was confined to the last few years of his life. While Wielif had only repeated the worn-out arguments against the mendicants, his disciples went much farther and accused them of the lowest vices. Nor did they confine their calumnies to learned treatises, but embodied in popular poetry. The first great English treatise which we have any examples in the two volumes published by Wright (see bibliography). The chief place of controversy was Oxford, where the friars were accused even of sedition. On 18 Feb., 1382, the heads of the four mendicant orders wrote a joint letter to John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, protesting against the calumnies of the Wieliffs and stating that their chief enemy was Nicholas Hereford, Professor of Holy Scripture, who in a sermon announced that no religious should be admitted to any degree at Oxford. This letter is inserted in Thomas Netter's "Fasciculi zianiorum magistri Joh. Wyclif" (ed. Waddington, Ret. Brit. Script., London, 1588, 292-300). There are in the later centuries many other instances of hostility with which the friars, especially the Minorites, were regarded by the University of Oxford. Though the Black Death and the Great Schism had evil effects on their general discipline, the mendicants, thanks to the rise of numerous branches of stricter observance, on the whole, continued to flourish, especially in the South. The heavy losses sustained during that period, the mendicants have nevertheless continued to take their part, and that a considerable one, in the life of the Church down to the present day.


LIVIARIUS OLIVER, MENDIETA, JERONIMO, Spanish missionary; b. at Vitoria, Spain, 1525; d. in the City of Mexico, 9 May, 1604. While still a youth he took the habit of St. Francis at Bilbao, and arrived in New Spain at the end of 1545. Being desirous of helping in the conversion of the Indians, he applied himself with zeal to study the Mexican language, and it is said that, although a natural defect interfered with his speaking Castilian and kept him from preaching to Spaniards, yet, when he mounted the pulpit to address the Indians in their language, he spoke clearly and without stammering. At Taxco he probably had for his father guardian F. Toribio de Motolinia, the last superior of the first band of Franciscans in Spain so highly esteemed in his province that the provincials, Diego de Olarte and Miguel Navarro, took him with them on their visitation of the convents and the Indians, while the entire province, assembled in chapter, judged him capable of selecting at his own individual discretion all the provincial officers, a selection which in the event proved satisfactory to all.

In 1569 Mendieta accompanied Miguel Navarro on his way to the general chapter in France, and while on his journey he remained in his native town, Vitoria. Here he put himself in communication with Juan de Ovando, the distinguished magistrate of the Council of the Inquisition, who had been appointed visitor of the Council of the Indies and was
afterwards its president. Ovando no doubt already knew Mendieta by name, through his letters written from New Spain in 1562 and 1565 to the commissary, Bustamante, and to King Philip II. The questions propounded to Mendieta by Ovando concerned the civil as well as the religious administration, the two being, in consequence of the existing relations between Catholicism and Crown, very closely interwoven; and Mendieta’s replies revealed not merely opinions but a fairly complete and systematic theory of government. In his view the authority of the Viceroy of New Spain should be increased; that of the Audienza diminished, and limited exclusively to judicial matters. In the administration of justice, except in criminal cases, he solemnly desire separate tribunals for Spaniards and for Indians, which were set up in 1572. At the same time he cried out against the possession of land. As to the question of compulsory Indian labour, in agriculture and mining, he was perplexed. The difficulty was a serious one: if the Indians were not compelled to work, then, perhaps content with their land and what little they obtained from it, they would not assist the Spaniards, and these latter could not by their own unaided efforts provide for themselves and for the other Spaniards who inhabited the cities, nor could they, without the Indians, derive from the mines the profit which they looked for. Lastly, however, Mendieta pointed out that in some cases the Indians voluntarily entered into contracts to perform hard work, and that he sought, to be well encouraged at face value. His letters to the Indians impelled him to speak unfavourably of the Spanish colonists. He advocated complete separation of the two races in different towns and villages, saying that the Spaniards ought to have only such settlements as might be necessary to secure the country against forced United States, and that he would not permit any Spanish settlements situated on the borders of the Chichimecas and the savage tribes, with the sole object of guarding the frontier. The Indians, he said, ought all to be confined to certain towns chosen by themselves, and some of these towns ought to be transferred from their actual sites to more suitable. To Ovando’s inquiry, by what means the friars and the bishops could be made to dwell together in peace, his answer clearly betrays his fiery character and the partiality of his views. He suggests the appointment of two bishops in each diocese, one for the Spaniards and one for the Indians, clearly giving it to be understood, at the same time, that the bishops ought all to be chosen from the same order, and that the various diocesan churches were to be treated without either mercy or justice, although it appears from the testimony of Bishop Montufar that at that time they were performing their duties correctly, that they knew the language of the aborigines, and were on good terms with the friars. Mendieta concluded by proposing that a commissary-general of the Indies should be appointed with residence at Seville, who should arrange all the affairs of his order with the Council of the Indies. This last was the only one of his suggestions which met with approval, the first commissary-general appointed being Francisco de Guzman, in 1572, to whom Mendieta immediately wrote his congratulations.

On 26 June, 1571, his general ordered him back to New Spain, asking permission, as was usual, from the Council of the Indies. Jerónimo de Albornoz, Bishop of Tucuman, a member of the council, opposed the granting of the permission, but these difficulties were overcome in 1573, when Mendieta set out, taking with him several religious of his order. In 1575 and 1576 he was confessor of Xochimilco; in 1576 he was at Tlatelolco; and in 1585 was superior of the convent of Tlaxcala. Soon after this he accompanied the commissary, Alonso Ponce, on visitsations, and by his admirable tact and prudence kept himself out of these troubles which arose within the order from the opposition of the provincial and his partisans to Ponce’s execution of his commission. In 1591 he was guard- dian in Santa Ana of Tlaxcala, and in 1597 of Xochimilco. He was buried in the convent of Mexico.

Having undertaken to write the history of the Indies on his return from Spain, he was delayed in executing the work for twenty-five years by the large number of duties which he had to discharge, and, in addition, the consultations and negotiations with which he was occupied, he violated opinion, and was not, even known, for instance, that, while he was guardian at Tlaxcala, he was busy with the work of removing four hundred families of Christian Indians, to colonize among the Chichimecas. Mendieta’s principal work is his "Historia Eclesiastica Indiana". The general, Cristoval de Capitanfum, gave him the command to write it in 1572. He continued the work until 1596. He sent it immediately to Spain, as he had been ordered to do, and never had any further knowledge of it. No writer later than Torquemada ever quoted it, until, through the exertions of Senor Joaquin Garcia Icascalinda, the manuscript, acquired at Madrid, was printed in Mexico in 1870. It is divided into five books. The first book, consisting of seventeen chapters and a prologue, treats "Of the introduction of the Gospel and the Christian religion in the islands of Espanola and the neighbouring regions which were first discovered". The second, containing forty-one chapters and a prologue, tells "Of the rites and ceremonies of the Indians of New Spain and their infidelity". The third, containing sixty-six chapters and a prologue, treats "Of the manner in which the Faith of Our Lord Jesus Christ was introduced and planted among the Indians of New Spain". The fourth, containing forty-six chapters and a prologue, treats "Of the improvement of the Indians of New Spain and the progress of civilization of these conversions". The fifth book is divided into two parts: the first contains fifty-eight chapters, and "There are related the lives of the noble men, apostolic workers of this new conversion, who have ended in peace with a natural death"; the second part, only ten chapters, treats "Of the Friars Minor who have died for the preaching of the Gospel in this New Spain". In this work he displays, without fear or human respect, and even exaggerates at times, the vices, disorders, abuses, tyrannies, and wrongs done by the colonists; he goes so far as to flout the Government, not excepting the sovereign himself. The lofty spirit of rectitude and justice which dominates the work enhances the value of its simple, terse narration, full of information, which with which it is written, as well as its clarity and propriety of language, render it pleasing to the reader.

MENDIETA, Historia Eclesiastica Indiana (Mexico, 1870); Icascalinda, Obra (Mexico, 1905); Beristain, Biblioteca Argentina Americana septentrional (Amecama, 1880); Detap- court, Menologia franciscana (Mexico, 1873).

CAMILLUS CRIVELLI.

Mendoza, Diego Hurtado de, a Spanish diplomat and writer, and one of the greatest figures in the history of Spanish politics and letters; b. in Granada, of noble parentage, about 1503; d. in Madrid, 1575. He received his early education under private tutors and later at the University of Salamanca. A powerful personality, he was a man who carried to a successful termination whatever he undertook. He was destined originally for the Church, and acquired much knowledge suited to further his ecclesiastical advancement, both at home, where he learned to speak Arabic fluently, and at Salamanca, where he studied Latin, Greek, philosophy, civil and canon law. But he had a predilection for 15ics and a marked taste for books, and the notice of Charles V, who sent him in 1530 as ambassador to the Republic of Venice. In 1543 the emperor sent him as one of his representatives to the Council of Trent, where he successfully sustained the imperial interests. While at the Council he was appointed in 1547 special ambassador to Rome and
days he lived a life of laxity, but, during the twenty-
two years of his chancellorship, he used his great in-
fluence for the good of the Church and his country,
being one of the few great men of Spain who advocated
the cause of Columbus. His great revenues were
consumed in the erection of magnificent churches and
charitable institutions; at Valladolid he erected
at his own expense the College of Santa Cruz for poor
students, and at Toledo a hospital of the same name
for foundlings. To the latter he bequeathed his en-
tire fortune of 75,000 ducats. On his death-bed he
recommended the great Ximenes as his successor.

MEDINA Y MENDEZ, Vida del cardenal Pedro González de Meneses in "Memorial historic," pp. 185-310; SÁLABAR DE MENDOZA, Cronica del gran cardenal de Es-
pana, don Pedro Gonzalo de Mendoza (Toledo, 1625); PRESCOTT, The Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, passim, especially
pt. ii, chap. v.

MICHAEL OTT.

Mendes de Aviles, Pedro. See Florida.

Meneses, Osorio Francisco, Spanish painter, b. at
Seville, 1630; d. probably in the same place, 1705. It is
extraordinary that so very little is known of his history.
He was not only a pupil of Murillo, but by far the
most perfect of his imitators, and undoubtedly many of the
works commonly attributed to the master came from
the brush of his pupil. The few that are known to
have been painted by Murillo as his friend, that he was an intimate ac-
quaintance of Juan Garzon, with whom he worked,
that he was at one time secretary, and later on presi-
dent of the Academy of Seville, and that while in that
city he had a high reputation, not only for his skill, but
also for his personal devotedness. This reputation, it
seemed, was somewhat discounted after his death, be-
dcause it was considered that some of his copies of
Murillo's works were so accurate that he should have
signed the master's name. It was in fact suggested that
two of his copies had been accepted as genuine works
by Murillo. On the other hand, these statements are
declared by one Spanish author to have been made
only with a view of discrediting Meneses. His prin-
cipal work was painted for the church of Saint Martin
in Madrid, and represents the Prophet Elijah. There is a
fine work by him in the museum at Cadiz, and in the
museum at Seville, a picture dealing with the Order of St.
Francis. A work representing St. Catherine, which
is preserved at Cadiz, is said to have been commissed
by the same Murillo. Meneses died in 1705, and his
devotion for St. Philip Neri, and to have been buried
in the church dedicated to that saint.

QUILLIET, Dictionnaire des Peintres Espanols (Paris, 1810);
PARRA, DIAZ DE CASTRO Y VELASCO; RIVAS, Manuel,
Histoire des peintres de l'Espagne (Madrid, 1715); MAXWELL, Annals of the Artists of Spain
(London, 1848); GUARD, Vie Complète des Peintres Espanols (Paris, 1839).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Menevia, Diocese of (Menevensis).—Menevia
is said to be derived from Menapia, the name of an an-
cient Roman settlement supposed to have existed
in Pembrokeshire, or Hen Meneu (vetus rubus) where St.
David was born. From the time of the establishment
of the four vicars Apostolic in England, in 1688, Wales
belonged to the Vicariate of the Western District. In
1840 it was made a separate vicariate by Gregory XVI:
in 1850 the Catholic hierarchy was re-established, and
Wales was divided between the Dioceses of Shrewsbury
and Newport. In 1895 the principality, with the excep-
tion of Glamorganshire was again formed into a
separate vicariate Apostolic. Right Rev. Francis
Joseph Mostyn, son of Sir Pyers Mostyn, eighth baron-
et, of Talacre in North Wales, was appointed first
vicar Apostolic, his see being拒绝 Ace romant. In 1898 he was transferred to Menevia when the vicariate
was made a diocese by Leo XIII. The Bishop of Menevia is the only member of the hierarchy who holds
one of the ancient titles of pre-Reformation times.
The diocese is under the patronage of Our Lady Help of
Christians, St. David, and St. Winefride, patrons of
Wales. It covers 6500 square miles of country, most of which is rugged and mountainous; there are no large towns, so that the Catholic population of some 8500 souls is much scattered in country districts. To meet the spiritual needs of this little flock there are forty-three public churches, chapels, and stations, besides twelve chapels belonging to religious communities. The number of priests (in 1910) is eighty-two, twenty-eight regulars and fifty-four lay-sisters; more than half this number of regulars is accounted for by the monastery of Breton Benedictines, at Caermaria, near Cardigan, the convent of Franciscan Capuchins at Pantasaph, and St. Beuno’s College, the theologue of the English Jesuits. These religious, as well as Oblates of Mary Immaculate and Passionists, serve various missions in the diocese. There are convents of nine congregations of nuns, the Sisters of the Holy Ghost (White Sisters) having no less than seven. The church of Our Lady of Dolours, Wrexham, serves as pro-cathedral; on 10 August, 1909, a cathedral chapter, consisting of a provost and four canons, was erected.

The diocese is rich in relics of the Ages of Faith, thickly strewn as it is with churches once Catholic, but now used for Protestant worship, and with ruins of ancient Catholic churches and monasteries named after the countless saints of the British Church. Most famous of these is the holy well of St. Winefrid (q. v.), at Holywell, which is and always has been in Catholic hands.

This miraculous well has been a centre of pilgrimage from the earliest days of authentic Welsh history, and the saint still attracts her votaries to the shrine, and dispenses her miraculous favours even in this unbelieving age. The beautiful building which stands over the well was erected towards the close of the fifteenth century. The mission has been served by the Society of Jesus since about 1600. St. Mary’s College is a small episcopal college in the town, for the education of boys to supply priests for the diocese; the Welsh language is a prominent feature in the curriculum. The Diocese of Menevia is the restoration of the ancient Catholic Diocese of St. David’s, the foundation of which, in the latter half of the sixth century, is traditionally attributed to that saint. The contention of recent historians that there were no territorial bishops in Wales at so early a date, but only monastic bishops without sees, is considered baseless by Dr. Zimmer, no partisan authority. “Though monasticism was strong in it, it did not impart to the (Welsh) Church either its character or its form” (Realeencyklopadie, X. 224). The four independent Welsh sees were co-extensive with the four independent principalities that had come into being during the sixth century; Menevia with Dyfed, Llandaff with Gwent, St. Asaph with Powys, Bangor with Gwyneudd.

The records of the history of the diocese before Norman rule are very fragmentary, consisting of a few chance references in old chronicles, such as “Annales Cambriae” and “Brut y Tywysogion” (Rolls Series). Originally corresponding with the boundaries of Dyfed (Demetia), St. David’s eventually comprised all the country south of the River Dovey and west of the English border, with the exception of the greater part of Glamorganshire, in all some 3800 square miles. Though it was never an archbishopric, it is far from clear when St. David’s came definitely under the metropolitan jurisdiction of Canterbury. About 1115, however, Henry I intruded a Norman, Bernard (1115–1147), into the see. Bernard’s rule was wise and vigorous; but on the death of Henry he claimed Metropolitan jurisdiction over Wales, and presented his suit unsuccessfully before six successive popes. This claim was afterwards revived in the time of Giraldus Cambrensis (q. v.). Among the more famous bishops who held the see before the Reformation may be mentioned Peter de Leia (1176–1203), who began the building of the present cathedral of St. David’s; Henry Gower (1328–47); and Edward Vaughan (1509–20), who made considerable additions to the same; the learned John Thorsby (1347–50) served the see up to the Archbishopric of York; Henry Chicheley (q. v.) (1408–14), afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury; and the notorious William Barlow (1536–48), the so-called consecrator of Archbishop Parker in 1559. The last Catholic bishop, Henry Morgan (1554–59), was, like the rest of the Catholic bishops, deprived of his see by Elizabeth, but was saved by death from the imprisonment for the Faith.

The oldest portions of the cathedral, dating from 1180, belong to the period of transition from the Early to the Decorated style of architecture; the additions of Bishop Gower, including the beautiful stone rood screen, are excellent examples of the Decorated style, while to the north of the cathedral are the ruins of his magnificent episcopal palace. In 1862 a partial restoration of the cathedral was begun by Sir G. G. Scott. The shrine of St. David in the cathedral was a famous place of pilgrimage; it is said that by favour of Calistus II, who canonized the saint, two pilgrimages to St. David’s were to be accounted equal to one to Rome:—

Menevian pete bis, Roman adire si vis;  
Merces asqua tibi redditur hic et ibi;

Roma semel, quantum dat bis Menevia, tantum  
(anient lines found at the shrine by Archbishop Peckham, 1240–92).


Kenele Digby Beste.

Mengarini, Gregorio, pioneer missionary of the Flathead tribe (q. v.) and philologist of their language, b. in Rome, 21 July, 1811; d. at Santa Clara, California, 23 September, 1886. He entered the Jesuit novitiate in 1828, when barely seventeen, and later served as instructor in grammar, for which his philological bent particularly fitted him, at Rome, Modena, and Reggio. While studying at the Roman College in 1839, a letter from Bishop Rosati of St. Louis, voicing the appeal of the Flatheads for missionary priests, was read out in the refectory, and Mengarini was at
Mengs moved to volunteer for the work. Ordained in March, 1840, he sailed with Father Cotting, another volunteer, from Leghorn on 23 July, and after a tedious nine weeks' voyage landed at Philadelphia. From Baltimore the missionaries found their way to the University of Georgetown, District of Columbia, and a little later to St. Louis, where it was decided Father Cotting should remain. Mengarini was chosen for the distant mission of the upper Missouri, partly on account of his voice and knowledge of music—possessions of no little value in Indian mission work. On 24 April, 1841, Fathers De Smet, Mengarini, and Point, with the lay brothers Specht, Huett, and Classens, and nine other companions, began the long journey by river and overland trail to Fort Hall, Idaho, and thence to Flathead country. On the Feast of the Assumption (15 August), and found a party of Flatheads waiting to conduct them to their final destination. It was nearly a month later when they arrived at the chosen site on St. Mary's river, Montana, in the Flathead country, and began the foundations of the log mission, the missionaries themselves leading the work of cutting the frozen earth with axes. The church and house were of logs plastered between with clay, and were thatched with reeds, the rooms being partitioned with curtains of deerskin and thin scraped deerskin being used in lieu of glass for the windows. The winter cold was so intense that the buffalo-skin robes in which they were arrived, were found to be thawed out each morning. To the native of sunny Italy these early winters in Montana mountains were among the most vivid recollections of later years.

The missionaries at once began the study of the language, translating into it simple prayers and hymns. Mengarini's diligence and success in this work, which was the standard for the cognate dialects. He taught the children to sing in Salish hymns of his own composition, and even trained an Indian band for service on feast days. The work progressed until 1849, when, in consequence of the irruptions of the Blackfeet and the defection and lapse of a large part of the Flathead tribe under a rival claimant for the chiefship, it was decided to close the mission, and Mengarini was summoned to join Father Accolti, the superior of the north-western Jesuit missions, in Oregon. About a year later, on request of Archbishop Alemany of San Francisco for Jesuit workers, he was sent to aid in a mission being fitted up at the Columbia City mission which was the nucleus of the present college. In the meantime the repentant Flatheads had sent to Oregon to ask for his return. They were told this was impossible as he was then assigned to another station, but on their urgent desire the Flathead mission was re-established at St. Ignatius in 1851. Mengarini remained at Santa Clara for the rest of his life, acting for thirty years as treasurer or vice-president, until a stroke of apoplexy and failing sight caused his retirement from active duties. The hardest trial came when his eyes became too weak to allow him to read Masse. A third stroke of apoplexy ended his life work in his seventy-sixth year.

Mengarini's principal contribution to philology is his "Salish or Flathead Grammar; Grammatica lingua Selica"—published by the Cramoisy Press (New York, 1861) from the third manuscript copy, the first two, laboriously written out by him, having been lost by Indian carelessness or accident. Originally intended solely for the use of the missionaries, it was written in Latin, and he himself always said that the first draft was the most correct. He also furnished vocabularies of the cognate Salish languages—of Shwomyel (Colville), S'chitsui (Cœur d'Alene), and Salish proper (Flathead) in Powell's "Contributions to North American Ethnology", I (Washington, 1877), and of the Santa Clara dialect of California in Power's "Tribes of California", volume III of the same series, published in the same year. He contributed some linguistic notes in the "Journal of the Anthropological Institute of New York", I (1871-2). His interesting personal memoir, "The Rocky Mountains", published in the Woodstock Letters for 1888, was dictated a few months before his death.

In addition to the memoir "Obituary Notice in Woodstock Letters, XVI (Woodstock, Maryland, 1887); SOMMERVOGEL, Bib. de l. C. de J., Bibliogr. V (new ed., Brussels and Paris, 1894); FILLING, Bibliography of the Salishan Languages in Brit. Amer. Ethnology (Washington, 1883); SHEA, Catholic Missions (New York, 1884), JAMES MOONEY.
MENNAS

extraordinary merit, and his original pictures are ec-
estic in their composition and technique, correct in
design, smooth in execution, but somewhat too sweet,
and a trifle insipid. As a portrait painter, he had
great success, and his works in pastel and crayon are
amongst his finest creations. There are some
copies of his miniatures in Berlin, and there
are numerous engravings of his paintings
in Dresden and Vienna, and in the former
city are some excellent miniature portraits and some
carved pictures. The result was the painting of the
 Ecclesiastic of the Artillery of the East
(London, 1848); HUGARD, Vie Complexe des Peintres Espagnols
(Paris, 1839).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople from 536 to
552. Early in 536 Pope St. Agapetus came to
Constantinople on a political mission forced on him by the
Gothic King, Theodahad. Anthimus, Archbishop of
Trebizond, had just been transferred to Constantinople
through the influence of the Empress Theodora, with
whose Monophysite leanings he was in sympathy.
Agapetus promptly deposed Anthimus and he conse-
crated Mennas patriarch. Anthimus was deposed partly
because his transfer from one see to another
was uncanonical, and partly on account of his doubts
as to the validity of the question of the ancient
liturgical divisions, which should be allowed to return to his old see.
Agapetus was preparing to deal with this question when he died.
Mennas proceeded with the affair at a synod held in
Constantinople the same year, 536, presiding over it,
the place of honour on his right hand being assigned to
five Italian bishops who represented the Apostolic See,
resulting in the removal of Anthimus, who failed to ap-
pear and vindicate his orthodoxy, was excommunicated
together with several of his adherents. In 543
the Emperor Justinian acting with the approval, if not
under the prompting of Mennas and the Roman rep-
resentative, Pelagius, issued his celebrated edict against
the teaching of Origen, at the same time directing
Mennas to proceed to consider the question.
No record of this synod has been preserved, but Hefele
states it to be more than probable that the
celebrated fifteen Anathemas of Origen, mistaken-
ly ascribed to the Fifth Ecumenical Council, were
there promulgated. We now come to the part played
by Mennas in the initial stage of the Three Chapters
controversy in the Constantinople Council of 541,
first from whom the emperor Justinian demanded sub-
scription to the edict anathematizing the Three Chap-
ters. He hesitated, but eventually gave
way on the understanding that his subscription should be
returned to him if the pope disapproved. Later on
he compelled his suffragans to subscribe. Many of them
complained to the papal legate Stephen of the
constraint put upon them. Stephen broke off con-
munion with Mennas. When Pope Vigilius arrived
at Constantinople in 547, he cut Mennas off from
Church communion for four months. Mennas re-
torted by striking the pope's name off the diptychs.
The pope, listening to his "Jews and Idiots", the two were
reconciled. In 551 Mennas was again excommunicated.
When Vigilius and Justinian came to terms,
Mennas once more made his peace with the former,
asking pardon for having communicated with those
whom the pope had excommunicated. He died in
August, 552.

Mennonites, a Protestant denomination of Europe
and America which arose in Switzerland in the six-
teenth century and derived its name from Menno
Simons, its leader in Holland. Menno Simons
was born in 1492 at Wittumser in Friesland. In 1515 or
1516 he was ordained to the Catholic priesthood
and appointed assistant at Pingen not far from Wittum-
ser. Later (1532) he was named pastor of his native
place, but 12 January, 1536, resigned his charge and
became an Anabaptist elder. The rest of his life was
devoted to the interests of the new sect which he had
joined. Though not an imposing personality he ex-
ercised no small influence as a speaker and more par-
cipant. As such he was held in esteem by the leaders
of Anabaptist views. His death occurred 13 January,
1559, at Wustenfelde in Holstein. The opinions held
by Menno Simons and the Mennonites originated in
Switzerland. In 1525 Grebel and Manz founded an
Anabaptist community at Zürich. Persecution fol-
lowed upon the very foundation of the new sect, and it
was exercised against its members until 1710 in vari-
ous parts of Switzerland. It was powerless to effect
suppression and a few communities exist even at pres-
ent. About 1620 the Swiss Mennonites split into
Amish or Upland Mennonites and Lowland Mennon-
ites. The former differ from the latter in the belief
excommunication dissolves marriage, in their re-
jection of buttons and of the practice of shaving.
During Menno's lifetime his followers in Holland di-
vided (1554) into "Flemings" and "Waterlanders",
on account of their divergent views on excommunica-
tion. The former subsequently split up into different
parties and dwindled into insignificance, not more
than three congregations remaining at present in Hol-
land. Division also resulted in the division in Germany
until in 1811 they united, dropping the name of Mennon-
ites and called themselves "Doodsgesinde" (Baptist
persuasion), their present official designation in Hol-
land. Menno founded congregations exclusively in
Holland and Northwestern Germany. Mennonite
communities existed at an early date, however, in
South Germany where they were connected on the
west with the Swiss movement, and are found at
present in other parts of the empire, chiefly in eastern
Prussia. The offer of extensive land and the assur-
ance of religious liberty caused a few thousand Ger-
mann Mennonites to emigrate to Southern Russia
(1779). This emigration movement continued until
1824, and resulted in the foundation of comparatively
important Mennonite colonies. In America the first
congregation was founded in 1683 at Germantown,
Pennsylvania. Subsequently immigration from Ger-
mans, Holland, Switzerland, and since 1870 from Rus-
 sia, considerably increased the number of the sect in
North America. There are twelve different branches
in the United States in sects whose combined membership does not reach 1000.
Among the peculiar views of the Mennonites are the following: repudiation of infant
baptism, oaths, law-suits, civil office-holding and the bearing of arms. Baptism of adults and the Lord's
Supper, in which Jesus Christ is not really present, are retained, but not as sacraments properly so-called.
The necessity to witness against wrong is important and an extensive use is made of excommunication.
All these views, however, are no longer universally held. Some Mennonites now accepting secular
offices. The polity is congregational, with bishops, elders, and deacons.
The aggregate membership of the Mennonites is now usually given as about 250,000; of these there are
some 60,000 in Holland; 18,000 in Germany; 70,000 in Russia; 1500 in Switzerland; 20,000 in Canada, and
according to Dr. Carroll (Christian Advocate, New York, 27 January, 1910), 55,007 in the United States.

Chamber, Bibliotheca Reformatorum Nederlandica, II and V (The Hague, 1881-1882); 11th, EKDERS, Geschichte der
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Mechnochio, Giovanni Stefano, Jesuit Biblical
scholar, b. at Padua, 1575; d. in Rome, 4 Feb., 1655.
He entered the Society of Jesus, 25 May, 1594. After the usual years of training and of teaching the classics, he became master of sacred scripture and then of sacred theology at Milan; thereafter began his long life of superintendence. He was successively superior of Cremona, Milan, and Genoa, rector of the Roman College, provincial of the provinces of Milan and Rome, assistant of Italy, and admonitor to the Fathers-General Carafa and Piccolomini. The exegetical work of Menochio is still deservedly famous. His first essay in this line was a politico-Biblical study: "Hieropolitici, sive Institutiones Politicae et Sacrae Scripturis depromptae", 956 pages (Lyons, 1625). This book on theocratic politics was dedicated to Cardinal Alessandro Osini. A second edition (Cologne, 1628) was dedicated to Ferdinand III. The Jesuit poet Sarbiewski made this study the subject of an ode (see "Lyrica", II, n. 18).

The next year there appeared an economic study of the Bible: "Institutiones Economicae ex Sacra Liternis depromptae", 543 pages (Lyons, 1627). The author translated into Italian these lessons on the care of one's own household; this translation was a success, and a new edition appeared in 1653, 542 pages (Venice, 1656). The work by which Menochio lives and will live is his "Brevis Explicatio Sensus Litteralis Sacre Scripturae optimus quibusque Autoribus per Epitomen Collecta", 3 vols., 115 pages, 449, 549 + 29 (Cologne, 1630). Many other editions of this commentary have been published in many languages, usually in two parts, but sometimes bound in three, form an office-book, which in the Greek Church, corresponds, though very roughly, to the Proprium Sanctorum of the Breviary. They include all the movable parts of the services connected with the commemoration of saints and in particular the canons sung in the Orthros, the office which corresponds in our Book of Synaxaria, i.e. the historical notices regarding the saints of the day, which are always inserted between the sixth and seventh odes of the canon. The Synaxaries are read in this place very much as the Martyrology for the day is interpolated in the choral recitation of Prime in the offices of Western Christendom.

Men of Understanding (Hominem Intelligendi), name assumed by a heretical sect which in 1410–11 was cited before the Inquisition at Brussels. Its leaders were Egidius Cantorius, an illiterate layman, and the Carmelite William of Hildernis, near Bergen-op-Zoom. The sect was doctrinally related with the earlier Brethren of the Free Spirit. It taught the essential being of all was the living and ever-changing demons, maintained that the soul of man cannot be defiled by bodily sin, and believed in a mystical state of illumination and union with God so perfect, that it exempted from all subjection to moral and ecclesias-

cal laws and was an infallible pledge of salvation. Both teachings girded in the view that man was the creature he has been favoured. Cantorius in a moment of religious exaltation went so far as to run nude through the streets of Brussels declaring himself the saviour of mankind. About 1410 Peter d'Ailly, Bishop of Cambrai, seems to have taken the first steps towards the suppression of the heresy. William of Hildernis consented to a retraction of the sincerity of which appeared doubtful. In 1411 a second investigation resulted in another retraction, but also in a sentence compelling William to return permanently to an extra-diocesan Carmelite monastery after three years' detention in one of the episcopal castles. No information has reached us respecting the result of the inquisitorial procedure against the other members of the sect.


N. A. WEBER.

Menologium.—Although the word Menologium (in English also written Menology and Menologe) has been in some measure, as we shall see, adopted for Western use, it is originally and in strictness a name describing a particular service-book of the Greek Church. From its derivation the term Menologium \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \lambda \gamma \omega \lambda \iota \gamma \iota \mu \alpha \) from \( \mu \nu \nu \pi \tau \alpha \eta \) "a month" means "month-book," in other words, a book arranged according to the months. Like a calendar, it is a religious almanac, e.g. lectionary (q. v.), the word has been used in several quite distinct senses by writers of authority, and the main purpose of the present notice must be to try to elucidate this confusion.

(1) In the first place Menologium is not unfrequently used as synonymous with Menason (\( \mu \varepsilon \nu \lambda \gamma \omega \lambda \iota \gamma \iota \delta \alpha \nu \) \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \lambda \gamma \omega \lambda \iota \gamma \iota \mu \alpha \)). The Menason is a collection of both Church and world events but sometimes bound in three, form an office-book, which in the Greek Church, corresponds, though very roughly, to the Proprium Sanctorum of the Breviary. They include all the movable parts of the services connected with the commemoration of saints and in particular the canons sung in the Orthros, the office which corresponds in our Book of Synaxaries, i.e. the historical notices regarding the saints of the day, which are always inserted between the sixth and seventh odes of the canon. The Synaxaries are read in this place very much as the Martyrology for the day is interpolated in the choral recitation of Prime in the offices of Western Christendom.

(2) Secondly and more frequently, the term Menologium is used to denote the bare collection of those historical notices just mentioned, without the odes and the other matter of the canon in which they are inserted. Such a collection, consisting as it does purely of historical matter, bears a considerable resemblance, as will be readily understood, to our Martyrology, although we differ in method. It is, however, the most part considerably larger and fuller than those found in our Martyrology, while on the other hand the number of entries is smaller. The "Menology of Basil", a work of early date often referred to in connection with the history of the Greek Offices, is a book of this class.

(3) Thirdly, it frequently happens that the tables of scriptural lessons, arranged according to months and saints' days, which are often found at the beginning of manuscripts of the gospels or other lectionaries, are described as menologe. The saints' days are briefly named and the readings indicated beside each; thus the document so designated corresponds much more closely to a calendar than anything else of Western use to which we can compare it.

(4) Lastly the word Menologium is very widely applied to the collections of long lives of the saints of the Greek Church, whenever these lives, as commonly happens, are arranged according to months and the days of the month. This arrangement has always been a favourite one also in the great Legendaria of the West, and it might be illustrated by the "Acts of Thomas", the well-known Lives of the Saints by Surius. The Greek compilers however regard September as the first and August as the last month of the ecclesiastical year.
As for propriety of usage it must be confessed that the question is primarily one of convenience; but on the whole it seems desirable that the term Menologium should be limited to the fourth acceptance among those just given. One of the most important collections of this kind is that made by a writer in the second half of the tenth century known to us as Symeon Metaphrastes. Subsequently it was adopted by Father Delahaye and Professor Albert Ehrhard working independently succeeded for the first time in correctly grouping together the works which are really attributable to this author, but great uncertainty still remains as to the provenance of his materials, and as to the relation between this collection and certain contracted biographies of which existence among the manuscripts of our great libraries. The synaxaries, or histories for liturgical use, are nearly all extracted from the older Menologias, but Fr. Delahaye who has given special attention to the study of this class of documents, considers that the authors of these compendia have added, though sparsely, materials of their own, derived from various sources. (See Delahaye in his preface to the “Synaxarium Eccles.” C.p., published as a Propylleum to the “Acta SS.” for November, lix–lxxxvi.)

Menologies in the West.—The fact that the word Martyrology (q. v.) was already consecrated to a liturgical or quasi-liturgical compilation arranged according to the anniversaries and days and the canonized saints and festivals universally received, probably led to the employment of the term Menologium for works of a somewhat analogous character, of private authority, not intended for liturgical use and including the names and agnia of persons in repute for sanctity but not in any sense canonized Saints. In most monastic orders it is the custom to commemorate the memory of their dead brethren specially renowned for holiness or learning. In more than one such order during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the collection of these short eulogistic biographies was printed under the name of Menologium and generally so arranged as to form a selection for each day of the year. Since they were made by private authority which could not pronounce judgment on the sanctity of those so commemorated, the Church prohibited the reading of these compilations as part of the Divine Office; but this did not prevent the formation of such menologies for private use or even the reading of them aloud in the chapter-houses and refectories of the monastery. Thus the collection in 1833 by the Franciscan Fortunatus Huber of the abbreviated lives of those of the Friars Minor who had died in the order of sanctity, printed in 1691 under the title of “Menologium Franciscanum,” was evidently intended for public recitation. In lieu of the concluding formula “Et alibi aliorum” “et ceterum,” the Roman Martyrology, the compiler suggests “as the feria tomentaria ciusuacumque diei the three verses of the Apostles’ Creed,” perhaps to substitute “Post hoc vidi turbam magnam.” The earliest printed work of this kind is possibly that which bears the title “Menologium Carmelitanae” compiled by the Carmelite, Saracenus, and printed at Bologna in 1657; but this is not arranged by day in the order of the ecclesiastical year, and it does not include members of the order yet uncanonized. A year or two later, in 1630, Father Henriquez published at Antwerp his “Menologium Cisterciense.” That no general custom then existed of reading the Menology at table appears from his remark: “It would not appear unsuitable if it (the Menologium) were read aloud to the guest (if not or at least in the refectorry at the beginning of dinner or supper).” Again quite a number of works have been printed under the name Menologium by Fathers of the Society of Jesus, one or other of which it has been and still is the custom of the order to read aloud in the refectories during part of the evening meal, though Fathers Nuremberg and Nadaud compiled collections of a similar character, they did not bear the name Menologium. The earliest Jesuit compilation which is so styled seems to have been printed in the year 1669. A more elaborate Menologium was that compiled by Father Patrignani in 1730; and great collections were made during the last century by Father de Guerry for the publication of a series of such menologies, divided according to the groups of provinces of the Society called “Assistencies.” The author did not live to complete his task, but the menologies have been published by other hands since his death. The term Menologium is also loosely used for any calendar divided into months, as, for example, the “Anglo-Saxon Menologium” first published by Hickes.


Herbert Thurston.

Menominee Indians, a considerable tribe of Algonquian linguistic stock, formerly ranging over north-eastern Wisconsin to the west of Menominee River and Green Bay, and now occupying a reservation in Shawano including the Menominee forest, and districts in the territory. The name by which they are commonly known (translated Folles Avoines by the French) is taken from their term for the wild rice, menomia, Lat. Zizania aquatica, which grows abundantly in the small lakes, and forms a staple food of the tribes of that region. Before their first contact with the whites the Menominee may have numbered about 3000 souls; in 1879 they were officially reported at 1487. The earliest known explorer among the Menominee was Champlain’s interpreter, Jean Nicolet, who visited the tribes about Green Bay in 1634, being probably the first white man within the present State of Wisconsin. In 1640 they are mentioned under the name of Maroons, and in the Jesuit’s Journal of the Jesuit Le Jeune, as one of the tribes without missionaries. In the “Relation” for 1657–8 they are spoken of as Maluminek, allied with the Nookack and Winnebago and “reaping without sowing” a wild rye considered superior to corn, the first notice of the now well-known wild rice.

In May, 1670, the Jesuit explorer Claude Allouez visited them near the mouth of the Menominee River. They were then greatly reduced by wars, probably with their hereditary enemies, the Sioux. They listened to his teaching and asked him to remain. A small mission, St. Michel, was established, and placed under the jurisdiction of the central Potawatomie mission of St. Francis Xavier at Green Bay. In 1673 the Jesuit Louis André arrived and ministered for several years both to the Menominee and to other tribes, travelling in summer by bark canoe and in winter over the ice. Soon after his arrival he found set up an image of the sun, with a number of net flosters attached, as a sacrifice to the sun for a prosperous fishing season, their exertions having been thus far disappointing. After explaining that the sun was not a god, he persuaded them to allow him to substitute a crucifix. The next morning the fish entered the river in such abundance that the Indians, firmly convinced of the efficacy of his teaching, crowded to be instructed every evening on their return from their fishing grounds. Flokta or gills being worn by them to abandon their superstitious dream ceremonies on setting out against the Sioux, although apparently he was unable to prevent the expedition. Among his converts was a principal medicine-man, who claimed the thunder spirit as his special medicine, and was accustomed to invoke it with songs and naked
In 1847 he was succeeded by Father F. J. Bonduel, who added another school, and who in turn was succeeded in 1852 by Fr. Otho Skolla, the first of the Franciscans, to whom the care of this mission has since been committed. Two years later FatherAndre's cabin, with all that it contained, was burned by an Indian whose two small children, after one had been baptized, had been killed by an enemy, the grief-stricken father, in Indian fashion, attributing his misfortune to the ceremony. The Menominee mission grew and flourished until the outbreak of the long war in 1812, which continued for thirty years, and resulted in the almost complete destruction of the Fox tribe and the ruin of the Wisconsin missions. Close upon this came the seven years' French and Indian War (1754—60); the Pontiac war (1763—4); the Revolution and its Indian war of 1778 and 1779; and finally Tippecanoe and the War of 1812 (1811—15). In all of these the Menominee, like the Sauk and Fox tribes of the central region, had their part, fighting on the French side until the fall of Quebec and afterwards supporting the English against the United States. In 1817 they made their peace with the United States, and by various subsequent treaties, have disposed of all of their ancient territory excepting their present reservation of about 360 square miles.

In 1762 the Jesuit missions had been suppressed by the French Government, and "for thirty years there was no priest west of Detroit." (Shea quoting McCabe.) Deprived of their teachers and for sixty years compelled to make almost constant war against the advancing whites, a large part of the former missions was taken by the Menominee in all the tribes relaxed into paganism, while still cherishing an affection for their former friends. In 1823 the Ottawa tribe of lower Michigan addressed to Congress two remarkable petitions asking to have Jesuit missionaries again sent among them. No response came, but in 1825 Father J. V. Badin made a tour of the lake tribes, in 1827 Father Dejean visited the Ojibwa at Mackinaw and in 1829 founded the new Ottawa mission at Arbre Croche (HARBOR Springs, Michigan), and in 1830 Father Samuel Massuchelli established a school and church among the Menominee at Green Bay, for which the Government, in accordance with the policy at that period, made an appropriation. Soon afterwards Father Massuchelli extended his labours to the Winnebago. A church for the few white residents had already been begun by Father Gabriel Richard in 1823. Father Massuchelli was assisted in the school by two sisters and by Mrs. Rosalie Dousman (1831), who continued in the work for a number of years. Later missions of the same period were Fathers Simon Sander, Redemptorist, and T. J. Van den Broeck. In 1827 an Episcopal mission was started, but was discontinued in 1838 owing to non-attendance of the Indians. In 1844 Fr. Van den Broeck established a second mission, St. Francis, at Lake Powahogan on the Wolf River, which within a short time had 400 Indians.

In 1847 he was succeeded by Father F. J. Bonduel, who added another school, and who in turn was succeeded in 1852 by Fr. Otho Skolla, the first of the Franciscans, to whom the care of this mission has since been committed. Two years later Father Andre's cabin, with all that it contained, was burned by an Indian whose two small children, after one had been baptized, had been killed by an enemy, the grief-stricken father, in Indian fashion, attributing his misfortune to the ceremony. The Menominee mission grew and flourished until the outbreak of the long war in 1812, which continued for thirty years, and resulted in the almost complete destruction of the Fox tribe and the ruin of the Wisconsin missions. Close upon this came the seven years' French and Indian War (1754—60); the Pontiac war (1763—4); the Revolution and its Indian war of 1778 and 1779; and finally Tippecanoe and the War of 1812 (1811—15). In all of these the Menominee, like the Sauk and Fox tribes of the central region, had their part, fighting on the French side until the fall of Quebec and afterwards supporting the English against the United States. In 1817 they made their peace with the United States, and by various subsequent treaties, have disposed of all of their ancient territory excepting their present reservation of about 360 square miles.

In 1762 the Jesuit missions had been suppressed by the French Government, and "for thirty years there was no priest west of Detroit." (Shea quoting McCabe.) Deprived of their teachers and for sixty years compelled to make almost constant war against the advancing whites, a large part of the former missions was taken by the Menominee in all the tribes relaxed into paganism, while still cherishing an affection for their former friends. In 1823 the Ottawa tribe of lower Michigan addressed to Congress two remarkable petitions asking to have Jesuit missionaries again sent among them. No response came, but in 1825 Father J. V. Badin made a tour of the lake tribes, in 1827 Father Dejean visited the Ojibwa at Mackinaw and in 1829 founded the new Ottawa mission at Arbre Croche (HARBOR Springs, Michigan), and in 1830 Father Samuel Massuchelli established a school and church among the Menominee at Green Bay, for which the Government, in accordance with the policy at that period, made an appropriation. Soon afterwards Father Massuchelli extended his labours to the Winnebago. A church for the few white residents had already been begun by Father Gabriel Richard in 1823. Father Massuchelli was assisted in the school by two sisters and by Mrs. Rosalie Dousman (1831), who continued in the work for a number of years. Later missions of the same period were Fathers Simon Sander, Redemptorist, and T. J. Van den Broeck. In 1827 an Episcopal mission was started, but was discontinued in 1838 owing to non-attendance of the Indians. In 1844 Fr. Van den Broeck established a second mission, St. Francis, at Lake Powahogan on the Wolf River, which within a short time had 400 Indians.
on the language, all still in manuscript. His present successor at the mission, Father Blase Krake of the same order, is also a master of the language, of which he has written a manuscript grammar and dictionary. A vocabulary of some thirty pages accompanies Hoffman’s monograph.


JAMES MOONEY.

Mensa, Mensal Revenue (Lat. Mensa, table).—The Latin word mensa has for its primitive signification "a table for meals," it designates by expropriation the expenses, or better, the necessary resources of subsistence, and generally, all the resources for personal support. He who lives at the expense of another, and at his table, is his "commensal." In ecclesiastical language, the mensa is that portion of the property of a church which is appropriated to defraying the expenses of the prelate or other clergy who administers it. The property of the church is divided between the two, and is administered at the will of the one or the other. Thus, in a cathedral, to which both the bishop and the chapter belong, the bishop's mensa is distinct from that of the chapter, the former consisting of property the revenues of which are enjoyed by the prelate, the latter by the chapter. The objection is raised that the church has neither individual nor corporate property, for the primitive mensa of the chapter has almost everywhere been divided among the canons, each of whom has his personal share under the designation of a "prebend." Similarly, in the case of abbeys given in commendam (cf. c. ÉDOERIC, 21, De rescriptio), the abbatial mensa, which the abbot enjoys, is distinct from the canonic mensa, which is appropriated to the maintenance of the religious community. The curial mensa, which is of later origin, is of the same nature: the property reserved for the personal maintenance of the parish priest, as distinct from that applied to the expenses of worship or to the support of other clergy, has been regarded as curial mensa. To constitute a mensa curial a canonical seal is required. The reason is enough that a certain portion of church property be appropriated to the maintenance of the clergy (for in that case every benefice would be a mensa, which is untrue); it is necessary that there be a partition made in the property of one particular church so as to appropriate certain property to the maintenance of the clergy, or of the clergy subject to him; it follows, therefore, that the administration of this property belongs to those who enjoy it.

Thus the bishop, the secular abbot, the chapter, the religious community, administer, each within appropriate limits, the property of their respective mensae, without being liable to any accounting for the employment of the same; but this is the case only who has a curial mensa. The other resources of the cathedral or parish church, or monastery, destined for religious worship, pious works, the maintenance of buildings, etc., are subject to the general or special rules for the administration of church property, whether this be done by church committees, trustees, or other administrative organ, or by the rector of the church as sole administrator; in all cases an accounting is due to the bishop and, in general, to the ecclesiastical authorities, for the administration of such property and for the use to which all the revenues and resources accruing may have been put, whereas no one is accountable for the use of his mensal property. There are however some exceptions to this principle; the mensa, particularly episcopal mensa, are legal entities, property and foundations have in the course of centuries often been annexed to them for purposes other than the maintenance of prelates; these properties or foundations may be real "opera pia" or pious works in the canonical sense. In this way some episcopal mensae are larger than the property of the bishop himself, the property of aged or infirm priests, also for educational and other establishments; to some curial mensae schools or hospitals are attached, and for these various good works administrative rules may be provided at the time of their foundation. But such cases it is easily seen are later extensions, foreign to the primary and chief aim of the mensa. Even in respect to these properties the old rule applies, in the sense that they are not common ecclesiastical possessions and are not administered as such, but after the manner of mensal property.

Although appropriated to the maintenance of certain definite persons, mensal property is nevertheless church property, and its administrator is bound to observe the canonical rules concerning it. As to the administration strictly speaking, he must keep the property in good condition and execute all works expedient to that end; in short, he must act like a good head of a household. But he cannot do anything that would infringe upon proprietary rights, for he is not the property owner: any annuities or other endowments regarded as similar to alienation, is forbidden him, excepting under prescribed juridical formalities, under pain of excommunication (Extrav. Ambit. De reb. eccl. non alienandis; see also BENEFICE; PROPERTY, ALIENATION OF CHURCH). The chief of these prescribed formalities is the Apostolic authorization, which in every individual case is to be obtained. For the alienation or similar contract is to the advantage of the Church. For the alienation of mensal property, or for making any similar contract, the bishop is, in particular, bound to safeguard himself with the consent of the chapter (S. C. Concilii, 25 July, 1891).

HISTORY.—Like all ecclesiastical institutions, the mensa has its appropriate history, and the result of various modifications. In the first ages, all the church property of a diocese formed but one mass connected, like everything else, with the principal, or cathedral church. The administration of it belonged to the bishop alone, who administered it himself or through his ecclesias or his deacons. The clergy benefited accordingly in the form of a mensa, sometimes fixed (one-fourth in Italy, one-third in Spain; see the collected texts, c. 23-30, C. XII, q. ii; c. 1-3, C. X, q. iii), sometimes left to the equitable decision of the bishop. Soon the churches outside of the episcopal city had distinct administrations of their own, and the wealth appropriated to religious worship or to the support of the clergy was given to each in the same way. After the fifth century we find bishops granting to certain clerics church property, by way of "precarium," i. e. property revocable at will, which such clerics used for their own support. So long as the bishop, the abbot, or the rector of the church remained faithfully in residence and discharged his ecclesiastical functions, the property in question, both to the inferior clergy, or the monks, a part of the ecclesiastical wealth that they might thence draw their support. But when the early Carolingians, especially Charles Martel, habitually gave abbey and churches to their companions in arms, and when bishops nominated by royal favour ceased to reside habitually at their sees, there arose a kind of division and opposition between the prelate, abbot, or bishop and the community of monks or clerics, who were on more than one occasion left in want by greedy or negligent superiors. The remedy for this was the institution of mensae.

To secure what was necessary to the community, the mensae were compelled to reserve for its use a sufficient portion of the property of the church or monastery. Thus the superior's administration was made lighter for him, while he could enjoy in peace and quiet
MENSING

the balance of the property reserved for his own proper use (indominicatum); on the other hand the community gained, besides material security, a renovation of very fostered material life (via coenobii) being a cause of relaxation of discipline. The Carolingian reforms, notably those of Louis the Pious, were chiefly responsible for the establishment of menas properly imposed and regulated in regard to monasteries; as to cathedrals the menas was more commonly a benevolent concession on the part of the bishop, who in this way fostered communal life (via coenobii) among his clergy. This community life becoming more and more rare after the end of the ninth century, each canon received his own share of the mensal revenues—his "prebend". Later on, indeed, the canons often had the separate administration of their respective properties, either as the result of partition or, more particularly, in pursuance of provisions made in the foundation. The menes, of whatever character, were legally capable of acquiring additions. It was through them that church property, intended, as before the division, not only for the support of the clergy, but for all religious and charitable works, was re-established.

A. BOUDINHON

Mensing (Mensing), John, theologian and celebrated opponent of Luther, b. according to some at Zutphen, Holland, but more probably at Magdeburg, Saxony, date unknown; d. about 1541. In 1495 he entered the Dominican Order and made part of his theological studies in the studium of his province. Matriculating at the university of Wittenberg in 1515, he became a doctor of divinity that year and the following year received in Frankfort-on-the-Oder the doctorate in theology from the hands of the general of his order. According to the Dominican historian, Quétif, he taught theology in 1514 in the monastery at Ulm, but it is highly improbable that Mensing, belonging to the province of Saxony, should have acted as a doctor of divinity in a German university in 1514 and 1515. He was also in the studium of his province, Mensing zealously entered into all the controversies with the sectaries. From 1522 to 1524 he occupied the pulpit in the cathedral of Magdeburg, where he also composed his first apologetic works on the Sacrifice of the Mass. Notwithstanding his efforts, the boldness of the enemy forced him to leave and seek other means of restriction. Under the influence of Princess Margaretha von Anhalt, who ruled during the minority of her son, he proceeded to Dessau to support her in her efforts against heresy in her territory. In 1529 he was professor in the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder and preacher in the cathedral. The following year he attended, as theologian to the Elector Joseph von Anhalt, the Diet of Augsburg, and secured from Charles V a renewal of the letter of protection for the Dominican Order in Germany which Charles IV had granted them in 1355 and 1359. In 1534 he was elected provincial of his own province, but before the termination of his office Paul III made him suffragan Bishop of Halberstadt. In 1540 and 1541 he asserted against them in a sermon the principle, which the Jesuits taught at Ratisbon, where with Eck, the vice-chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt, and Pegasus, he took a leading part in the deliberations. His vast theological knowledge and remarkable command of the German language made him one of the foremost controversialists of the first half of the sixteenth century. A complete list of his works, all of which bear a polemical tinge, is given by Strebler in the "Kirchenlexikon". Quétif-Eichard, SS. Ord. Praed., II, 84; Paulus, Die deutschen Dominikaner im Kampf gegen Luther (Freiburg, 1903), 18-45; Paulus, Katholik (Freiburg, 1903), 11, 21-36, 120-125.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Mental Reservation, the name applied to a doctrine which has grown out of the common Catholic teaching about lying (q. v.) and which is its complement. According to the common Catholic teaching it is never allowable to tell a lie, not even to save human life. A lie is something intrinsically evil, and as evil may not be done that good may come of it, we are never allowed to tell a lie. However, we are also under an obligation to keep our own faithfully, and in sometimes the easiest way of fulfilling that duty is to say what is false, or to tell a lie. Writers of all creeds and of none, both ancient and modern, have frankly accepted this position. They admit the doctrine of the lie of necessity, and maintain that when there is a conflict between justice and veracity it is justice that should yield to veracity. The common Catholic teaching has elaborated the theory of mental reservation as a means by which the claims of both justice and veracity can be satisfied. The doctrine was broached tentatively and with great difficulty by St. Raymund of Pennafort, the first writer on casuistry. In his "Summa" (1235) St. Raymund quotes the saying of St. Augustine that "One must not say lies, but one should not preserve the life of another, and that it would be a most perilous doctrine to admit that we may do a less evil to prevent another doing a greater. And most doctors teach this, he says, though he allows that others teach that a lie should be told when a man's life is at stake. Then he adds: "I believe, as at present standing, that when justice is disputed, and one is taking the life of someone hiding in the house whether he is in, no answer should be given; and if this betrays him, his death will be imputable to the murderers, not to the other's silence. Or he may use an equivocal expression, and say 'I am not at home', or something like that. And this can be defended by a great number of examples." St. Raymund then says that he may say simply that he is not there, and if his conscience tells him that he ought to say that, then he will not speak against his conscience, nor will he sin. Nor is St. Augustine really opposed to any of these methods." Such expressions as, "I am not at home", were called equivocations, or amphibilologies, and when such a words was good, rather than for the speaker to lie, and was admitted by all. If the person inquired for was really at home, but did not wish to see the visitor, the meaning of the phrase, "He is not at home", was restricted by the mind of the speaker to this sense, "He is not at home for you, or to see you". Hence, equivocations and amphibilologies came to be called "false" or "equivocal" statements. St. Raymund admitted that an equivocal expression need not necessarily be used when the words of the speaker receive a special meaning from the circumstances in which he is placed, or from the position which he holds. Thus, if a confessor is asked about sins made known to him in confession, he should answer: "I do not know", and such words as those when use "I do not know apart from confession", or "I do not know as man", or "I have no knowledge of the matter which I can communicate". All Catholic writers were, and are, agreed that when there is good reason, such expressions as the above may be made use of, and that they are not lies. Those who hear them may understand that they are not lies, and such deception may be permitted by the speaker for a good reason. If there is no good reason to the contrary, veracity requires all to speak frankly and openly in
such a way as to be understood by those who are addressed. A sin is committed if mental reservations are used without just cause, or in cases in which the question has a right to the naked truth. In the sixteenth century a further development of this commonly received doctrine began to be admitted even by some theologians of note. We shall probably not be far wrong if we attribute the change to the very difficult political circumstances of the time due to the wars of religion. Martin Aspilcueta, the "Doctor Navarrus," as he was called, was one of the first to develop the new doctrine. He was nearing the end of a long life, and was regarded as the foremost authority then living on canon law and moral theology, when he was consulted on a case of conscience by the Fathers of the Jesuit college at Valladolid. The case sent to him for solution was drawn up in these terms: "Titius, who privately said to a woman, 'I take thee for my wife,' without the intention of marrying her, answered the judge who asked him whether he had said those words, that he did not say them, understanding mentally that he did not say them with the intention of marrying the woman." Navarrus was asked whether Titius told a lie, whether he had committed perjury, or whether he committed any sin at all. He drew up an elaborate opinion on the case, and dedicated it to the reigning prince of Portugal. It was published in 1582, and maintained that Titius neither lied, nor committed perjury, nor any sin whatever, on the supposition that he had a good reason for answering as he did. This theory became known as the doctrine of strict mental reservation, to distinguish it from wide mental reservation with which we have thus far been occupied. In the strict mental reservation the speaker mentally adds some mental qualification to the words which he utters, and the words altogether with the mental qualification make a true assertion in accordance with fact. On the other hand, in a wide mental reservation, the qualification comes from the ambiguity of the words themselves, or from the circumstances of time, place, or person, in which they are uttered. The opinion of Navarrus was received as probable by such contemporary theologians of different schools as Salom, Sayers, Suarez, and Lessius. The Jesuit theologian Sanchez formulated it in clear and distinct terms, and added the weight of his authority on the side of its defenders. Laymann, however, another Jesuit theologian of equal or greater weight, rejected the doctrine, as did Anger, S.J., the Dominicans Novalis and Soto and others. Laymann shows at considerable length that such reservations are lies. For that man tells a lie who makes use of words which are false with the intention of deceiving another. And this is what is done when a strict mental reservation is made use of. The words uttered do not express the truth as known to the speaker. They are at variance with it and therefore constitute a lie. The opinion of Navarrus was freely debated in the schools for some years, and it was acted upon by some of the Catholic confessors of the Faith in England in the difficult circumstances in which they were frequently placed. It was, however, condemned as formulated by Sanchys by the Council of Trent (1563, xi, 17; xxvii, 179), and as propounded by Laymann in 1631.

St. Raymund, Summa de Fidelitate (Rome, 1666) and Aspilcueta, Oratio omnina (Venice, 1618); Sanchez, In Declaratum (Antwerp, 1631); Laymann, Theologia moralis (Munich, 1834); Slater, Manual of Moral Theology (New York, 1905).

T. Slater.

Mentelin (Mention), Johannes, b. c. 1410; d. 12 Dec., 1478; an eminent German typographer of the fifteenth century, and the first printer and bookseller at Strasbourg (Alsace). He belonged to a respected family at Schlettstadt. After 1447 he was a "goldschreiber" (illuminator) at Strasbourg, where he became a burgess and member of the painters' and goldsmiths' guilds. It was as an illuminator that he became connected with printing; and he received his printer's training at Mainz; he began printing at Strasbourg before 1460. His establishment at once developed great activity; in a few years it produced quite a large number of immense folio volumes, and a number of smaller books. He also procured the sale of his prints by means of printed catalogues. These "publisher's catalogues" have proved a very valuable means of identifying and ascertaining facts about Mentelin's prints, because he usually appended neither name, place nor date to his works. His type is nearly always conjectural, and the name is not mentioned in the catalogues; this is the minuscule used in the books of the period. Though they cannot compare either in design or technical finish with those of Gutenberg and Schöffer, they are not without some original features especially in the capital letters, which occur both in flourishing Gothic and in the simple Roman laciary style. Of his larger printed works, about 30 in number, including at least 35 large folio volumes, the following are the most conspicuous: the Latin edition of the Bible of 1460, and 1463; the German Bible, about 1466; also the first editions of the writings of St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, Aristotele, Isidore, and the "Canon of Avizoneo." The business was managed by the brothers Mentelin, and afterwards by Dolf Ruysch and afterwards by Johann Prüs. Although Mentelin cannot be reckoned the inventor of the art of printing books, as his grandson Johann Schott claimed in 1521, he was nevertheless one of the most skilful of the early typographers.

Heinrich Wilh. Wallau.

Menzini, Benedetto; priest and poet, b. at Florence, 1646; d. at Rome, 7 Sept., 1704. His family being poor, he early gave himself up to teaching, becoming a professor of belles-lettres at Florence and at Prato. He was already in Holy Orders. In 1681 he failed to obtain the chair of rhetoric in the University of Pisa partly because of the jealousy of other clerics, and partly because of the acrimony constantly shown by him in his words and acts. In 1685 he went to Rome and enjoyed the favour of Queen Christina of Sweden, until her death in 1689. Pope Innocent XII then gave him a canonry, and appointed him to a chair of rhetoric in one of the institutions of the city of Rome. Following the models provided by the poems of Chiarattus and Tevera, and also by Pietro "Cansoni eroiche e morali" (1674-80). These observe the Greek division—strophe, antistrophe, and epode, and deal with subjects that were also engaging the attention of the contemporary poet Filicaja, e.g., the freeing of Venice, the taking of Budapest. Some seventeen of his elegiac treat of matters of various interest. The poem "Il Paradiso terrestre" is almost a continuation of the "Mondo creato" of Tasso, Menzini's favourite poet. In the "Academie Tusculana," in mingled prose and verse, he introduces leading spirits of the time, who discuss subjects of many sorts. The pastoral note was struck by him with no little success in his "Sonetti pastorali," and in his "Camerieta anacreontica," a number of graceful little lyrics. Perhaps the most famous work of Menzini is his satires, some thirteen in number, in which he assails in acrid terms the hypocrisy prevailing in Tuscany in the last years of the Medici rule. In like fashion he lashes in his "Arte poetica" the artificiality and the uncouthness of the versifiers of the time.

Opere (4 vols., Florence, 1731); Satira (Amsterdam, 1729) and Borghini, III (1785); Paolucci, Vita di Benedetto Menzini (Florence, 1723); Maggioli, Studio critico su Benedetto Menzini (Naples, 1865); Tonchini, Benedetto Menzini e le sue opere (Cairo, 1903). For more recent edition of his work see Satira, rime e lettere scolice di Benedetto Menzini (Florence, 1874).

J. D. M. Ford.
Mercadé, Eustache, French dramatic poet of the fifteenth century. The dates of his birth and death are not known. In 1414 he was official of the Abbey of Corbie near Amiens. According to a document that has been discovered quite recently, he was removed from his office in 1427 but was reinstated in 1437, in accordance with a decision of the court of the Châtelet which was ratified by the Parliament of Paris on 2 May, 1439. Martin Franç, or “le Franc”, who wrote in the middle of the fifteenth century, mentions Mercadé as one of the most famous “rhetoricians” of the time. In the “Mystery” that he composed, the author is mentioned on the back of the last but one sheet: Ustasse Merchide, Docteur en decret, Bachelier en le Droit, et Renommé Poète, auteur du presente Paris en la Mystery to which he has attached his name: “La Vie, la Passion et la Vengeance de Jésus Christ.” It is kept in the library of Arras under No. 625; the last part only, or the Vengeance, should be considered as the work of Mercadé. It contains 312 characters, of whom 112 have a speaking part.

P. J. Marique.

Merkator, Marius. See Marius Mercator.

Mercedarians (Order of Our Lady of Mercy), a congregation of men founded in 1218 by Peter Nolasco, at Mas-des-Saintes-Puelles, Department of Aude, France. Joining Simon de Montfort’s army, then attacking the Albigenses, he was appointed tutor to the young king, James of Aragon, who had succeeded to the throne after the death of his father, Pedro II, killed at the battle of Muret. Peter Nolasco followed his pupil to his capital, Bell to his arms, in 1218. The town of Albi, 1192 ecclesiastics of the city had formed a confraternity for the purpose of caring for the sick in the hospitals, and also for rescuing Christian captives from the Moors. Peter Nolasco was requested by the Blessed Virgin in a vision to found a religious order especially devoted to the ransom of captives. His confessor, St. Raymond of Penafort, then canon of Barcelona, encouraged and assisted him in this project; and King James also extended his protection. The noblemen already referred to were the first monks of the order, and their headquarters was the convent of St. Eulalia of Barcelona, erected 1232. They had both religious in holy orders, and lay monks or knights; the choir monks wore white or ermine; the supernumeraries white or ermine with red sleeves and chasuble. These religious followed the rule drawn up for them by St. Raymond of Penafort. The order was approved, first by Honorius III and then by Gregory IX (1230), the latter, at the request of St. Raymond Nonnatus presented by St. Peter Nolasco, granted a Bull of confirmation and prescribed the Rule of St. Augustine, the form of his order, forming the constitutions (1235). St. Peter was the first superior with the title of Commander-General; he also filled the office of Ransomer, a title given to the monk sent into the lands subject to the Moors to arrange for the ransom of prisoners. The holy founder died in 1256, seven years after having resigned his superintendence; he was succeeded by Guillaume Llorens, the third commander-general (1271), codified the decisions of the general chapters. In the fourteenth century, disputes arising from the rivalry between the convents of Barcelona and Puy, and from the discord between the priests and knights, which ended in the latter’s suppression, disturbed the peace of the order. Christopher Columbus took some members of the Order of Mercy with him to America, where they founded a great many convents in Latin America, throughout Mexico, Cuba, Brazil, Peru, Chile, and Ecuador. These formed no less than eight provinces, whereas they only had three in Spain and one in France. This order took very active part in the conversion of the Indians. At the beginning of the seventeenth century Father Gonzales, who had made his profession at the convent of Olmedo in 1573, conceived the idea of a reform, at that time necessary. The commander-general, Alfonso de Montoy, at first supported this scheme, but ended by opposing it. In 1605 he undertook Gonzales was excommunicated by the Countess of Castellana, who obtained for him the necessary authorization from Clement VIII, and presented him with three convents for his reformed monks (at Vigo, Diocese of Seville; Almoragha, Diocese of Cadiz; Ribas). The reform was confirmed at the provincial chapter of Guadalajara in 1603. Father Gonzales took the name of John Baptist of the Blessed Sacrament, and died at Madrid in 1618. Pius V approved his reform in 1606; in 1621 Gregory XV declared it independent of the monks of the Great Observance. Their convents formed two provinces, with houses at Madrid, Salamanca, Seville, and Alcalá, with a few foundations in Sicily.

Father Antonio Velasco founded a convent of nuns of Our Lady of Mercy at Seville in 1568, of which the first superior was Blessed Anne of the Cross. This foundation had been authorized by Pius V. The reformed branch also established houses of barefooted nuns, or Nuns of the Recollection, at Lura, Madrid, Santiago de Castile, Fuentes, Thoro, and elsewhere. The female tertiaries were founded in 1571 (1265). Two widows of Barcelona, Isabel Berti and Eulalia Peins, whose confessor was Blessed Bernard of Corbario, prior of the convent there, were the foundresses. They were joined by several companions, among them St. Mary of Suecor (d. 31 Decemb., 1281), the first superior of their community. Blessed Mary Anne of Jesus (d. 1624), founded another community of tertiaries, under the jurisdiction of the reformed branch. The Order of Mercy of late years has much decreased in membership. The restoration of the reformed convent at Thoro, Diocese of Zamora, Spain, is worthy of note (1888). At present the order has one province and one vice-province in Europe, and smaller establishments in America, with thirty-seven convents and from twelve to八十 members. The Mercedarian convents are in: Perma; Spain; Venezuela (Caracas, Maracaibo); Peru (Lima); Chile (Santiago); Argentina (Cordova, Mendosa); Ecuador (Quito); and Uruguay. The Mercedarians of Cordova publish “Revista Mercedariana”.

Besides the founder of the order, the following illustrious members of the order may be mentioned: St. Raymond Nonnatus (d. 1240), the most famous of the monks who gave themselves up to the work of ransoming captives; Blessed Bernard of Corbario, already mentioned; St. Peter Paschal, Bishop of Jaen, who devoted all his energies to the ransom of captives and the conversion of the Muslims, martyred in 1300; St. Raymond was a cardinal, as also were Juan de Luto and Father de Salazar. It is unnecessary to enumerate the archbishops and bishops. Writers were numerous, especially in Spain and Latin America in the seventeenth century. To mention only a few: Alfonso Henrique de Almendares, Bishop of Cuba, who had founded a convent for his order, from whom Philip III received an interesting report on the spiritual and temporal condition of his diocese in 1623; Alfonso de Monroy, who drew up the constitutions of the reform, and was a bishop in America; Alfonso Ramón, theologian, preacher, and annalist of his order; Alfonso Velagas de Miranda (1661), who
Mercier, a French Canadian statesman, b. 15 October, 1840, at Iberville, Quebec, of a family of farmers; d. 30 October, 1894. He received his classical education at the Jesuit college, Montreal, and prepared for the Bar in the employ of a prominent lawyer. He was called to the Bar in 1862, when only 22, as editor of "Le Courrier de St-Hyacinthe". His views were then opposed to the federation of the provinces, which he considered as the death-blow to French Canadian influence. In his later years he inclined towards annexation to the United States. In 1873 Rouille county elected him for the Federal Parliament; and, in 1881, St-Hyacinthe returned him to the local House of Assembly, Quebec. The general indigence caused among the Canadians of French origin by the execution of the half-breed leader, Louis Riel, at Regina, an act rightly attributed to Orange fanaticism and vindictiveness, provided Mercier with the opportunity of founding the National League (1886) which comprised elements from both Liberals and Conservatives. It was during his premiership (1887 to 1892), that was passed the famous Jesuit Estate Bill, partly indemnifying the Society for the properties confiscated by the British Crown after the cession of Canada. It was Mercier's honour and right to have brought to a successful conclusion the negotiations to that effect pursued under his predecessors in office—an event almost unparalleled in modern legislation, and to which the Ottawa Federal Parliament, with its conservative majority, lent its concurrence. His devotedness in behalf of the interests of his former teachers proved his fidelity and attachment to his Alma Mater. In recognition of this act of justice, he was knighted by Leo XIII. A vigorous and redoubtable debater rather than an eloquent orator, Mercier spoke with great clearness and force. He possessed a remarkable talent of exposition and argumentation, which gave him a prominent rank in the Canadian Bar. Certain utterances in some of his speeches unfortunately betray the influence of a reprehensible school of thought and too great intimacy with the literature of its representative minds. The Legislature of Quebec has voted (1910) a monument to his memory.

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Mercurialis, Geronimo, better known by his Latin name Mercurialis, famous phiologist and physician, b. at Forli, 30 September, 1530; d. there, 13 November, 1606. His preliminary studies and some of his medical courses were taken at Bologna, but he received his degree at Padua and then settled down to practice in Forli. He was sent by his townfolk on a political mission to Paul IV and made such good friends at Rome that he was persuaded to take up his residence there. He studied the old classic medical writers for some seven years and then wrote his "De arte gymnastica", in which he gathered all that the ancients had taught with regard to the use of natural methods for the cure of disease. This gave him a great reputation; the emperor, in person, sent for it by the Venetian senators led to his call to the chair of medicine at Padua in 1569. Here he devoted himself to the critical study of the works of Hippocrates. His exhaustive monograph, "Censura et dispositio operum Hippocratica" (Venice, 1583), enhanced his reputation and he began the preparation of a great reprint of the Hippocratic works. He died on 25 April, 1611. The complete edition of it by the Venetian senators, known as Merc. 2 volumes (1599); GAREY, Emile, Bibliotheque medecinale (Barcelona, 1875); HÉLOT, Histoire des ordres monastiques, 111, 266-296; CURRIER, Hist. of Religious Orders (New York, 1896). J. M. BESSE.

MERCY, BROTHERS OF OUR LADY OF, founded at Mechlin in 1839 by Canon J. B. Cornelius Schepers for the instruction and care of prisoners and of the sick. They were invited to S. Babina at Perugia by Cardinal Peci, afterwards Leo XIII, who had witnessed their work while he was nuncio at Brussels. It was at his instance that Pius IX confirmed the constitution of the Brothers in 1854. In 1855 Cardinal Manning invited them to London, where they have undertaken the care of the prisoners in Catholic institutions, and are also occupied with the education of the children of poor. They are under simple vows and the term of the novitiate is one year. They wear a black habit and scapular with a brown cross on the breast.

HEINRICH, Die Orden und Kongregationen, III, 361; SPEKEL, Monasteries and Religious Houses of Great Britain (London, 1903), 51.

BLANCHE M. KELLY.

MERCY, CORPORAL AND SPIRITUAL WORKS OF.—Mercy as it is here contemplated is said to be a virtue influencing one's will to have compassion for, and, if possible, to alleviate another's misfortune. It is the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas that although mercy were the spontaneous action of charity, yet it is to be reckoned a special virtue adequately distinguishable from this latter. In fact the Scholastics in cataloguing it consider it to be referable to the quality of justice mainly because, like justice, it controls relations between distinct persons. It is as they say ad afferen. Its motive is the misery which one discerns in another, particularly in one's own charity. It is to be reckoned, in some sense at least, involuntary. Obviously the necessity which is to be succored can be either of body or soul. Hence it is customary to enumerate both corporal and spiritual works of mercy. The traditional enumeration of the corporal works of mercy is as follows: (1) To feed the hungry; (2) To give drink to the thirsty; (3) ...
Mercy, established the Order of Our Lady of Ransom. Both of these communities had as their chief scope the recovery of Christians who were held captive by the infidels. In the religious body which owes its origin to St. Peter Nolasco, the members took a fourth vow to surrender their own persons in place of those whom they were not otherwise able to redeem from slavery.

Sr. Lucas, The Catechism Explained (New York, 1999); W. W. McCabe, The Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Articles, Leckhampton, Tilbury House (Frensham, 1887); BILLIARD, Summa Sancti Thomas (Paris); ST. THOMAS AQUINAS, Summa Theologica (Turin, 1885).

JOSEPH F. DE LAUNAY.

Mercy, Sisters of, a congregation of women founded in Dublin, Ireland, in 1827, by Catherine Elizabah McAuley, b. 29 September, 1787, at Stor- manstown House, County Dublin. Descended from an ancient and distinguished Catholic family, she was the eldest of three children. At a time when Catholicism was crushed, Mrs. McAuley strove as much as was possible to keep the faith alive in those who had so many inducements to relinquish it, and engaged in many charitable works. In these he was little assisted by Mrs. McAuley, whose charm and accomplishments attracted the attention of better sorts. After McAuley's death (1794) the pecuniary affairs of the family became so involved that the widow sold Stor- manstown House and removed to Dublin. Here the family came so completely under the influence of Protestants fashionable society that all, with the exception of Catherine, became Protestants. She remained a Catholic, and her education was such that she was not only capable of taking care of herself, but was able to give employment to several of the orphans who came to her. She was too young to be induced by threats or promises to join in Protestant worship, for she clung with strange pertinacity to the very name Catholic; but having no one to consult in her doubts, she finally became unsettled in her religious ideas. Precocious and serious beyond her years, she grew daily more Alive to the insecurity of her spiritual position, and finally to the necessity of a return to the Church. The friends who were the most confidential and on whom she drew for advice and counsel were the two sisters, who, on her advice, left the Protestant Church and entered the Roman Catholic Church. Her name is described as being beautiful, her complexion was fair, her eyes blue, and her hair golden; her nature was singularly unselfish, amiable, and affectionate. Though several advantages were proposed, nothing could induce her to marry.

More and more attracted to the faith of her father, Catherine became acquainted with the works of Charity, and joined James' Church, Dublin, and Dr. Betagh, whose friendship greatly aided her. About this time a distant relative of her mother, returning from India, purchased Coolock House, a few miles from Dublin, and being attracted by Catherine's appearance, desired to adopt her; consequently, in the year 1805 Catherine removed to her new and beautiful home. Catherine's interior life was now made up of the simple devotions which she determined to follow the dictates of her conscience. She sought an interview with Rev. Dr. Murray, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, and shortly after was received into the Church. Her kind guardians allowed her to practise the charitable works to which she felt inclined and even provided her with the necessary means; but they were opposed to every appearance of Catholicism that they would not allow a crucifix,
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religious picture, or any pious article in the house, nor did they make any provision for fast days. Her successor, Rev. Dr. Blake and Rev. Dr. Armstrong, were rewarded by the deposition of Mrs. Callahan, on her death bed; and in 1822 Mr. Callahan also, when dying, was duly reconciled. To Catherine he left his entire fortune. She immediately devised a system of distributing food and clothing to the poor who flocked to Coolock House, and her time was fully devoted to these works of charity, to visiting the sick and to instilling the poor. When Catherine came into full possession of her property, she felt that God required her to do something permanent for the poor, and she was now able to carry out her early visions of founding an institution in which women might, when out of work, find a temporary home. In this undertaking Rev. Dr. Blake and Rev. Dr. Armstrong undertook to assist her, but the work was to be completed by her. After some deliberation, these clergymen selected a site for the new building at the junction of lower Baggot and Herbert Streets, Dublin, and in June, 1824, the corner-stone was laid by the Rev. Dr. Blake.

As Dr. Blake was called to Rome soon after, the Rev. Edward Armstrong undertook to assist her, but the work was to be completed by her. After some deliberation, these clergymen selected a site for the new building at the junction of lower Baggot and Herbert Streets, Dublin, and in June, 1824, the corner-stone was laid by the Rev. Dr. Blake.
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On the 22 December, 1843, the sisters opened the first house of the congregation in the United States. In 1844, M. Agatha O'Brien, a native of Ireland, entered the Congregation, and was made superior of the second house of the congregation, which was moved after the patronage of St. Charles Borromeo, the Apostle of Charity, and adapted the rules and constitutions drawn up by Père Épiphanie Louys, Abbé of Estival and Vicar-General of the Reformed Premonstratensians. By the middle of the eighteenth century the congregation was in charge of numerous hospitals, and shortly afterwards took up as an additional task the Christian education of children. During the Revolu-
tionary period the members, although dispersed and deprived of their garb, continued their work so heroically as to win the encomiums of their persecutors. On 22 July, 1804, they reasserted their religious habit, obtained the approval of Napoleon, and were soon in a flourishing condition. Their rule, based on that of St. Augustine, received papal approva-
bation in 1859, and additional constitutions were confirmed by Leo XIII in 1892. Their work includes the direction of all manner of charitable institutions, such as domestic and trade schools, homes for first-com-
unicants, protectories, poor-houses, homes for de-
fectives, and female reformatories, as well as the care of the sick. They have thirty-seven houses for schools, including a number of normal institutes in Austria. Candidates must spend one year as postu-
lates and from three to four and a half years as nov-
ces before being admitted to the congregation. The auxiliary sisters for the care of the sick renew their vows annually.

There are several entirely independent branches of Borromean Sisters. In 1838 one was established by Aloysius Joseph Freiherr von Schrenk, Prince-Bishop of Prague (d. 1849), which was confirmed as a separate congregation in 1841, and now numbers 900 members in 140 houses, chiefly in Bohemia, Moravia, and Upper and Lower Austria. In 1849 Melchior Freiherr von Schrenk, Bishop of Prague Borromeans to found a house at Neisse, which, in 1857, was raised to the rank of the mother-house of a separate congregation. Later the mother-house was transferred to Trebnitz, and temporarily, during the Kulturkampf, to Teschen, where a provincial house for Austria was later established (1859). A house of the congregation for the ancient Order of Alcolumbia, founded in 1894, made a provincial mother-house and a novitiate for the Orient, with the direction of schools, an asylum for the aged, and a hospice for German pilgrims. Affiliated foundations have been made at Jerusalem (1886), Haifa (1888), Cairo (1904), and Emmaus. The members of the Trebnitz congregation number 1,200, while the house of America was made from Nancy to Trier, whence the congregation spread to other cities of Western Germany. In 1849 a provincial house was erected at Trier, which, by decree of Pius IX (18 September, 1872), was made the mother-house of an independent congregation. A famous Borromean institution is St. Hedwig's Hos-
ital at Berlin, founded in 1846 by Archibald Eck-
weiler. The Trier branch comprises over 1,200 sisters in 70 houses. A foundation was also made at Maastricht in 1837 by Peter Anton van Baer.

Hist. de la congr. des sœurs de St. Charles (Nancy, 1898); Hoehn, Die Nancy-Trierer Borromäerinnen (1896); Itzum, Borromäische Schwester von hl. Karl Borromäus 1528–1900 (1900); Heimsoeth, Orden u. Kongregationen (2 vols., 1898).

Florence Rudge McGahan.

Meredith, Edward, English Catholic controversialist, b. in 1648, was a son of the rector of Landulph, Cornwall. He studied with distinction at Westminster School and in 1665 was elected to a scholarship at Christ Church, Oxford. In 1668 he went to Spain as secretary of the ambassador, Sir William Godolphin, and while residing there embraced the Catholic faith. He returned to England after three years and engaged in a religious controversy with Stillingfleet (8 August, 1671). In this discussion, an account of which he pub-
ished in 1864, he was aided by Edmund Coleman, who was executed seven years later for alleged complicity in the Titus Oates plot. In 1862 Meredith wrote a reply to one Samuel Johnson, who had libelled the Duke of York in a work entitled "Julian the Apostle". On 7 September, 1864, he entered the Jesuit novitiate at Watton, Flanders, under the name of James, a supernaturally merited, in a few years to England, where he published several controversial pamphlets. On the fall of James II, he withdrew to Saint-Germain. He was resident in Rome during the years 1700 and 1710; the year of his death is uncertain, but his will, dated 1715, is said to be preserved in the archives of the English College, Rome. The following, in the Consolamenta Latin, a devotional work under the title "A Journal of Meditations for every day of the year" (London, 1887).


A. A. MacEneaney.

Merici, Angela. See Angela Merici, Saint.

Mérida (Emeritensis in India), Diocese of, a suffragan see of Santiago de Venezuela or Caracas, consecrated by Lope of Legazpi, and part of the province of Zamora. It lies in the north-western portion of the republic, to the south of Lake Maracaibo. Until 17 Jan., 1905, it included the territory of the Goejira. Mérida was first erected into a bishopric on 17 Feb., 1777. Its first bishop, Juan Ramos de Lora, a Franciscan, b. at Palacios y Villafranca, Diocese of Seville, in Langue, was nominated in the Consolamenta Latin, a devotional work under the title "A Journal of Meditations for every day of the year" (London, 1887).


A. A. MacEneaney.

Mérida.—By merit (meritum) in general is understood that property of a good work which entitles the doer to receive a reward (premium, merces) from him in whose service the work is done. By antonomasia, the word has come to designate also the good work itself, in so far as it deserves a reward from the person in whose service it was performed. In the theological sense, a supernatural merit can only be a salutary act (actus salutaris), to which God in consideration of his infallible promise owes a supernatural reward, consisting ultimately in eternal life, which is the beatific vision in heaven. As the main purpose of this article is to vindicate the Catholic doctrine of the meritoriousness of good works, the subject is treated under the following heads: I. Nature of Merit; II. Existence of Merit; III. Conditions of Merit, and IV. Objects of Merit.

I. Nature of Merit.—(a) If we analyse the definition given above, it becomes evident that the property of merit can be found only in works that are positively good, whilst bad works, whether they benefit or injure a third party, contain nothing but demerit (demeritum) and consequently deserve only punishment. Thus the good workman certainly deserves the reward of his labour, and the thief deserves the punishment of his crime. From this it naturally follows that merit and reward, demerit and punishment, bear to each other the relation of deed and reward; they are correlatives of the same kind, of which one is due to the other. The former is due to merit, and the reward is in proportion to the merit. This leads to the third condition, viz., that merit supposes two distinct persons, the one who acquires the merit and the other who rewards it; for the idea of self-reward is just as contradictory as that of self-punishment. Lastly, the relation between merit and reward furnishes the basis of the justice, the service and its remuneration the guiding norm can be only the virtue of justice, and not disinterested kindness or pure mercy; for it would destroy the very notion of reward to conceive of it as a free gift of bounty (cf. Rom., xi, 6). If, however, salutary acts can in virtue of the Divine justice give the right to an eternal reward, this is possible only because they themselves have their root in gratuitous grace, and consequently are of their very nature dependent ultimately on grace, as the Council of Trent emphatically declares (Sees. VI, cap. xvi, in Denzinger, 10th ed., Freiburg, 1908, n. 810): "the Lord ... whose bounty towards all men is so great, that He will have the things, which are known gifts, be their own merit.

Ethics and theology clearly distinguish two kinds of merit: (1) condign or merior in the strict sense of the word (meritum adequantum sive de condigno), and (2) congruous or quasi-merit (meritum inadequatum sive de congruo). Congruous merit supposes an equality between service and return; it is measured by comparative justice (justice comparationis), and thus gives a real claim to a reward. Congruous merit, owing to its inadequacy and the lack of intrinsic proportion between the service and the recompense, claims a reward only on the ground of equity. This early-scholastic distinction and terminology, which is already recognized in concept and substance by the Fathers of the Church in their controversies with the Pelagians and Semi-pelagians, were again emphasized by Johann Eck, the famous adversary of Martin Luther (cf. Greving, "Joh. Eck als junger Gelehrter," Münster, 1906, pp. 153 sqq.). The essential difference between meritum de condigno and meritum de congruo is based on the fact that, besides those works which claim a recompense under penalty of denial of grace (as in contracts between employer and employee, in buying and selling, etc.), there are also other meritorious works which at most are entitled to reward or honour for reasons of equity (ex equitate) or mere distributive justice (ex iustitia distributiva), as in the case of gratuitities and military decorations. From
an ethical point of view the difference practically amounts to this, that if the reward due to condign merit be withheld, there is a violation of right and justice and the consequent obligation in conscience to make restitution, while, in the case of congruous merit, to withhold the reward involves no violation of right and no obligation to restore, it being merely an offence against what is fitting or a matter of personal discrimination (acceptio personarum). Hence the reward of congruous merit always depends in great measure on the kindness and liberality of the giver, though not purely and simply on his good will.

In applying these notions of merit to man's relation to God it is especially necessary to keep in mind the fundamental truth that the virtue of justice cannot be brought forward as the basis of a real title for a Divine reward either in the natural or in the supernatural order. The simple reason is that God, being self-existent, absolutely independent, and sovereign, can be in no respect bound in justice with regard to his creatures. Properly speaking, man possesses nothing of his own; all that he has and all that he does is a gift of God, and, since God is infinitely self-sufficient, there is no advantage or benefit which man can by his services confer upon him. Hence on the part of God there can only be question of a gratuitous promise of reward, by which work of perfection he owes to himself the promised reward, not in justice or equity, but solely because he has freely bound himself, i.e., because of His own attributes of veracity and fidelity. It is on this ground alone that we can speak of Divine justice at all, and apply the principle: Do ut des (cf. St. Augustine, Serm. civii. e ii, in F. L., XXXVIII, 903). For this reason the difference between merit and satisfaction; for a meritorious work is not identical, either in concept or in fact, with a satisfactory work. In the language of theology, satisfaction means: (1) atoning by some suitable service for an injury done to another's honour or for any other offence, in somewhat the same fashion as in modern dueing outrageous honour is satisfied by compensations to swords or pistols; (2) paying off the temporal punishment due by sin by salutary penitential works voluntarily undertaken after one's sins have been forgiven. Sin, as an offence against God, demands satisfaction in the first sense; the temporal punishment due to sin calls for satisfaction in the second sense (see Pex- Ammer, 62). Hence in concept and in fact the Son of God by His death on the cross has in our stead fully satisfied God's anger at our sins, and thereby effected a reconciliation between the world and its Creator. Not, however, as though nothing were now left to be done by man, or as though he were now restored to the state of original innocence, whether he was it or not; on the contrary, God and Christ demand of him that he make the fruits of the Sacrifice of the Cross his own by personal exertion and co-operation with grace, by justifying faith and the reception of baptism. It is a defined article of the Catholic Faith that man before, in, and after justification derived from the infinite treasure of merits which Christ gained for us on the Cross (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. VI, cap. xvi; Sess. XIV, cap. viii).

The second kind of satisfaction, that namely by which temporal punishment is removed, consists in this, that the penitent after his justification gradually conforms himself by the faithful devotion, either ex opere operato, by conscientiously performing the penance imposed on him by his confessor, or ex opere operantis, by self-imposed penances (such as prayer, fasting, almsgiving, etc.) and by bearing patiently the sufferings and trials sent by God; if he neglects this, he will have to give full satisfaction (apotlanto) in the pains of purgatory (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XIV, can. xiii, in Denzinger, n. 923).

Now, if the concept of satisfaction in its twofold meaning be compared with that of merit as developed above, the first general conclusion will be that merit constitutes a debtor who owes a reward, whilst satisfaction supposes a creditor whose demands must be met. In Christ's work of redemption satisfaction materially coincides almost to their full extent, since as a matter of fact the merits of Christ are also works of satisfaction for man. But, since by His Passion and Death He truly merited, not only graces for us, but also external glory for His own Person (His glorious Resurrection and Ascension, His sitting at the right hand of the Father, the glorification of His name of Jesus, etc.), it follows that His personal merit extends further than His satisfaction, as He had no need of satisfying for Himself. The substantial and conceptual distinction between merit and satisfaction holds good when applied to the justified Christian, for every meritorious act has for its main object the increase of grace and of eternal glory, while satisfactory works have for their object the removal of the temporal punishment still due to sin. In practice and generally speaking, however, merit and satisfaction are found in every salutary act, so that every meritorious work is also satisfactory and vice versa. It is indeed also essential to the concept of a satisfactory work that it be suitable to the perfection of which qualities are not connoted by the concept of merit; but since, in the present state of fallen nature, there neither is nor can be a meritorious work which in one way or another has not connected with it difficulties and hardships, theologians unanimously teach that all our meritorious works without exception are to some extent not wholly satisfactory, while in a manner of course, they are all simultaneously works of satisfaction. Against how many difficulties and distractions have we not to contend even during our prayers, which by right should be the easiest of all good works! Thus, prayer also becomes a penance, and hence confessors may in most cases content themselves with imposing prayer as a penance. (Cf. De Lugo, "De poenitentia," Disp. xxv, sect. 1.)

(c) Owing to the peculiar relation between and material identity of merit and satisfaction in the present economy of salvation, a twofold value must in general be distinguished in every good work: the meritorious and the satisfactory value. But each preserves its distinctive character, the one being the inalienable nature of the act, the other in this, that the value of merit as such, consisting in the increase of grace and of heavenly glory, is purely personal and is not applicable to others, while the satisfactory value may be detached from the meriting agent and applied to others. The possibility of this transfer rests on the fact that the residual punishments for sin are in the nature of a debt, which may be legitimately paid to the creditor and thereby cancelled not only by the debtor himself but also by a friend of the debtor. This consideration is important for the proper understanding of the usefulness of suffrages for the souls in purgatory (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXV, Decret. de purgat., in Denzinger, n. 985). One may not, however, apply the purely meritorious quality of his work, because the increase of grace and glory accures only to the agent who merites. But it has pleased the Divine wisdom and mercy to accept the satisfactory quality of one's work under certain circumstances as an equivalent of the temporal punishment still to be paid by the faithful deceased, just as if the latter had themselves performed the work. This is one of the most beautiful and consoling aspects of that grand social organization which we call the "Communion of Saints" (q. v.), and moreover affords us an insight into the nature of the "heroic act of charity" approved by Pius X, whereby the faithful deceased, but of heroic charity for the souls in Purgatory, voluntarily renounce in their favour the satisfactory fruits of all
their good works, even all the suffrages which shall be offered for them after their death, in order that they may thus benefit and assist the souls in purgatory more quickly and more efficaciously.

The efficacy of the prayer of the just, be it for the living or for the dead, calls for special consideration. In the first place it is evident that a prayer has a profoundly meritorious work has in common with other similar good works, such as fasting and almsgiving, the twofold value of merit and satisfaction. Because of its satisfactory character, prayer will also obtain for the souls in purgatory by way of suffrage (per modum suffragii) either a diminution or a total canceling of the time of their purgatorial pains. Prayer has, however, the characteristic effect of impetnation (effectus impetrorius), for he who prays appeals solely to the goodness, love, and liberality of God for the fulfilment of his desires, without throwing the weight of his own merits into the scale. He who prays fervently and unceasingly gains a hearing with God because he prays, even should he pray with empty hands (cf. John, xiv, 13 sq.; xvi, 23). Thus the special efficacy of prayer for the dead is easily explained, since it combines efficacy of satisfaction and impetration, and this twofold efficacy is enhanced by the personal worthiness of the one who, as a friend of God, offers the prayer. (See F. X. Fries, p. 73.) In fact, a salutary effect of the meritoriousness of good works supposes the state of justification, or, what amounts to the same, the possession of sanctifying grace, supernatural merit is only an effect or fruit of the state of grace (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. VI, cap. xvi). Hence, it is plain that this whole article is really only a continuation and a completion of the doctrine of sanctifying grace (see Grace).

II. THE EXISTENCE OF MERIT.—(a) According to Luther justification consists essentially in the mere covering of man's sins, which remain in the soul, and in the external imputation of Christ's justice; hence his assertion that even "the just sin in every good work" (see Ephes. ii, 10). Still, it is possible that the just work of the just is worthy of imputation (damnabilis) and a mortal sin [peccatum mortale], if it be considered as it is really in the judgment of God" (see Möhler, "Symbolik", 22). According to the doctrine of Calvin (Instit., III, ii, 4) good works are "impurities and defilements (inquinamenta et sordes), but God covers them that he may not be found without grace. Each merit of Christ, and imputes to them the predestined as good works in order that He may require them not with life eternal, but at most with a temporal reward. In consequence of Luther's proclamation of "evangelical liberty", John Agricola (d. 1566) asserted that in the New Testament it was not allowed to preach the "law", and Nicholas Amador (d. 1565) maintained that good works were positively harmful. Such exaggerations gave rise in 1527 to the fierce Antinomian controversy, which, after various efforts on Luther's part, was finally settled in 1540 by the condemnation forced from Agricola by Joachim II of Brandenburg. Although the doctrine of modern Protestantism attempts to cover up the difficulties, it teaches generally speaking that good works are a spontaneous consequence of justifying faith, without being of any avail for life eternal. Apart from earlier dogmatic declarations given in the Second Synod of Orange of 529 and in the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 (see Denzinger, 191, 498), the Council of Trent defended against the justifications of the meritoriousness of good works by insisting that life everlasting is both a grace and reward (Sess. VI, cap. xvi, in Denzinger, n. 809). It condemned as heretical Luther's doctrine of the sinfulness of good works (Sess. VI, can. xxv), and declared a dogma that the just, in return for their good works in God through the merits of Jesus Christ, should obtain an eternal reward (loc. cit., can. xxvi).

The doctrine of the Church simply echoes Scripture and Tradition. The Old Testament already declares the meritoriousness of good works before God. "But the just shall live for evermore: and their reward is with the Lord" (Wis., v, 16). "Be not afraid to be justified even to death: for the reward of God continue for ever" (Eccles., xviii, 22). Christ Himself adds a special reward to the good works of the Eight Beatitudes, and he ends with this fundamental thought: "Be glad and rejoice, for your reward is very great in heaven" (Matt., v, 12). In His description of the Last Judgment, He makes the possession of eternal bliss depend on the practice of the corporal works of mercy (Matt., xxv, 34 sqq.). Although St. Paul insists on nothing but faith as the ground of justification, in his letter to the Ephesians he recognizes that Christian grace, still he acknowledges merits founded on grace and also the reward due to them on the part of God, which he variously calls "prize" (Phil., iii, 14; I Cor., ix, 24), "reward" (Col., iii, 24; I Cor., iii, 8), "crown of justice" (II Tim., iv, 7 sq.; cf. James, i, 12). It is worthy of note that in these and many others, good works are not represented as mere adjuncts of justifying faith, but as real fruits of justification and the fruit of our eternal happiness. And the greater the merit, the greater will be the reward in heaven (cf. Matt., xvi, 27; I Cor., iii, 8; II Cor., ix, 6). Thus the Bible itself refutes the assertion that "the idea of merit is foreign to the faith" (Reuss, "Handbuch für praktische Theologie", XX, 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1908, p. 501). That Christian grace can be merited either by the observance of the Jewish law or by mere natural works (see Grace), this alone is foreign to the Bible. On the other hand, eternal reward is promised in the Bible to those supernatural works which are performed in the state of grace, and that because they are meritorious (cf. Matt., xxv, 34 sqq.; Rom., ii, 6 sqq.; II Cor., v, 10).

Even Protestants concede that, in the oldest literature of the Apostle Fathers and Christian Apologists, "the idea of merit was read into the Gospel," and that Tertullian by defending "merit in the strict sense" gave the key to his doctrine of Catholicism" (Reaencyclopdie, pp. 601, 602). He was followed by St. Cyprian with the declaration: "You can attain to the vision of God, if you deserve it by your life and works" ("De op. et elemos.", xiv, ed. Hartel, i, 384). With St. Ambrose (De offic., i, 87) and St. Augustine (De morib. eccl., i, xxv), the other Fathers of the Church completed the dogma of the merit of works in their teaching, especially in their homilies to the faithful, so that uninterrupted agreement is secured between Bible and Tradition, between patristic and scholastic teaching, between the past and the present. If therefore "the reformation was mainly a struggle against the doctrine of merit" (Reaencyclopdie, loc. cit., p. 596) this only proves that the Council of Trent defended against unjustified innovations the old doctrine of the meritoriousness of good works, founded alike on Scripture and Tradition.

(b) This doctrine of the Church, moreover, fully accords with natural ethics. Divine Providence, as the supreme lawgiver, owes it to itself to give efficacious sanctions to the incentives of natural law with their many commandments and prohibitions, and to secure their observance by holding out rewards and punishments. Even human laws are provided with sanctions, which are often very severe. He who denies the meritoriousness of good works performed by the just must necessarily also deny the responsibility and the desirability of the virtue which holds that sins remain without punishment, and that the fear of hell is both groundless and useless. If there be no eternal reward for an upright life and no eternal chastisement for sin, it will matter little to the majority of people whether they lead a good or a bad life. It is true that, even if there were neither reward nor punishment, it would be contrary to natural nature to lead an immoral life; for the moral obligation
to do always what is right, does not of itself depend on retribution. But Kant undoubtedly went too far when he repudiated as immoral those actions which are performed with a view to our personal happiness or to that of others, and proclaimed the “categorical imperative,” i.e., frigid duty clearly perceived, as the only means of moral conduct. For, through this so-called “autonomy of the moral will,” may at first sight appear highly ideal, still it is unnatural and cannot be carried out in practical life, because virtue and happiness, duty and merit (with the claim to reward), are not mutually exclusive, but, as correlatives, they rather condition and complete each other. The one may be perfect only when the other is taken into account as well. The faithful performance of duty is an unsought-for reward of our action and an interior happiness of which no calamity can deprive us, so that, as a matter of fact, duty and happiness are always linked together.

(c) But is not this continual acting with one eye on heaven, with which Professor Jodl reproaches Catholic moral teaching, the meanest “mercenary spirit” and greed which necessarily vitiate to the core all moral action? Can there be any question of morality, if it is only the desire for eternal bliss or simply the fear of hell that determines one to do and avoid evil? Such a disposition is certainly far from what the Church professes to teach. On the contrary, the Church proclaims to all her children that pure love of God is the first and supreme commandment (cf. Mark, xvi, 30). It is its highest ideal to act out of love. For he who truly loves God would keep His commandments, even though there were no eternal reward in the next life. Nevertheless, the desire for heaven is a necessary and natural consequence of the perfect love of God; for heaven is only the perfect possession of God by love. As a true friend desires to see his friend without thereby sinking into egotism so does the loving soul ardently desire the Beatific Vision, not from a craving for reward, but out of pure love. It is unfortunately too true that only the best of Christians, and especially the great saints of the Church, reach this high standard of morality in everyday life. The great majority of ordinary Christians must be deterred from sin principally by the fear of hell and spurred on to good works by the thought of an eternal reward, before they attain perfect love. But, even for those souls who are not of the meritoria of Christ, they still have when only the thought of heaven and hell keeps them from falling. Such a disposition, be it habitual or only transitory, is morally less perfect, but it is not immoral. As, according to Christ’s doctrine and that of St. Paul (see above), it is legitimate to hope for a Heavenly reward, so, according to the same doctrine of Christ (cf. Matt., x, 28), the fear of hell is a motive of moral action, a “grace of God and an impulse of the Holy Ghost” (Council of Trent, Sess. XIV, cap. iv, in Denzinger, n. 989). Only that desire for remuneration (amor mercenarius) is reprehensible which would content itself with an eternal happiness without God, and that “doubly servile fear” (amor servilis) disregard to proceed from a mere dread of punishment without at the same time fearing God. But the dogmatic as well as the moral teaching of the Church avoids both of these extremes (see ATTENTION).

Besides blaming the Church for fostering a “craving for reward,” Protestants also accuse her of teaching “justification by works.” External virtues, they allege, such as fasting, almsgiving, pilgrimages, the recitation of the rosary etc., make the Catholic good and holy, the interior intention and disposition being held to no account. “The whole doctrine of merit, especially as explained by Catholics is based on the erroneous view which places the essence of morality in the non-action itself, in the mere regulation of the interior disposition as the habitual direction of the personal will” (Realencyclopaedie, loc. cit., p. 508). Only the grossest ignorance of Catholic doctrine can prompt such remarks. In accord with the Bible the Church teaches that the external work has a moral value only when and in so far as it proceeds from a right interior disposition and intention (cf. Matt., vi, 3, seq.; Mark, x, 31, seq.; Cor., x, 31, etc.). As the body receives its life from the soul, so must external actions be penetrated and vivified by holiness of intention. In a beautiful play on words St. Augustine says (Serm. iii, n. xi): Bonos more faciant boni amores. Hence the Church urges her children to form each morning the “good intention,” that they may keep to it and perform not only the各项工作, but also the indifferent actions of their exterior life serve for the glory of God; “all for the greater glory of God,” is the constant prayer of the faithful Catholic. Not only does the moral teaching of the Catholic Church attribute no moral value whatever to the mere external performance of good works without a corresponding good intention, but it detests such performance as hypocrisy and pretence. On the other hand, our good intention, provided it be genuine and deep-rooted, naturally spur us on to external works, and without these works it would be reduced to a mere semblance of life.

Against the Catholic doctrine on merit is summed up in the word “self-righteousness,” as if the just man utterly disregarded the merits of Christ and arrogated to himself the whole credit of his good works. If any Catholic has ever been so pharisaical as to hold and practise this doctrine, he has certainly set himself in direct opposition to what the Church teaches. The Church has always proclaimed St. Augustine’s words: “Non Deus coronat merita tua tanquam merita tua, sed tanquam dona sua” (De grat. et lib. arbitrio, xv), i.e., God crowns thy merits, not as thine earnings, but as His gifts. Nothing was more strongly and frequently inculcated by the Council of Trent than the proposition that the faithful owe their capability of meriting and all their good works solely to the infinite merits of the Redeemer Jesus Christ. It is indeed clear that meritorious works, as “fruits of the justification,” cannot be anything but merits due to grace, and not merits due to nature (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. VI, cap. xvi). The Catholic certainly must rely on the merits of his Redeemer to gain salvation on his own righteousness, he must acknowledge in all humility that even his merits, purchased with the help of grace, are full of imperfections, and that his justification is uncertain (see GRACE). Of the satisfactory works of penance the Council of Trent makes this explicit declaration: “Thus, man has not wherein to glory, but all our glorying is in Christ, in whom we live, move, and make satisfaction, bringing forth fruits worthy of penance, which from Him have their efficacy, are by Him offered to the Father, and through Him find with the Father acceptance” (Sess. XIV, cap. viii, in Denzinger, n. 904). Does this read like self-righteousness?

Conduproduction of Merit.—For all true merit (mera mereri; Council of Trent, Sess. VI, can. xxxiii), by which is to be understood only meritum de condigno (see Pallavicini, “Hist. Concil. Trident.,” VIII, iv), theologians have set down seven conditions, of which four regard the meritorious work, two the agent who merits, and one God who rewards.

(a) In order to be meritorious a work must be morally good, morally free, done with the assistance of actual grace, and inspired by a supernatural motive. As every evil deed implies derelict and deserves punishment, so the very notion of merit supposes a morally good work. St. Paul teaches that “whatsoever good thing (bonum) any man shall do, the same shall receive his reward” (Rom. xiii, 8). Not only are more perfect works
of supererogation, such as the vow of perpetual chastity, good and meritorious, but also works of the first class, as the ten commandments. Christ Himself actually made the attainment of Heaven depend on the mere observance of the ten commandments when he answered the youth who was anxious about his salvation: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments" (Matt., xix, 17). According to the authentic declaration of the Fourth Lateran, until (1215), the married state is also meritorious for heaven: "Not only those who live in virginity and continence, but also those who are married, please God by their faith and good works and merit eternal happiness" (cap. Firmiter, in Densinger, n. 430). As to morally indifferent actions (e.g., exercise and play, recreation derived from reciting the Veni, amen; St. Augustin) the Scotists hold that such works may be indifferent not only in the abstract, but also practically; this opinion, however, is rejected by the majority of theologians. Those who hold this view must hold that such morally indifferent actions are neither meritorious nor demeritorious, but become meritorious in proportion as they are morally good or bad. This may be called "the ethical intention". Although the voluntary omission of a work of obligation, such as the hearing of Mass on Sundays, is sinful and thereby demeritorious, still, according to the opinion of Suarez (De gratia, X, ii, 5 sqq.), it is more than doubtful whether conversely the mere omission of a bad action is in itself meritorious, since the eternal good or evil that is done in the act of omission just as it is in the act of commission. Since this struggle is a positive act and not a mere omission. Since the external work as such derives its entire moral value from the interior disposition, it adds no increase of merit except in so far as it reacts on the will and has the effect of intensifying and sustaining its action (cf. De Lugo, "De potentia potestatis," sect. 6).

As to the second requisite, i.e., moral liberty, it is clear from ethics that actions, due to external force or internal compulsion, can deserve neither reward nor punishment. It is an axiom of criminal jurisprudence that no one shall be punished for a misdeed done without free will; similarly, a good work can only then be meritorious and deserving of reward when it proceeds from a free determination of the will. This is the teaching of Christ (Matt., xix, 21): "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give it to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." The necessity of the third condition, i.e., of the influence of actual grace, is clear from the fact that even the natural just as heaven itself is supernatural, and that consequently it cannot be performed without the help of prevenient and assisting grace, which is necessary even for the just. The strictly supernatural destiny of the Beatific Vision, for which the Christian must strive, necessitates ways and means which lie altogether beyond what is purely natural (see Grace).

Finally, a supernatural motive is required because good works must be supernatural, not only as regards their object and circumstances, but also as regards the end for which they are performed (ex fine). But, in assigning the necessary qualities of this motive, theologians differ widely. While some require the motive of faith (motivum fidei) in order to have merit, others demand in addition the motive of charity (motivum caritatis), and thus, by rendering the conditions more difficult, considerably restrict the extent of meritorious works (as distinguished from merely good works). Others again set down as the only condition that the good work of the just man, who already has habitual faith and charity, be in some form with the Divine law and require no other special motive. This last opinion, which is in accordance with the practice of the majority of the faithful, is tenable, provided faith and charity exert at least an habitual (not necessarily virtual or actual) influence upon the good work, which influence essentially preserves the prevenient of his conversion makes an act of faith and of love of God, thereby knowingly and willingly beginning his supernatural journey towards God in heaven; this intention habitually retains its influence as long as it has not been revoked by mortal sin. And, since there is a grave obligation to make acts of faith, hope, and charity from time to time, these two motives will thereby occasionally renewed and revived. For the controversy regarding the motive of faith see Chr. Pecht, "Prelat dot. mag." V, 3rd ed. (1908), 225 sqq.; on the motive of charity, see Pohle, "Dogmatik" II 4th ed. (1909), 565 sqq.

(b) The agent who merits must fulfil two conditions: he must be in the state of pilgrimage (status viae) and in the state of grace (status gratiae). By the state of pilgrimage is to be understood our earthly life; death, as a natural (although not an essentially necessary) limit, closes the time of meriting. The time of sowing is confined to this life; the reaping is reserved for the next; when no man will be able to sow either wheat or tares. Only a man of the time of grace and of the time of death at midnight, says Christ: "The night cometh, when no man can work" (operari) (John, ix, 4; cf. Eccl., xi, 3; Ecclus., xiv, 17). The opinion proposed by a few theologians (Hirscher, Schell), that for certain classes of men there may still be a possibility of conversion after death, is contrary to the incontestable judgment (judicium particulare) determines instantly and definitively whether the future is to be one of eternal happiness or of eternal misery (cf. Kleutgen, "Theologie der Vorzeit"). II, 2nd ed., Münster, 1872, pp. 427 sqq.). Baptized children, who die before attaining the age of reason, are admitted to heaven without the merits of this life (titulus mercedis); in the case of adults, however, there is the additional title of reward (titulus mercedis), and for that reason they will enjoy a greater measure of eternal happiness.

In addition to the state of pilgrimage, the state of grace (i.e., the possession of sanctifying grace) is required for meriting, because only the just can be "sons of God" and "heirs of heaven" (cf. Rom., viii, 17). In the parable of the vine Christ expressly declares the "abiding in him" a necessary condition for "bearing fruit": "He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit" (John, xv, 5); and this constant union with Christ is effected only by sanctifying grace. Consequently the majority of theologians are of opinion that one who is holier will gain greater merit for a given work than one who is less holy, although the latter perform the same work under exactly the same circumstances and in the same way. The reason is that a higher degree of grace enhances the godlike dignity of the agent, and this dignity increases the value of the merit. This explains why God, in consideration of the greater holiness of some saints specially dear to Him, has deigned to grant favours which otherwise He would have refused (Job, xlii, 8; Dan., iii, 35).

(c) Merit requires on the part of God that He accept (in actu secundo) the good work as meritorious, even though the work in itself (in actu primo) and previous to its acceptance by God, be already truly meritorious. Theologians, however, are not agreed as to the necessity of this condition. The Scotists hold that the entire condignity of the good work rests exclusively on the gratuitous promise of God and His free acceptance, without which even the most heroic act and its devoi do of the first class, and naturally good works may become meritorious.

Other theologians with Suarez (De gratia, XIII, 30) maintain that, before and without Divine acceptance, the strict equality that exists between merit and re-
ward forwards a claim of justice to have the good works rewarded in heaven. Both these views are extreme. The former until death, the latter, until the dignity which belongs to the just as "adopted children of God", and which naturally impresses on their supernatural actions the character of meritoriousness; Suarez, on the other hand, unnecessarily exaggerates the notion of Divine justice and the con dignity of merit, for the abyss that lies between human service and Divine remuneration is so great that there could be no obligation of bridging it over by a gratuitous promise of reward and the subsequent acceptance on the part of God who has bound himself by his own fidelity. Hence we prefer with Lessius (De perfect. moribusque div., Xll, ii) and De Lugo (De incarnat. disp. 3, sect. 1 sq.) to follow a middle course. We therefore conclude that the spiritual reward owes its origin to a twofold source: to the intrinsic value of the good work and to the free acceptance and gratuitous promise of God (cf. James, i, 12). See Schiini, "De gratia divina" (Freiburg, 1901), pp. 418 sqq.

IV. THE OBJECTS OF MERIT.—Merit in the strict sense (meritum de condigno) gives a right to a threefold reward: increase of sanctifying grace, heavenly glory, and the increase thereof; other graces can be acquired only in virtue of congruous merit (meritum de congruo).

(a) In its Sixth Session (can. xxxiv), the Council of Trent declared: "If any one saith . . . that the justified man by good works . . . acquires . . . some increase of grace; eternal life; and the attainment of that eternal life—if so be, however, that he depart in grace—and also an increase in glory; let him be anathema." The expression "vere mereri" shows that the three objects mentioned above can be merited in the true and strict sense of the word, viz., de condigno. Increase of grace (momentum gratiae) is termed in the first place to exclude the first factor of justification concerning which the council had already taught: "None of those things, which precede justification—whether faith or works—merit the grace itself of justification" (Sess. VI, cap. viii). This impossibility of meriting the first habitual grace is as much a dogma of our Faith as the absolute impossibility of meriting the first actual grace (see GRACE). The growth in sanctifying grace, on the other hand, is perfectly evident from both Scripture and Tradition (cf., Ecclus., xviii, 22; II Cor., ix, 10; Apoc., xxii, 11 sqq.). To the question whether the right to actual graces needed by the just be also an object of strict merit, theologians have answered in the affirmative. The increase of habitual grace, merely sufficient graces may be merited de condigno, but not efficacious graces. The reason is that the right to efficacious graces would necessarily include the strict right to final perseverance, which lies completely outside the sphere of condign merit although it may be obtained by prayer (see GRACE). Not even heroic acts give a strict right to graces which are always efficacious or to final perseverance, for even the greatest saint is still obliged to watch, pray, and tremble lest he fall from the state of grace. This explains why the Council of Trent purposely omitted efficacious grace and the gift of perseverance, when it enumerated the objects of merit.

Life everlasting (viae aeterna) is the second object of merit; the dogmatical proof for this assertion has been given above in treating of the existence of merit. It still remains to inquire whether the distinction made by the Council of Trent between viae aeterna and viae aeterna consecutio is meant to signify a twofold reward, "life everlasting" and "the attainment of life everlasting", and hence a twofold object of merit. But theologians rightly deny that the council had this in view, because it is clear that the right to a reward coincides with the right to the payment of the same. Nevertheless, the distinction was not useless or superfluous, because, notwithstanding the right to eternal glory, the actual possession of it must necessarily be dependent on the man's perfect condition: "Sicut enim in gravioribus" (provided he depart in grace). With this last condition the council wished also to inculcate the salutary truth that sanctifying grace may be lost by mortal sin, and that the loss of the state of grace ipso facto entails the forfeiture of all merits however great. Even the greatest saint, should he die in the state of mortal sin, arrives in eternity as an enemy of God with empty hands, just as if during life he had never done anything, meritorious. All his former rights to grace and glory are cancelled. To make them revive a new justification is necessary. On this "revival of merits" (reviviscenra meritorum) see Schiini, "De gratia divina" (Freiburg, 1901), pp. 418 sqq.; this question is treated in detail by Pohle, "Dogmatik", III (4th ed., Paderborn, 1910), pp. 440 sqq.

As the third object of merit the council mentions the "increase of glory" (groria augmentum) which evidently must correspond to the increase of grace, as this corresponds to the accumulation of good works. At the Last Day, when Christ will come to judge the world, "He will render to every man according to his works [secundum opera eiu]" (Matt., xvi, 27; cf. Rom., ii, 6). And St. Paul repeats the same (I Cor., iii, 8): "Every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labour [secundum suum laborum]." This explains the inequality that exists between the glory of the different increase.

(b) By his good works the just man may merit for himself many graces and favours, not, however, by right and justice (de condigno), but only congruously (de congruo). Most theologians incline to the opinion that the grace of final perseverance is among the objects of congruous merit, for which grace of merit above, is not and cannot be merited condignly. It is better, however, and safer if, with a view to obtaining this great grace on which our eternal happiness depends, we have recourse to fervent and unremitting prayer, for Christ held out to us that above all our spiritual needs he would infallibly hear our prayer for this great gift (cf. Matt., xxii, 22; Mark, ii, 24; Luke, xi, 9; John, xiv, 13, etc.). For further explanation see Bellarmine, "De justif.", V, xxix; Tepe, "Insti. theol.", III (Paris, 1896), 258 sqq.

It is impossible to answer with equal certainty the question whether the just man is able to merit in advance the grace of conversion, if perchance he may, by his good works, meritoriously gain the grace of merit for that grace. Most theologians deny this absolutely: "Nullus potest sibi mereri reparationem post lapsum futurum neque merito condigno neque merito congrui."

But because the Prophet Jephthah declared to Josephat, the wicked King of Juda (cf. II Par., xix, 2 sqq.), that God had regard for his former merits, almost all the other theologians consider it a "pious and probable opinion" that God, in granting the grace of conversion, does not entirely disregard the merits lost by mortal sin, especially if the merits previously acquired surpass in number and weight the sins, which, perhaps, were due to weakness, and if those merits are not crushed, as it were, by a burden of iniquity (cf. Suarez, De gratia, XII, 38). Prayer for future conversion from sin is indeed morally good and useful (cf. Ps., lxx, 9), because the disposition by which we sincerely wish to be freed as soon as possible from the state of enmity with God cannot but be pleasing to Him. Temporal blessings, such as health, freedom from extreme poverty, success in one's undertakings, seem to be objects of merit in some way, and therefore the refusal of which is conducive to eternal salvation; for only on this hypothesis do they assume the character of actual graces (cf. Matt., vi, 33). But, for obtaining temporal favours, prayer is more effective than meritorious works, provided that the granting of the petition be not against
the designs of God or the true welfare of him who prays. The just man may meriti de congruo for others (e.g. his own relatives, and friends), whatever is able to merit for himself: the grace of conversion, final perseverance, temporal blessings, nay even the very first prevenient grace (gratia prima praevenientia), (Summa Theol., I-II, Q. cxxiv, a.6) which he can in no wise merit for himself. St. Thomas gives a reason for this the intimate bond of friendship which sanctity of degrees implies between the just man and the God. These effects are immeasurably strengthened by prayer for others; as it is beyond doubt that prayer plays an important part in the present economy of salvation. For further explanation see Suarez, “De gratia,” XII, 38. Contrary to the opinion of a few theologians (e.g. Biatiart), we hold that even a man in mortal sin, if he is indeed joined with the grace of conversion, is able to merit de congruo by his supernatural acts not only a series of graces which will lead to conversion, but finally justification itself; at all events it is certain that he may obtain these graces by prayer, made with the assistance of grace (cf. Ps., 1, 9; Tob., xii, 9; Dan., iv, 24; Matt., vi, 14).

Mermillod, GASPARD, Bischof von Lausanne und cardinal, b. at Carouge, Switzerland, 22 Sept., 1824; d. in Rome, 23 Feb., 1892. He studied at the Jesuit College at Freiburg, Switzerland; became a priest in 1847, and was soon after a curate in Geneva, where he established two periodicals, “L'Observateur Catholique” and “Les Catholiques”. In 1862 he became parish priest of Geneva and at the same time Vicar-General of the Bishop of Lausanne for the canton of Geneva. The splendid edifice of Notre-Dame, still the principal church of Geneva, was built by him from 1851 to 1859. The funds were subscribed from all parts of Christendom. In 1864 he became titular Bishop of Hebron, and auxiliary of the Bishop of Lausanne for the canton of Geneva, with residence at Geneva. For seven years he pursued without hindrance his episcopal functions, and was especially active for Catholic education, founding with Marie de Sales Chappuis the female Oblates of Saint Francis of Sales at Troyes for the protection of poor working girls. When the Holy See made him independent Administrator of Geneva, the Radical Government of the canton protested, and a long and serious conflict ensued. He was at first forbidden to exercise any episcopal functions whatever, and later was declared deposed even as regarded his functions as a parish priest. When the Bishop of Lausanne renounced unconstitutionality of the Swiss and appointed Mermillod to be Vicar-Apostolic of Geneva. The City Council, then, caused his expulsion from Switzerland, whereupon he repaired to Ferney, in French territory, from which place he governed his diocese as best he could. At the cessation of the religious conflict Leo XIII made the newly elected Bishop of Lausanne also Bishop of Geneva, without, however, depriving Mermillod of his office. The Government did not, however, alter its tactics, and Mermillod could return to Switzerland only after the death of the bishop whose successor he became. The conflict was, however, by no means at an end, for the canton of Geneva refused to recognize him as bishop, and normal relations were resumed only when Mermillod became cardinal in 1890. Cardinal Mermillod was one of the great preachers of modern times. In his far-sighted policy he founded in 1885 the “Union Catholique d'études sociales et économiques”. His “Lettres à un Prostestant sur l'autorité de l'Église et le schisme” (Paris, 1860) made a great impression. Another important work was his “Histoire du nom de Jésus” (Paris, 1865; Rome, 1881). His collected works were edited by Grospeller (Paris, 1893) in three volumes.

J. Pohle.

Mermillod, J., Le cardinal Mermillod, son vie, ses œuvres et son apostolat (Fribourg, 1892).

Patricius Schläger.
MÉRODE, a Belgian prelate and statesman, b. at Brussels, 1820; d. at Rome, 1874. The son of Félix de Mérode, Westerloer who held successively the portfolios of foreign affairs, war, and finances under King Leopold, and of Rosalie de Grammont, he was allied to the best names of France.—Lafayette, Montmorency, Clement-Lyonnerre, etc.; the Mérode family claimed saints like Ethelbert and Etheldreda, and one of them married the offspring of Schwartzzenbroch, and a long line of captains from that Raymond-Bérenger who took the cross at St. Bernard’s call, to Frédéric, Xavier’s grandfather, who gave his life for the autonomy of Belgium. Bereft of his mother at the age of three, Xavier was brought up at Villerscel, in French pensions on the Moselle. After attending for a time the Jesuit College of Namur, then entered the Collège de Jullie presided over by de Salinis, whence he passed (1839) to the Military Academy of Brussels. Graduating with the rank of second lieutenant, after a short service at the armory of Liège, he joined (1844) as foreign attaché the staff of Marshal MacMahon, himself a brilliant part in the most daring engagements and winning the cross of the Légion d’honneur. In 1847, he abruptly resigned the military career and went to study for the priesthood in Rome, where he ordained (1849). Assigned, after his ordination, as chaplain to the French garrison of Viterbo, he was being pressed by his family to return to Belgium when Pius IX, with a view to attach him permanently to his court, made him cameriere segreto (1850), an office which entitled the direction of the Roman prisons. The excellent work done by de Mérode for the material, moral, and religious betterment of the penitentiary system in Rome is described by Lebreton (Des établissements charitables de Rome, p. 1445). ambassador to the Vatican, Its Ruler and Institutions, p. 238); de Rayneval, the French envoy at Rome, praised it in an official report to his government (see “Daily News,” 18 March, 1848); Joachim Pecchi, Archbishop of Perugia, wanted the young cameriere to inaugurate similar work in his metropolis, and the Piedmontese, despite their bias against every foreign not only to change in the regulations introduced by de Mérode. In 1860, when it became evident that the insinuance policy Napoleon III was a poor safeguard against the greed of Piedmont, de Mérode, much against the views of the Roman Freiheit, headed by Cardinal Antonelli, persuaded Pius IX to form a papal army and succeed in enlisting the services of Lamoricière (q.v.) as commander-in-chief and was himself appointed minister of war. The task assumed by de Mérode and Lamoricière was difficult and well-nigh impossible; yet, the disasters of Castelfidardo and Ancora were due, not to the incompetence of the chiefs, nor solely to the hereditary nature of the recruits and the lack of proper supplies, but to the treachery of the Piedmontese and to the demoralization of the army, who, while feigning to curb the Carabidalian bands, led them to the assault of the Papal States.

The ensuing years of comparative quiet de Mérode spent in various public works; the building at his own expense of the campo pratorio outside the Porta Pia, the clearing of the approaches of Santa Maria degli Angeli, the opening of streets in the new section of Rome, the sanitation of the old quarters by the Tiber, etc. His impetuous temperament and progressive views made him enemies among the old traditional Roman element just as the vehemence with which he branded the French Emperor’s duplicity turned against him the heads of the French army of occupation, Lamoricière’s death (162 Sept., 1866) became the signal of open hostility. Pius IX was forced to discharge his minister whose continuance in office, it was freely asserted, meant the withdrawal of the French troops. Reduced to a simple cameriere, de Mérode was not forgotten by Pius IX on Hohenlueh’s promotion to the cardinalate, he was given the vacant title of papal almoner’s death (162 Sept., 1866) became the signal of open hostility. Pius IX was forced to discharge his minister whose continuance in office, it was freely asserted, meant the withdrawal of the French troops. Reduced to a simple cameriere, de Mérode was not forgotten by Pius IX on Hohenlueh’s promotion to the cardinalate, he was given the vacant title of papal almoner’s death (162 Sept., 1866) became the signal of open hostility. Pius IX was forced to discharge his minister whose continuance in office, it was freely asserted, meant the withdrawal of the French troops. Reduced to a simple cameriere, de Mérode was not forgotten by Pius IX on Hohenlueh’s promotion to the cardinalate, he was given the vacant title of papal almoner’s death (162 Sept., 1866) became the signal of open hostility. Pius IX was forced to discharge his minister whose continuance in office, it was freely asserted, meant the withdrawal of the French troops. Reduced to a simple cameriere, de Mérode was not forgotten by Pius IX on Hohenlueh’s promotion to the cardinalate, he was given the vacant title of papal almoner’s death (162 Sept., 1866) became the signal of open hostility. Pius IX was forced to discharge his minister whose continuance in office, it was freely asserted, meant the withdrawal of the French troops. Reduced to a simple cameriere, de Mérode was not
publishing a number of works on mathematical sciences. His chief merit, however, is rather the encouragement which he gave to scientists of his time, the interest he took in their work, and the stimulating influence of his suggestions and questions. Gassendi and Galileo were among his friends; but, above all, Mersenne is known to-day as Descartes's friend and adviser. In fact, when Descartes began to lead a free and dissipated life, it was Mersenne who brought him back to more serious pursuits and directed him toward philosophy. In Paris, Mersenne was close to the stimulating and various correspondent, auxiliary, and representative, as well as his constant defender. The numerous and vehement attacks against the "Meditations" seem, for a moment, to have aroused Malebranche's suspicions; but Descartes's answers to his critics gave him full satisfaction as to his friend's orthodoxy and sincere Christian spirit. Mersenne asked that, after his death, an autopsie be made on his body, so as to serve to the last the interests of science.

Mersenne's works are: "Questiones celeberrimae in Gencisa" (Paris, 1623), against Atheists and Deists; a part only has been published, the rest being still in manuscript, as also a "Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel" (1625), "Les Dialogues des Savants" (1634), "Geometriae Gallicae" (Paris, 1634), a translation from the Italian; "Harmonie universelle, contenant la theorie et la pratique de la musique" (Paris, 1636-7); "Nouvelles decouvertes de Galilée" and "Nouvelles pensées de Galilei sur les mécaniques" (Paris, 1639), both translations; "Cogitatio physico-mathematica" (Paris, 1644); "Euclidis elementorum libri XII" and "Sereni de dianothe et psiche libri quinque." (Paris, 1626), selections and translations of ancient mathematicians, published again later with notes and additions under the title, "Universe geometriae mixtœque mathematicæ synopsés" (Paris, 1644).

Messa (Gr., Μοῖρα; Moabite Stone, נשת; Heb., נשת, meaning "deliverance" according to Gesenius), a King of Moab in the ninth century B.C., whose history is given in IV Kings, iii. He paid tribute to Ahab, King of Israel, "and gave tribute yearly and hired armed thousand rams with their fleeces" (verse 4). This seems to have been paid annually, and was possible since Moab was rich in pastures; accordingly, Messa is styled "מָיוֹר, which, though left untranslated in the Greek text, means "sheep-owner" (Gesenius). After Ahab's death, Moab refused to pay tribute, on which account of Moab's King Joram and King of Edom entered into an alliance against him. They went by the southern route passing through an arid country, where they would have perished of drought, had not the prophet Elisha miraculously supplied them with water. The ditches they had dug by command of the prophet were filled, and at a distance the Moabites "saw the waters over against them red, like blood" (verse 22). Thinking their enemies had killed one another, they rushed to the camp with the cry "Moab to the spoils" (verse 23), only to be driven back with great slaughter. The allies followed. Messa having tried, with seven hundred warriors, to cut his way through the besiegers and failed, took to flight, and, in the sight of all, put him to death. "There was great indignation in Israel", so that, for reasons not given in detail, "they departed from him."
France 27 Nov., 1887, the delegate Apostolic, Mgr. Alt-
mayer, received the title of Archbishop of Babylon or
Bagdad, but continued to reside at Mossul. In 1902 he
resigned and was replaced in the See of Bagdad by a
Carmelite, Mgr. Drue, who on 5 March, 1904, received
the title of delegate Apostolic of Mesopotamia and still
bears it. He usually resides at Mossul. The Delega-
tion Apostolic of Mesopotamia has almost the same
boundaries as the Archdiocese of Bagdad, but comprises
part of the mission of Greater Armenia and the Ne-
torians of Turkish Kurdistan, which mission is confided
to the Dominicans of Mosul. (See BAGGAD; MOSSUL.)
Violet, Les Missions, 1 (Paris, 1900), 236–41.
S. Vaille.

Mesrobo, also called Mashtots, one of the greatest
figures in Armenian history, b. about 361 at Hassak
in the Province of Taron; d. at Valarsabard, 441. He
was the son of Vartan of the family of the Mamikon-
ians. Gorun, his pupil and biographer, tells us that
Mesrobo received a liberal education, and was versed
in the Greek, Syrian, and Persian languages. On ac-
count of his piety and learning Mesrobo was appointed
secretary to King Chosroes III. His duty was to
write in Greek, Persian, and Syrian characters the
decrees and edicts of the sovereign, for, at this time,
there was no national alphabet. But Mesrobo felt cal-
ced to leave behind him a body of literature. To serve
the service of God, he took Holy orders, and withdrew
to a monastery with a few chosen companions. There,
says Gorun, he practised great austerities, enduring
hunger and thirst, cold and poverty. He lived on
vegetables, wore a hair shirt, slept upon the ground,
and often spent whole nights in prayer and the study of
the Scriptures. After a few years, preparing himself
for the great work to which Providence was soon to call him. Indeed both
Church and State needed his services. Armenia, so
long the battle-ground of Romans and Persians, lost
its independence in 387, and was divided between the
Byzantine Empire and Persia, about four-fifths being
given to the latter. Western Armenia was governed
by Greek generals, while an Armenian king ruled,
but only as feudatory, over Persian Armenia. The
Church was naturally influenced by these violent politi-
cal changes, although the loss of civil independence
and the partition of the land could not destroy its
organization or subdue its spirit. Persecution only
quickened its activity. Through the labors of bringing
the clergy, the nobles, and the common people closer
together. The principal events of this period are the invention of the Armenian alphabet,
the revision of the liturgy, the creation of an ecclesias-
tical and national literature, and the readjustment of
hierarchical relations. Three men are prominently
associated with this stupendous work: Mesrobo, Patri-
arch Isaac, and King Vramshapuh, who succeeded his
brother Chosroes III in 394.

Mesrobo, as we have noted, had spent some time in a
monastery preparing for a missionary life. With the
support of Princes Shampit, he preached the Gospel
in the district of Goitn near the Araxes, converting
many heretics and pagans. But he encountered great
difficulty in instructing the people, for the
Armenians had no alphabet of their own, but used the
Greek, Persian, and Syrian scripts, none of which was
well suited for representing the many complex sounds
of their native tongue. Again, the Holy Scriptures
and the liturgy, being written in Syriac, were, to a
large extent, beyond the comprehension of the
people. It was necessary to translate these into an
alphabet which would be more easily understood.

To this end, Mesrobo invented an alphabet which
he proposed to call the "Mesrobo Alphabet." The
names of the first five letters were: Abo, Abah, An,
Afall, and Aboz. The letters were arranged in the
same order as in our alphabet, and the names of the
letters were given to each letter in accordance with
the way in which the letter was pronounced.

Mesrobo's alphabet was 수가 introduced into the
region of Armenia, where it was used for several hun-
tred years. It was adopted by the Armenian Church
and became the official alphabet of Armenia. The
alphabet was used for a variety of purposes, including
writing religious texts, official documents, and
cultural and scholarly works. It was a major
achievement in the history of Armenian culture and
language, and it played a significant role in the
development of the Armenian nation.

In conclusion, Mesrobo's invention of the Armenian
alphabet was a significant event in the history of
Armenian culture. It represented a major advance in
the field of language and writing, and it paved the
way for the later development of national literature
and education in Armenia. Mesrobo's contribution to
this field was a testament to his dedication and
vision, and it continues to be an important legacy for
the Armenian people.

The invention of the alphabet (406) was the begin-
ing of Mesrobo's work on the alphabet, and it
represented a major step forward in the development
of the Armenian language. Through his efforts, Mesrobo
made a significant contribution to the history of
Armenian literacy and culture, and his work contin-
ues to be an important part of the Armenian
heritage. His dedication to the cause of literacy and
education was a testament to his commitment to the
benefit of his people, and his legacy continues to
inspire future generations of Armenians.
He survived his friend and master only six months. The Armenians read his name in the Canon of the Mass, and celebrate his memory on 19 February.


dota Graeca”, III, 182). In Armenia in the middle of the fifth century strict decrees were issued against them, and they were especially accused of immoralit; so that their very name in Armenian became the equivalent for “filthy”. The Nestorians in Syria did their best to stamp out the evil by legislation; the Messalians ceased to exist under that name, but re-appeared under that of the Bogomili. In the West they seem hardly to have been known; when the Manicians, who held somewhat the same tenets as the Messalians, were mentioned to Gregory the Great, he pressed never to have heard of the Marcian heresy.

Messene, a titular see, suffragan to Corinth, in Achaia. Under this name at least, the city dates only from the fourth century B.C. When Epaminondas had crushed the Spartans at Leuctra, he recalled the scattered Messenians and caused them to build, on the slopes of Mount Ithome, a new capital which they called Messene (370 B.C.): the walls of this city were over five and a half miles in length, and were accounted the best in Greece. The portion of them which still remains justifies this reputation. Christianity early took root there, though only a few of its bishops are known (Le Quien, “Orients christians”, II, 195). At the beginning of the fourth century the “Notitiae episcopatuum” of the Wise gives Messene as an independent archbishopric (Gelzer, “Ungedruckte ... Texte der Notitiae episcopatum”, 551); and the same is true for the beginning of the fourteenth century (op. cit., 612). As this diocese does not figure in the “Notitiae” of the fifteenth century, it must be assumed that it ceased to exist. The little village of Mavromati, with a population of 600, the capital of the Deme of Ithome, now stands upon the ruins of ancient Messene.

Messias.—The name Messias is a transliteration of the Hebrew, מֶשֶׁא, “the anointed”. The word appears only twice of the promised prince (Dan., ix, 26; Ps. ii, 2); yet, when a name was wanted for the promised one, who was to be at once King and Saviour, it was natural to employ this synonym for the royal title, denoting at the same time the King’s royal dignity and His relation to God. The full title “Anointed of Jehovah” occurs in several passages of the Psalter and the Apocalypse of Baruch, but the abbreviated form, “Anointed” or “the Anointed”, was in common use. When used without the article, it would seem to be a proper name. The word Xpārtos so occurs in several passages of the Gospels. This, however, is no proof that the word was generally so understood at that time. Bishop of Antioch, tried to suppress them in his city about 376. By feigning sympathy he made Adelphius disclose his real doctrines; and then he banished him and his followers. They then wandered to the south-east of Asia Minor. Amphilochoi of Icornium were induced by them to be once again condemned at the Synod of Side (388-390). They were once again condemned at the Synod of Ic. And the local council at which Amphilochoi of Side presided. Yet the sect continued to exist. At first it included only laymen. Lampetius, one of the leaders after the middle of the fifth century was a priest, having been ordained by Alypius of Cesarea. He was degraded from his priesthood on account of unpiety, and composed a book bearing the title “The Testament of Solomon” to this work of Lampetius (Wolf, “Anec-
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not pass from Judaea until he comes to whom it belongs”—taking שַׁלַּח as standing for שָׁלַח, and of David (II Kings, vii, 11-16). It is sufficiently established that this last passage refers at least typically to the Messias. His kingdom shall be eternal (II Kings, vii, 13), His sway boundless (Ps. lxxi, 8); all nations shall serve Him (Ps. lxxi, 11). In the type of prophecy we are considering, the emphasis is on His position as a national hero. It is to Israel and Judah He will bring salvation (Jer. xxvi, 6), triumphing over their enemies by force of arms (cf. the warrior-king of Ps. cv). Even in the latter part of Isaiah there are passages (e.g. lxi, 5-8) in which other nations are regarded as sharing in the kingdom rather as servants than as heirs, while the function of the Messias is to lift up Israel and Judah to glory and lay the foundations of an Israelitic theocracy.

But in this part of Isaiah also occurs the splendid conception of the Messias as the Servant of Jehovah. He is a chosen arrow, His mouth like a sharp sword. The Spirit of the Lord is poured out upon Him, and His word is put into His mouth (xiii, 1; xiv, 1 sq.). The instrument of His power is the word of God. The nation waits on His teaching; He is the light of the Gentiles (xiii, 6). He establishes His Kingdom not by manifestation of material power, but by meekness and suffering, by obedience to the command of God in laying down His life for the salvation of many. "If he shall lay down his life for sin, he shall also rise again for the justification of God's elect." (Rom. vi, 7). He shall divide the spoils of the strong, because he hath delivered his soul unto death, and was reputed with the wicked" (lii, 12). His Kingdom shall consist of the multitude redeemed by His vicarious satisfaction, a satisfaction confined to the elect, who are justified and made perfect alike. (For the Messianic application of these passages, especially Is., lii, 13-14, cf. Condamine or Knabenbauer, in loc.) "Therefore will I divide him very many, and he shall divide the spoils of the strong, because he hath delivered his soul unto death, and was reputed with the wicked" (lii, 12). His Kingdom shall consist of the multitude redeemed by His vicarious satisfaction, a satisfaction confined to the elect, who are justified and made perfect alike. (For the Messianic application of these passages, especially Is., lii, 13-14; cf. Condamine or Knabenbauer, in loc.) In spite, however, of Justin's use of the last-mentioned passage in "Dial. cum Tryphone", xxxix, it would be rash to affirm that its reference to the Messias was at all widely realized among the Jews. In virtue of his prophetic and priestly offices the title of "the Anointed" naturally belonged to the promised one. The Messianic priest is described by David in Ps. cix, with reference to Gen., xxv, 14-20. That this psalm was generally understood in a Messianic sense is not disputed, while the universal consent of the Fathers puts the matter beyond doubt. The testimony of its Divine authorship, the arguments impugning it afford no warrant for an abandonment of the traditional view. That by the prophet described in Deut., xviii, 15-22, was also understood, at least at the beginning of our era, the Messias is clear from the appeal to his gift of prophecy made by the pseudo-Messias Theudas (cf. Josephus, Antiquities, xvi, 220), and the use made of the passage by St. Peter in Acts, iii, 22-23.

Special importance attaches to the prophetic description of the Messias contained in Daniel, vii, the great work of later Judaism, on account of its paramount influence upon one line of the later development of Messianic doctrine. In it the Messias is described as "like to a Son of Man," appearing at the right hand of Jehovah in the clouds of heaven, inaugurating the new age, not by a national victory or by vicarious satisfaction, but by exercising the Divine right of judging the whole world. Thus, the emphasis is upon the personal responsibility of the individual. The consummation is not an earth-born ascendency of the Messias, but the triumph of God's righteous will on earth; not a vindication of the holy by the solemn judgment of Jehovah and his Anointed One. Upon this prophecy were mainly based the various apocalyptic works which played so prominent a part in the religious life of the Jews during the last two centuries before Christ. Side by side with all these prophecies speaking of the establishment of a kingdom under the sway of a Divinely-appointed legate, was the series foretelling the future rule of Jehovah himself. Of these Is., xl, may be taken as an example: "Lift up thy voice with strength thou that bringest good tidings to Sion: lift it up, fear not. Say to the cities of Judah: Behold your God. Behold the Lord your God shall come with strength and his arm shall rule." The reconciliation of these two series of prophecies was before the Jews in the passages—noticeably Ps. lii and Is., vii-xi—which clearly foretold the Divinity of the promised legate. "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace. All the ends of the earth shall fear him." (Is., xi, 2-3). The state of the Universe is all used elsewhere to glorify himself (cf. Davidson, "O. T. Prophecy", p. 367). But there seems to have been little realization of the relation between these two series of prophecy until the full light of the Christian dispensation revealed their reconciliation in the mystery of the Incarnation.

II. MESSIANIC DOCTRINE IN LATER JUDAISM (see APOCRYPHA).—Two quite distinct and parallel lines of messianism are discernible in the later development of Messianic doctrine among the Jews, according as the writers clung to a national ideal, based on the literal interpretation of the earlier prophecies, or an apocalyptic ideal, based principally on Daniel. The national ideal looked to the establishment on earth of the Kingdom of God under the rule of God's Anointed One (Daniel, 7, 9, 14, 18, 26, 27), the reconstruction of the temple, the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and the temple, and the gathering in of the Dispersed. The apocalyptic ideal drew a sharp distinction between αἰων ὑπερῶν and αἰων μελλόν. The future age was to be ushered in by the Divine judgment of mankind preceded by the resurrection of the dead. The Messias was one existing from the beginning of the world, and is the "first-born among many brethren," and shall appear at the consummation of all things, and then shall be also manifested the heavenly Jerusalem which was to be the abode of the blessed.

National Ideal.—The national ideal is that of official Pharisaism. Thus, the Talmud has no trace of the apocalyptic ideal. The scribes were mainly busy with the Law, but side by side with this was the development of the hope of the ultimate manifestation of God's Kingdom on earth. Pharisaic influence is clearly visible in vv. 573-808 of Sibyl. III, describing the national hopes of the Jews. A last judgment, future happiness, or reward are not mentioned. Many marvels are foretold of the Messianic wars which are described as "days of light and darkness, of mourning and rejoicing, of come from heaven, the darkening of the sun, the falling of meteors—but all have for end a state of earthly prosperity. The Messias, coming from the East, dominates the whole, a triumphant national hero. Similar to this is the work called the Psalms of Solomon, written probably about 40 B.C. It is really the prototype of apocalyptic against the later Zealotism. The Pharisees saw that the observance of the law was not of itself a sufficient bulwark against the enemies of Israel, and, as their principles would not allow them to recognize in the secularized hierarchy the promised issue of their troubles, they looked forward to the miraculous intervention of God through the agency of a Davideic Messias. The seventeenth Psalm describes his rule: He is to conquer the heathen, to drive them from their land, to allow no injustice in their midst; His trust is not to be in armies but in God; with the word of his mouth he is to slay the wicked. Of earlier date we have the description of the final glories of the holy city in Tobit (c. xiv), where, as well as in Ezekiel, there is a portrays the future gathering in of the Dispersion. These same nationalistic ideas reappear along with a highly developed system of eschatology in the apocalyptic works written after the destruction of Jerusalem, which are referred to below.
Apocalyptic Ideal.—The status of the apocalyptic writers as regards the religious life of the Jews has been keenly disputed (cf. Sanday, "Life of Christ in Recent Research", pp. 49 sqq.). Though they had small influence in Jerusalem, the stronghold of Rabbinism, they probably both influenced and reflected the religious aspirations of the Jews at large. Thus, the apocalyptic ideal of the Messias would seem not to be the sentiment of a few enthusiasts, but to express the true hopes of a considerable section of the people. Before the Asmonean revival Israel had almost ceased to be a nation, and thus the hope of a national Messias had grown very dim. In the earliest apocalyptic writings there is nothing said of the Messias. In the first part of the Book of Hencoh (i-xxxvi) we have an example of such a work. Not the coming of a human prince, but the descent of God upon Sinai to judge the world divides all time into two epochs. The just shall receive the gift of wisdom and become sinless. They will feed on the tree of life and enjoy a longer span than the Patriarchs.

The Machabean victories roused both the national and religious sentiment. The writers of the earlier Asmonean times, seeing the ancient glories of their race reviving, could no longer ignore the hope of a personal Messias to rule the kingdom of the new age. The problem arose how to connect their present deliverance with the Messianic promises. Leviticus, in the Massoretic text of Lev., 18:30, is the authorized text of Jewish tradition. Lev. 23:36 is the promise of a king, Lev. 26:43 the promise of a son of David, and Lev. 23:51 the promise of the city of Jerusalem. It is evident that the going version of the book was the one that was finally approved by the body of the tribe of Judah. The Messias is but a vague figure, and little stress is laid on the judgment. The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs is a composite work. The foundation portion, conspicuous from its glorification of the priesthood, dates from before 100 B.C.; there are, however, later Jewish additions, hostile in tone to the priesthood, and numerous Christian interpolations. Controversy has arisen as to the principal figure in this work. According to Charles (Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, p. xcvi) there is pictured as the Messias a son of Levi who realizes all the lofty spiritual ideals of the Christian Saviour. Lagrange on the other hand (Le Messiasime ches les Juifs) finds the type of the Messias in Moses in the Exodus. In this case, the portrait is the result of Christian interpolations; these removed, there remains only a laudation of the part played by Levi, in the person of the Asmoneans, as the instrument of national and religious liberation. A conspicuous instance in point is Test. Lev., Ps. xviii. While Charles says this ascribes the Messianic characteristics to the Levites, Lagrange and Bousset deny that it is Messianic at all. Apart from the interpolations, is merely natural praise of the new royal priesthood. There can be no question indeed as to the pre-eminence of Levi; he is compared to the sun and Judia to the moon. But there is in fact a description of a Messias descended from Juda in Test. Juda. There is much in the original of the tradition of the three of them and the foundation part of the book. He appears also in the Testament of Joseph, though the passage is couched in an allegorical form difficult to follow. The vision of Weeks of Hencoh, dating probably from the same period, differs from the last-mentioned work principally in its insistence on the judgment, or rather judgment and blessing. The three chapters that are devoted to the foundation part of the book. Messianic times again open with the prosperity of Asmonean days, and develop into the foundation of the Kingdom of God.

Thus, the Asmonean triumphs had produced an eschatology in which a personal Messias figured, while the present was glorified into a commencement of the days of Messianic blessings. Gradually, however, the deepest religious sentiment of the nation became alienated from the Machabean dynasty, and, when the last of the line fell in 27 B.C., it was realized that a different interpretation of the promises was called for. In the new apocalyptists the Messias was not merely the central figure of the age to come: He is already existing in the hearts of the Jewish nation, and will appear at the end of this order, after other... The oppressors of Israel were now the Romans. The ultimate failure of the Machabeans had shown the uselessness of human efforts at liberation, and the Jews could now only await the miraculous intervention that should usher in the Kingdom. To this era belongs the Assumption of Moses. In it, its writing was ascribed to Moses, it set forth a just and unjust. Israel is to be saved by a sudden and marvellous manifestation of Divine power. There is no gradual evolution of this age into the next: men will be transported in an instant to the already existing Kingdom of Heaven. Similar is the book of the Similitudes of Hencoh, where the Messias is called in the first parable "the Elect", and in the following ones sometimes "the Elect", and sometimes "the Son of Man". Lagrange considers the passages giving this latter title interpolations, whether the work of Christians or of Jews of the Christian era. Charles, however, considers them genuine, believing Christ's use of the title occasioned by its anterior use as indicating the presence of the Messiah. The genius of the author's mind on the Messias in the certainly authentic picture of "the Elect". No longer the son of David, he presides over the upper world, the abode of the saints, while the earth is under the domination of the wicked. This order will be terminated by the judgment, when the elect shall sit on his throne in glory and judge the nations of men. This is a marked opposition between the Messias and the Messiah. The whole concept bears the stamp of loftiness. The resurrection of good and wicked alike marks the passage from the order of sin to that of absolute justice.

We may regard this as the culmination of the apocalyptic ideal. After the fall of Jerusalem the apocalyptic writers returned to more directly national hopes; the Messias must play some part in the temporal state of the kingdom. But the Messias must not be expected to appear in the Sibyline Book. The Messias comes from Heaven, and establishes the reign of Israel in peace and holiness at Jerusalem, rebuilds the holy city and the Temple. There is no universal dominion and the rest of the world is almost ignored. IV Esdras is a work on a much grander scale. The writer combines a temporal Messianism with a most advanced eschatology. He sees the whole world corrupted, even the chosen seed of Abraham, among whom, as among the Gentiles, many transgressors may be found. The name of God has thus lost that honour which is due to it. The world, therefore, must be destroyed to be replaced by a better world. But the Mediator's part must first be played in this world, which shall witness the victory of the Messias over the Roman Empire, the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and the union of all Israel in the Holy Land. The Messias, conceived as existing from the beginning of the world, comes in the clouds up from the sea, not down from heaven, and by the breath of His mouth causes the mouth of all who denounce Him. Then there appears the holy city, before invisible. At the end of time, however, the Messias saves merely Israel upon earth. He has no concern with the ultimate salvation of the just. After accomplishing His work of national restoration He disappears, and the final judgment is the work of the Most High Himself. It is purely individual, not national. Thus this work combines the
national and apocalyptic ideals. The Apocalypse of Baruch, written probably in imitation, contains a similar picture of the Messianas. This system of eschatology finds reflection also in the chiliasm of certain early Christian writers. Transferred to the second coming of the Messianas, we have the reign of peace and happiness of a thousand years. The just are transported to their eternal home in heaven (cf. Papias in Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", III, xxxix).

III. The Vindication of the Messianic Dignity by Christ.—This point may be treated under two heads (a) Christ's explicit claim to be the Messianas, and (b) the implicit claim shown in His words and actions throughout His life.

Under the first of these two headings we may consider the confession of Peter in Matt., xvi, and the words of Christ before his judges. These incidents involve, of course, far more than a mere claim to the Messiahship; taken in their setting, they constitute a c'aim to the Divine Sonship. The words of Christ to St. Peter are too clear to need any comment. The silence of the other Synoptists as to some details of the incident concern the proof from this passage rather of the Divinity than of Messianic claims. As regards Christ's claim before the Sanhedrin and Pilate, it might appear from the narratives of Matthew and Luke that He at first refused a direct reply to the high priest's question, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the living God?" For those who, before the time of our Lord's revelation, sought to interpret the ancient prophecies, some single aspect of the Messianas sufficed to fill the whole view. We, in the light of the Christian revelation, see realized and harmonized in Our Lord all the conflicting Messianic hopes, all the visions of the prophets. He is at once the Suffering Servant and the King, the true Son of Man and God with us. On Him is laid the iniquity of us all, and on Him, as God incarnate, rests the Spirit of Jahveh, the Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding, the Spirit of Counsel and Fortitude, the Spirit of Knowledge and Piety, and the Fear of the Lord.

Messina, Antonello da, b. at Messina, about 1430; d. 1497. After studying for some time in Sicily he crossed over to Naples, where, as we are told, he became the pupil of an unknown artist, Antonio Cocelantio. It was here, according to Vasari, that Messina, on seeing a painting of John Van Eyck, belonging to Alphonson of Aragon, determined to devote himself to the study of the Flemish masters. It would seem too soon to set off for Bruges with this purpose; others, however, maintain that he need not have left Italy to ground himself in the new technic as several Flemish artists of renown had already, through the patronage of the princes René of Anjou and Alphonson of Aragon, won for themselves a reputation. The question will remain a debated point until the discovery of some authentic document shall decide definitively whether the Sicilian painter did or did not sail for Flanders. It is certain, however, that he mastered perfectly the methods followed by the Flemings in oil-painting, methods that had eclipsed all the efforts made by the Italian school. On his return to Messina, Antonello evinced remarkable skill in handling oils in a triptych, unfortunately destroyed in the recent earthquake, representing the Blessed Virgin with St. Gregory and St. Benedict on either side and two angels holding a crown over Our Lady's head. Later, Messina went to Venice, where in 1473 he executed an altar screen, no
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GASTON SORTAIN.

**Messina, Archidiocesi di (Messinizia), in Sicily.**

The city is situated, in the shape of an amphitheatre, exactly on the slope of Mount Catania, about a mile from the sea at the Strait of Messina, which separates Sicily from the peninsula. Its harbour, with its size and fine situation, is one of the most important in Italy after those of Genoa and of Naples. Nevertheless, the hopes entertained for its commerce, in view of the opening of the Suez Canal, were disappointed, for, between 1857 and 1884, the commerce of Messina decreased from 940,000 tons to 350,000 tons; still, in 1908, it grew again to 551,000 tons. The neighbouring seas are rich in coral, molluscs, and fish; and from the mountains are obtained calcio sulphate, alabaster, sulphates of argentiferous lead, antimony, iron, and copper. Messina is said to have been founded by Gorgos, a son of King Ar芝麻enes, the brave but unfortunate defender of the Messenians against the Spartans. Therefore, the population of the city was increased by fugitives from Chalcis, Corcyra, and Euboia, who had escaped from the Persian invasion; they became preponderant in the town and made it join the Ionian League. In 493 B.C. Anaxilas, tyrant of Rhegium, also a Messenian colony, drove the Samians from Zancle, took the town, and called it Messana (the α of the Doric dialect, which becomes η in the Ionic, coming later to be pronounced as English e). In 426 the city was retaken by the Ionians under the Athenian Laches, who, however, lost it in 415; an attempt of another Athenian, Nicias, to recover it failed. In consequence of the rivalry of the Athenians and the Carthaginians for the possession of Sicily, Messina was pillaged and destroyed by the Carthaginians in a Cyprian expedition, and in 312 the town was taken by Agathocles, and at his death the Campanian mercenaries of his army, called Mamertines, took possession of the city, and established there a military republic; having been defeated by Hiero II near Mylai (Milazzo) in 269, and then besieged in the town itself, a part of them sought the assistance of the Carthaginians, and a part that of the Romans. The Carthaginians under Hanno were the first to arrive, but in 264 the consul, Appius Claudius Caudex, took the city, compelling the Carthaginians and Syracusans. This brought about the Punk Wars. Other events of the pre-Christian history of Messina are the victory of Piso over the slaves in 353; and the massacre of the inhabitants by Agathocles in 276. The Gothic wars Messina had a considerable part; while, in 831, it fell into the hands of the Arabs. In the Norman conquest of Sicily, Messina was naturally the basis of operations. In 1038 the Byzantine general, George Marascia, assisted by the Normans, captured the town, but it was lost again, on the recall of that general. In 1062 Count Roger, after a siege of 13 days, took the town, and in the following year was master of Messina, which from that time followed the fortunes of the Kingdom of Naples. There was a serious revolt against Frederick II in 1232; and in 1282 Messina also had its "Vespres", and on that account was besieged by King Charles II, who, however, compelled to retreat, and left Sicily to the King of Aragon. In
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1676, the Messenians rebelled against Spanish domination, and were assisted by a French fleet, sent by Louis XIV; Viscount Duquesnes obtained a naval victory over the Spanish, but lost his life in the battle. The French made a foray into the city, captured Messina, and destroyed Messina almost entirely. The most beautiful of the palaces and of the churches were overthrown, among them the cathedral, a structure of three naves, containing six great columns of Egyptian marble that came from the ruins of Cape Faro (the ancient Pelorum Fromontorum); the chief entrance of this temple was a masterpiece of Roman art, rich in little columns, pilasters, spirals, bas-reliefs, and statuettes; the marble pulpit, a work of Gagini, was in the shape of a chalice; the tribune was adorned with mosaics of the time of Frederick II; and the walls were decorated with frescoes and oil paintings of great masters. The residence of the cardinals, and the sacristy also, had paintings by Anguissola, Tiepolo, Tiepolo, Lanfranco, Pozzo, Guglielmone, Catalano, Albrianti, Fiammingo, etc. On the cathedral square, before the façade of the Franciscan convent, was a monumental fountain, the work of Gian Angelo da Montorsoli (1551). The most beautiful church of Messina is that of the Madonna di Montevergine; other interesting churches are those of San Domenico, San Domenico, San Domenico, San Domenico, San Domenico, and San Giorgio with pictures by Guerino and others; Santa Maria dell' Alto where is preserved the only known picture by Cardinali (about 1200); the church of San Francesco d' Assisi, built in the Gothic style, but disfigured in 1721; lastly, the churches of San Domenico, San Domenico, and San Domenico, the latter, according to the mausoleum of the family of Cicala by Montorsoli, and a fine Pietà in marble. The episcopal palace, spared by the last earthquake, and the adjoining seminary, are interesting buildings; likewise, the city hall, with its Fountain of Neptune by Montorsoli, and the university dating from 1549, which had a most valuable library of 3000 editions princeps, 241 manuscripts, and 10 parchments with miniature paintings, a gallery of pictures, and a collection of coins, all of which is yet buried under the ruins. The hospital of La Pietà and the fortifications, constructed mostly under Charles V, were ornaments of the city.

According to the legend, Christianity was brought into the city by a little Perugian, and there is still preserved at Messina a letter attributed to the Blessed Virgin, which, it is claimed, was written by her to the Messenians when Our Lady heard of their conversion by St. Paul. St. Bachiri or Bachiul is venerated as the first Bishop of Messina. There is record of several bishops of Messene in the fourth and fifth centuries, but it is not known whether he was Messene, or Messene in Greece, to which reference is made; Eucaropus, a contemporary of Pope Symmachus (498), is the first Bishop of Messina of known date; the bishop who are known to have followed him were Felix (about 600), Peregirus (649), Benedict (682), Gaudioso (787), and Gregory (868); the latter was for some time a follower of Plotinus. Nothing is known of the episcopal see during the time of the Saracen occupation. In 1090, Roger established there, as bishop, Robert, who built the cathedral. Under Bishop Nicholas (1186) Messina was made a bishopric. Among other bishops of this see may be mentioned the Englishman, Richard Palmer (1182); Archbishop Lancelo (1277), to the dignity of cardinal; Cardinal Antonio Cerdani (1447); and Cardinal Antonio Cerdani (1447); in 1473 the chapter elected the Bishop of Archimandrite, Leontius, and he not being acceptable to the pope or to the king, the friar, Jacobo da Santa Lucia, was appointed in his stead, but was not consecrated as such. Cardinal Antonio Cerdani (1510), who had served on several occasions as pontifical legate; Cardinal Innocenzo Cibo (1538); Cardinal Gianandrea de Mercurio (1550), who had a controversy with the Greek bishop, Pamphilus, the latter claiming jurisdiction over the Greek priests of the archiepiscopate; Andrea Mastelli (1618), convoked many synods, and rebuilt the episcopal palace and the seminary; the Dominican, Tommaso Montada (1743), who at the same time was the patriarch of Jerusalem. The Archbishop of Messina is also Archimandrite of San Salvatore; this convent of Greek Monks of St. Basil was founded by Count Roger in 1094, and its archimandrite had jurisdiction over all the Basilian monasteries of the kingdom, of which there were forty-four, as well as over many parishes. In 1421, the archimandrite was secularized and was given in commendam to secular prelates, of whom Bessarion was one. In time the monastery fell into decadence; a fortification was erected on its site (1538), and the monks moved to the church of La Misericordia. Urban VIII transferred the archiepiscopal residence of St. Agostino to the convent, which was subsequently subject to the Holy See, and Leo XIII in 1883 united it with the Archdiocese of Messina. The collegiate church of Santa Maria del Graffeo, called the "Cattolica," is noteworthy in Messina: the so-called Greco-Latin Rite is used there, its characteristics being a combination of Latin vestments, unbleached bread, and the Gregorian chant, as well as the elevation of the Eucharist and the Gospel are read, first in Latin and then in Greek. In certain functions, the canons of the cathedral and those of the "Graffeo" officiate together, either at the latter church or at the cathedral. The clergy of the "Graffeo" have at their head a protopope who is under the jurisdiction of the archbishop. For the Greek Rite in use in Messina, the Annunciation, on the Feast of the Epiphany and the Office of the Epiphany, and the Mass on the Feast of the Epiphany, and the Mass on the Feast of the Epiphany, and the Mass on the Feast of the Epiphany, and the Mass on the Feast of the Epiphany, and the Mass on the Feast of the Epiphany, are celebrated. The liturgy of the Greek Church, which is used in Messina, introduced there probably during the Byzantine domination. The archiepiscopal and the Abbey of San Salvatore together had 179 parishes, with 250,000 inhabitants, 22 religious houses of men, and 26 of women. The seminary was uninjured by the earthquake, and since then the Jesuits reopened a college. There is a Catholic college which appears to have been opened within the year. Within the territory of the archiepiscopal is the praetorium nullius of Santa Lucia del Molo, which has 7 parishes, with nearly 15,000 inhabitants. The suffragan sees of Messina are those of Lipari, Nocera, and Patti.

Messingham, Thomas, Irish hagiologist, b. in the Diocese of Meath, and studied in the Irish College, Paris, proceeding to the degree of S.T.D. Among the Franciscan MSS. in Dublin is an interesting tract sent by David Rothe, Vice-Primate of All Ireland, addressed to my "loving friend Mr. Thomas Messingham at his chambers in Paris," dated 1615. It is evident that at this date Messingham was one of the staff of the Irish College in that city, and was commencing his studies on Irish saints. In 1620 he published Offices of SS. Patrick, Brigid, Columba, and other Irish saints; and in the following year was appointed rector of the Irish College, Paris, in succession to his friend and dean, Thomas Dease, who was promoted to the Bishopric of Meath, on 5 May, 1621. Messingham was honoured by the Holy See, and was appointed to the dignity of cardinal. He then acted as agent for many of the Irish bishops. Though diligent in the quest for materials with a view to an ecclesiastical history of Ireland, Messingham proved a most able and judicious rector of the Irish College, and
he thoroughly organized the course of studies with a view of sending forth capable missionaries to work in their native country. He gave the college affiliated with the University of Paris, and in 1632, with the approval of the Archbishop of Paris for the rules he had drawn up for the government of the Irish seminary. In 1624 he published, at Paris, his famous work on Irish saints, "Florilegium Insulae Sanctorum," containing also an interesting treatise on St. Patrick's Purgatory, in Lough Derg. In the same year he was appointed by the Holy See to the Deanship of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, in succession to Henry Byrne, but this position was merely honorary, inasmuch as all the temporalities were enjoyed by the Protestant dean, by patent from the Crown. Messingham had a lengthy correspondence with Father Luke Wadding, O.F.M., and was frequently consulted by the Roman authorities in the matter of selecting suitable ecclesiastics to fill the vacant Irish sees. On 15 July, 1630, he wrote to Wadding that he feared it was in vain to hope for any indulgences in religious disabilities from King Charles I. Between the years 1632 and 1635 he laboured for the Irish Church in various capacities, but his name disappears after the latter year. We may conclude that he either resigned or died in 1638.

Messemer, Sebastian Gerard. See Milwaukee, Archdiocese of.

Metal-Work in the Service of the Church.—From the earliest days the Church has employed utensils and vessels of metal in its liturgical ceremonies. This practice increased during the Middle Ages. The history of the metal-work of the Church in the Middle Ages is far from being clear. The art of metal-working in general, and this not only because the Church was the foremost patron of such works and because almost all the works that have been preserved from the Middle Ages are ecclesiastical in character, but also because until the twelfth century the works of the goldsmith were also almost exclusively manufactured by nobles and clerics. With the Renaissance also the manufacture of church metal-work formed a very important branch of the goldsmith's art, and even in our own day these works are counted among those in the production of which that art can be most profitably developed; but not only the goldsmith's art, that is the artistic treatment of the precious metals, but also the vessels for which the service of the Church, the base metals also, especially iron, bronze, and brass, have been largely utilized. As we are dealing, however, with the historical development of the metal-work in the service of the Church, we shall confine ourselves more particularly to works in the precious metals, without however entirely excluding those in the inferior metals from our consideration.

Antiquity.—Beginning with antiquity, we must first prove that the Church did in fact make use of valuable works of metal in the most ancient times. Honorius of Autun (d. 1145) makes the remark that the Apostles and their followers had employed wooden chalices in the celebration of the Holy Mass, but that Pope Zephyrinus had ordered the use of glass and Pepe Urban I of silver and gold vessels (Gemma amicis, P. L., CLXXII, 573). This opinion seems to have been widely disseminated during the Middle Ages; it is nevertheless untenable. Recourse to chalices must have been at some other cheap material wood, undoubtedly often aaved in the service of the persecutions, but this custom cannot have been general. If the earliest Christians believed in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and of this there can be no doubt, they assuredly also made offering of their most precious vessels in general, and, the Sacred Mysteries might be worthily celebrated.

The earliest positive notices of the use of metal-work in the service of the Church date from the third and fourth centuries. It is especially the "Liber pontificum," which is now accessible in the critical editions of Duchesne and Mommsen (see Liber Pontificalis), from which we derive the most interesting information concerning the subject under discussion. Here we first meet with the statement that Pope Urban had the sacred vessels made of silver, which does not by any means imply that before that time they were all made of glass. Of greater importance are the accounts of the magnificent donations of valuable works in metal made by Emperor Constantine to the Roman basilicas. It would take up too much space to enumerate them all, and we shall content ourselves with mentioning a few examples. To the Vatican basilica he presented seven large chalices (acrophi) of the purest gold, each of which weighed ten (Roman) pounds; furthermore forty smaller chalices of pure gold, each weighing five pounds. The Emperor also presented a chalice of solid gold weighing ten pounds, five silver chalices of ten pounds each, and two silver patens of thirty pounds each. The metal plates for the Eucharistic bread (patens) are often mentioned in connexion with the chalices; thus the Lateran basilica received seven gold and sixteen silver patens of thirty pounds each. Although certainly not a universal custom, the other churches also were in possession of valuable metal-work for the liturgical service. The Church of Carthage, according to the testimony of Optatus, possessed so many valuable vessels of gold and silver, that it was no easy matter to remove or hide them at the time of the persecutions (Contra Parmen., lib. II, cap. 21). In the Bishopric of Edessa, the Council of Chaledon (451) of having purloined a valuable chalice set with precious stones, which a pious man had presented to the church.

As to the various kinds of metal-work used in the Church, the "Liber pontificalium" mentions the following in addition to chalice and paten as in use in the time of Pope Sylvester I: a crown of gold, a censer, which was intended for the reception of the chrism at baptisms and confirmations, a silver baptismal vessel of twenty pounds, a golden lamb weighing thirty pounds, which was set up in the baptistery beside the Lateran, seven silver stags that quenched water, each of which weighed eighty pounds, and especially numerous were the golden and silver vessels and altars. Various metal vessels, as altars, were also used, two specimens of the purest gold, each of a weight of fifty pounds. Of importance to us also is the statement that beside the golden lamb just mentioned there stood silver statues, five feet in height, of the Redeemer and St. John, weighing 180 and 125 pounds respectively. Furthermore mention must be made of the metal caskets in which the models of covers, which were likewise made either entirely or in part of precious metal. With this enumeration the number of metallic utensils employed in Christian antiquity is by no means complete. The centre of Christian worship is the altar and the altar; for this reason it was early made of valuable material, at least equal to it. Metal statues were furthermore used to adorn the confession (q. v.) and the immediate surroundings of the altar. Great wealth of the precious metals was spent upon the superstructure of the altar, or ciborium, which was decorated with metal statues, with chalices and votive crowns. When Leo III had the church of St. Peter restored, he employed for that work 27041 pounds of silver. A large amount of metal was also used for the iconostasis, a screen connecting from two to six columns; thus Leo III had the iconostasis in
the church of St. Paul re-covered at an expenditure of 1452 pounds of silver.

A large amount of metal-work is also required for the illumination of the basilica. Constantine alone presented to the Lateran church 174 separate articles of the greatest variety intended for this purpose. It is sufficient here to make mention merely of the chandeliers, or lustres (corona), the candelabra, and lamps; they were made of bronze, silver, or gold. The Lateran church received among the rest a chandelier with fifty lamps of the purest gold, weighing 120 pounds, and a candelabrum of the same material, with eighty lamps. Even the vessels for storing the oil were sometimes made of precious metal. The Lateran basilica was the owner of three such vessels of the price of 100 pounds silver worth nothing; however, all of these treasures has come down to us; only a few small chandeliers of bronze, dating from the fifth to the eighth centuries, have been found, most of them in Egypt. There remains one more article of metal that was much used in the service of the Church from the earliest centuries, the censer. According to the "Liber pontificalis" the baptistery of St. John at the Lateran had a censer of gold weighing fifteen pounds, which was ornamented with green precious stones. If we take account of all these articles, the conclusion naturally follows that the use of articles of metal in the service of the Church had attained extraordinary proportions in Christian antiquity.

More difficult than the enumeration of the works in metal is the description of their decoration and the technical processes employed in their manufacture, because on this point our literary sources are almost wholly silent, while of the old Christian works, which might enlighten us, but very few are extant. We must therefore, in this case also, confine ourselves particularly to the statements of the "Liber pontificalis". Here we find numerous references to images (imagines) of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, the Angels, and Apostles, in most cases it is impossible to determine whether the works were carved or cast, certain it is that both methods were employed. The statues of Christ and the Apostles on the ciborium presented by Constantine to the Lateran church were undoubtedly carved. In some cases the core of the statues was of wood which was overlaid or covered with silver or gold. Painted images also were sometimes decorated with reliefs of silver or gold. Gregory III, for example, employed five pounds of pure gold and precious stones in the decoration of a statue of the Madonna in St. Maria Maggiore. Precious stones in particular were a favourite form of decoration for articles made of metal; golden statues were at times completely covered with them. When Sixtus I provided the confession of the Vatican basilica with costlier furnishings, Valentine presented a tablet in relief with the images of Christ and the Apostles, which was studded with precious stones. The baptistery too beside the Lateran church possessed a censer made of metal; golden statues were at times completely covered with them. Thus the chapels of St. John received doors with silver ornamentation. This was probably a kind of niello (cf. Rosenberg, "Niello", Frankfort, 1908). To obtain colour effects enamel and verroterie cloisonnées were likewise employed; of these a more detailed account will be given later. We shall call attention here only to the best-known specimen that has been preserved, the pentaptych in the treasury of Milan cathedral; the central division of this is ornamented by this process with the paschal lamb and the cross.

Finally, as to the workshops from which the Church derived its metal-work, there can be no doubt that they existed in all the larger cities of the civilized countries of ancient Christendom; but the cities of the Eastern Roman Empire, and especially Byzantium, seem to have been pre-eminent. There is a tendency even at the present day to consider almost all of the larger works that have been preserved as products of Eastern art. In fact a large number of works in metal were brought from the Greek and Byzantine countries. We mention here only a reliquary cross in St. Peter's at Rome, a present of the Byzantine emperor Justin II (cf. Beissel, "Verwendung edler Metalle zum Schmucke römischer Kirchen vom 5.-9. Jahrh." in "Zeitschrift für christl. Kunst," Düsseldorf, IX (1896), 331 sq.).

II. MIDDLE AGES.—A.—We begin the Middle Ages with the Byzantine metal-work, in order to remove at the outset the impression that the term Byzantine is used to express a definite period of time; it is rather to denote a definite geographical circle of art and culture, that is to say, Byzantium with its immediate and more distant surroundings. There were two factors that exerted a powerful influence upon the Byzantine works; first, the almost boundless extravagance which prevailed at the imperial Court, and which, as a result of the intimate relations existing between State and Church, made itself felt also in the latter; second, the close contact with the art of the inland provinces, particularly with Persian art. The Persian, or, to use a more general term, the Oriental, influence gave rise to an extravagant seeking after colour effects in the art of metal-working accompanied by a suppression of gold and the production of plastic works.

To understand the latter change, we must briefly explain a few technical terms.

To give artistic form to the shapeless mass of metal the processes employed are casting and hammering, or chiselling. In the former process the metal is brought to a liquid state and poured into a hollow form, which has previously been prepared by pressing a solid model into a yielding mass. Although casting must be regarded as the original mode of treating metals, nevertheless, so far as giving artistic form to gold and silver is concerned, hammering was of greater importance. By means of hammers the sheet of metal is hollowed out and in this way given plastic form. Very closely connected with hammering is the art of engraving; this consists in directing the blow of the hammer not directly upon the metal but transmitting it by means of small steel chisels. It is these two latter processes that we have chiefly in mind when we speak of the goldsmith's art. By means of these and the Occidental art of niello the most beautiful works in metal. A different state of affairs existed in the Orient, and particularly in the home of the Mesopotamia-Persian and Syrian art, where, so to say, the hand had less plastic training than the eye a gift for colour. The glittering gold here received
additional decoration by means of coloured enamels. This preference for coloured representation instead of white metal was transmitted to Byzantium also. But it will always remain to the credit of the Byzantine goldsmith's art that it produced magnificent works in metal for the service of the Church. The process employed in the Orient and Byzantium is known as cloisonné enamel (émail cloisonné); it consists in soldering very thin strips of gold on the gold base-plate so as to form cells into which the coloured enamel-paste is pressed and fused in place, the enamel combining with the metal during fusion.

In Byzantium cloisonné enamel forced the art of hammering and chiselling into a very subordinate position; enamel was used to decorate secular articles, such as bowls and swords, but especially the metalwork of the Church. One of the rarest and most beautiful articles of the Church is a reliquary in the crown-treasures at Budapest (1076-77). The terrible pillaging of the capital by the western crusaders, 1204, dealt the deathblow to this flourishing art.

Although the examples of Byzantine metal-work described with enamel are by far the most numerous, specimens of hammered work are not entirely lacking. In the first place we may mention two architectural relic-cases which are in the form of a central structure surmounted by a dome (at Aachen and Venice). The reliquary tablets with carved reliefs are either in the form of a small folding-altar or of a cross, which often bears the portrait of the emperor, Constantine, and his mother on the obverse, and on the reverse, the crucifixion. A distinct type of the Greek goldsmith's art are the icons; one of the most valuable is in the Swengorodskoi collection (St. Petersburg). A rare specimen with excellent chasing, a gilded silver pyx with the crucifixion of Christ, is in the cathedral at Erfurt; another, of the ninth century, in the collection of the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, and in the British Museum, London. When we consider that these works extend over a period of more than four centuries and are the products of several races it is at once apparent that we can give but a faint intimation of the character and decoration of the metalwork of the Church among barbarian nations.

The material used in the manufacture of these works is almost exclusively gold, while their artistic decoration consists for the most part of the so-called verroterie cloisonné, a glass mosaic. The process employed in this decoration is akin to that of cloisonné enamel; the setting of the semi-precious stones or paste gems is done. At only one place in the West is it possible at the present day to get an idea of the magnificence and costliness of the Byzantine metal-work, in the treasures and library of St. Mark's at Venice, which still possesses a portion of the booty of the year 1204 (cf. Kondakoff, "Gesch. und Denkmäler des byzant. Emailz", Frankfort on the Main, 1892).

B.—Though the manufacture of artistic metal-work for the Church was accompanied by no difficulties in the countries of the older civilization, conditions were much more unfavourable among the barbarian nations which embraced Christianity. Nevertheless we know that among them articles of metal were much used in the form cells into which the coloured enamel-paste is pressed and fused in place, the enamel combining with the metal during fusion. In Byzantium cloisonné enamel forced the art of hammering and chiselling into a very subordinate position; enamel was used to decorate secular articles, such as bowls and swords, but especially the metalwork of the Church. One of the rarest and most beautiful articles of the Church is a reliquary in the crown-treasures at Budapest (1076-77). The terrible pillaging of the capital by the western crusaders, 1204, dealt the deathblow to this flourishing art.

Although the examples of Byzantine metal-work described with enamel are by far the most numerous, specimens of hammered work are not entirely lacking. In the first place we may mention two architectural relic-cases which are in the form of a central structure surmounted by a dome (at Aachen and Venice). The reliquary tablets with carved reliefs are either in the form of a small folding-altar or of a cross, which often bears the portrait of the emperor, Constantine, and his mother on the obverse, and on the reverse, the crucifixion. A distinct type of the Greek goldsmith's art are the icons; one of the most valuable is in the Swengorodskoi collection (St. Petersburg). A rare specimen with excellent chasing, a gilded silver pyx with the crucifixion of Christ, is in the cathedral at Erfurt; another, of the ninth century, in the collection of the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, and in the British Museum, London. When we consider that these works extend over a period of more than four centuries and are the products of several races it is at once apparent that we can give but a faint intimation of the character and decoration of the metalwork of the Church among barbarian nations.

The material used in the manufacture of these works is almost exclusively gold, while their artistic decoration consists for the most part of the so-called verroterie cloisonné, a glass mosaic. The process employed in this decoration is akin to that of cloisonné enamel; the setting of the semi-precious stones or paste gems is done. At only one place in the West is it possible at the present day to get an idea of the magnificence and costliness of the Byzantine metal-work, in the treasures and library of St. Mark's at Venice, which still possesses a portion of the booty of the year 1204 (cf. Kondakoff, "Gesch. und Denkmäler des byzant. Emailz", Frankfort on the Main, 1892).
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mentation on the other hand is of rarer occurrence; it is found in a crude fashion on the Hereford reliquary. That this art was of Northern European origin is proved by the chaîne in Kremmünster, a present of Tassilo, Duke of Bavaria (about 780). In Irish art filigree also found a very delicate development; one of the most valuable examples, one that displays a concentration of all the processes with which the native masters were conversant, is the chalice of Ardagh, one of the folding-doors of the cathedral with crude reliefs, a column, which is patterned after Trajan's Column in Rome, and two candle-sticks belong to this period. In France scarcely a single work of any size has been preserved; in Italy several bronze doors, for instance, those of the basilica at St. Paul at Rome (1070) and Monte Cassino (1070), are noteworthy, because they were procured from Byzantium and show the influence of the Byzantine art.

C.—The second period embraces the age of the Carolingian and Othoman emperors, i. e., in round numbers a period of 200 years. While it can hardly be said that this period added anything essentially new to the metal-work of the previous centuries, it is nevertheless true that it gave new forms and a further development to many of the articles already in use. We know also more frequently with works cast in bronze, whereas in the so-called "style of the period of migrations" of the preceding age it was not necessary even to mention them. With the increase in the wealth of the Church, there arose also the necessity for an increased amount of valuable metal-work. This period included many of the churches which counted among their own members metal-workers of great artistic skill. The manufacture of the metal-work for the Church during the tenth and eleventh centuries was in fact so largely in the hands of the monks that this entire period has been designated as the period of monastic art. While Philistine as a result of the development of the religious and social life, from the tenth century it gradually fell behind Germany. One of the causes that helped to bring about this result was the lively interest which several of the prominent ecclesiastical princes took in the art of metal-working as developed within the Church; the most deserving of mention in this connection is the Archbishop Siegfried of Mainz. But the most important of the metal-workers of the period was the master who worked for the Bishops Meinwerk of Paderborn and Bernward of Hildesheim. In France the art of metal-working flourished especially in Reims, but also in Corbie, Tours, and Metz. In Germany the centres of the goldsmith's art of the Church were, besides Trier, especially the monasteries at Ratisbon, Reichenau, Essen, Hildesheim, and Hemershausen.

The characteristic feature of the art of the period of migrations, the verroterie cloisonnée, gradually disappears and yields precedence to the Byzantine cloisonné enamel which flourished especially at Trier and Reichenau. The revival of the plastic tendency in metal-working was of greater importance in Italy, where there was a lively art at this day several altar-decorations and book-covers with figural representations, which reveal a truly amazing skill in metal-hammering; such is the valuable antipodium of Henry II from Basle. The primitive method of covering a wooden core with thin sheets of metal was also still practised. A Madonna in the collegiate church at Essen (Reviers) and an image of St. Fides (Foy) at Conques, France, are the two best known examples of this art. In Italy the most important work of this period is the decoration of the high altar in the Church of St. Ambrose in Milan, the work of Wolvinus, executed under Archbishop Angelbert II (824–60). Prominent examples of the French metal-work are the portable altar, shaped like a ciborium, and the binding of a copy of the Gospels in the royal jewel-room at Munich, which were probably made at Reims and were brought to Germany as early as the reign of King Arnulf (d. 899). Germany possesses, as evidence of a more advanced art of metal-working, four crosses in the collegiate church at Essen, which are distinguished by a number of elements from the Byzantine art. Closely connected with Essen are the school of the monastery at Hildershausen, where the monk Rogerus wrote the first hand-book of the industrial arts, "Schedula diversarum artium," and the school of Hildesheim, which through the activity of Bishop Bernald became the centre of the metal-worker's art. The folding-doors of the cathedral with crude reliefs, a column, which is patterned after Trajan's Column in Rome, and two candle-sticks belong to this period. In France scarcely a single work of any size has been preserved; in Italy several bronze doors, for instance, those of the basilica of St. Paul at Rome (1070) and Monte Cassino (1070), are noteworthy, because they were procured from Byzantium and show the influence of the Byzantine art.

D.—The golden age of the metal-work of the Church is the Romanesque period (1050–1250). We have already, it is true, mentioned above several works belonging to this age, because the various styles of art often overlap, and sharp distinctions can be drawn only by force. The characteristic which at once distinguishes the metal-works of the Romanesque period from the older works, is their large size; this distinction is most noticeable in the reliquaries. For, while the receptacles for relics had up to that time been uniformly of small dimensions, they grew in the Romanesque period to such an extent that only three or four men were necessary. Several new varieties of metal-work also were added to the old, especially the aguamanile, i. e., a vessel in the form of an animal, used for washing the hands, and the metal structures placed upon the altar; other articles assumed new forms. These changes are in many cases due to the development of the liturgy. Almost to the close of the tenth century, for instance, neither a cross nor candle-stick was permitted upon the altar, only small reliquary caskets being tolerated; the altar itself up to this time had preserved the shape of a table or sarcophagus. As soon as these regulations were broken, the candle-stick, cross, and superfrontal found a place upon the altar. These articles have a strong influence upon the manufacture and decoration of the articles mentioned.

The material employed in the manufacture of the metal-work of the Church also experienced a change, as copper took the place of gold. Furthermore the cloisonné enamel was supplanted by the champlèvre. The champlèvre enamel differs from the cloisonné by the small cells intended to receive the enamel not being made in the Byzantine fashion by means of strips of flat gold wire soldered to the gold plate, but by being dug out of the plate with a burin. A peculiarity of the workshops of Limoges (France) was the affixing of the heads of persons or even of the entire figure in high relief. The ornamentation increased in size at this time, as the area of the panel was filled in with coloured enamel. A second difference consists in the more frequent occurrence of plastic ornamentations in silver. Of course plastic decorations, as we have already seen, were not lacking in the earlier periods, but the Romanesque period gave a mighty impulse to this branch of the metal-work, and many extraordinary productions, for instance on the shrine of the Three Kings at Cologne. Lastly, a third difference is apparent in the ornamentation, in that secular types of decoration are now more and more used on articles intended for the Church. On a reliquary at Sieburg (near Cologne), for example, axes, deer, dogs, and naked men are represented; the well-known fabulous creatures of the Romanesque art also win a place for themselves in the art of metal-working.

The evolution in style may be briefly characterized as follows: the monastic art of the previous period with its Byzantine tendencies is subdued but not entirely supplanted by the popular tendency; the two types enter into a fusion which forms the Romance art. Monuments of the Romanesque art in metals still exist in large numbers; but these are almost exclusively works of ecclesiastical origin. This is due not merely to the fact that
churches, which have been correctly called the oldest museums, have guarded their treasures more carefully than the worldly owners; it is rather to be ascribed to the fact that at that time the metal-work for secular purposes was practically negligible. We must not infer from this, however, that in the Romanesque period, as in the preceding, it was monks and clerics who were the principal manufacturers of the metalwork for the Church. During this period the art of metal-working, as well as the plastic arts in general, gradually passed into the hands of the laity. A number of Benedictine monasteries, it is true, still clung to the old traditions of the order, and remained centres of artistic pursuits.

By far the largest amount of ecclesiastical metalwork of the Romanesque period is to be found in Germany, where the art of metal-working created magnificent works in the districts bordering on the Rhine and the Meuse. On the Rhine the Benedictine monks Eilbert (1130) and Friedericus (1180) of the Benedictine monastery of St. Pantaleon produced several reliquaries and portable altars which they decorated for the most part with enamel. They were far surpassed by the laymen Godefroi de Claire and Nicholas of Verdun, who combined plastic ornamentation and enamelling with amazing perfection. They are the creators of the two most beautiful reliquaries of this whole period; Godefroi wrought the shrine of St. Heribert at Deutz (1185), and Nicholas the shrine of the Three Holy Bachelors. In France likewise the art of enamelling was zealously cultivated, especially in Limoges, where small articles of metal for church use were manufactured in large quantities and exported all directions.

The art of casting also can show several famous names such as Reinhard Huy, who cast the well-known baptismal font at Liège, and Riquinus of Magdeburg in whose workshop the great cathedral at Noyon was probably manufactured (1150). All these works are surpassed by the beautiful baptismal font at Hildesheim, the work of an unknown master. Italy has almost nothing to show from this period, except a few bronze doors, which enlighten us as to the position of casting in bronze which are the doors of Barifano of Trani in Ravello (1179) and Monreale (1180) of Bonano at Pisa (1180). (Cf. Falke and Fraubergen, “Deutsche Schmelzarbeiten” , Frankfurt, 1904; Neumann, “Der Reliquienchats des Hauses Braunschweig-Lüneburg” , Vienna, 1891.)

E. - The Gothic epoch (1250–1500) brought numerous changes and new requirements, also in church metalwork. In this period the feast of Corpus Christi was first introduced (1312), and thereby a new metal vessel, the monstrance or ostensory, made necessary. For this purpose a vessel was employed like those which up to that time had been in general use for exhibiting relics. Another vessel, which came into use at this time and upon whose manufacture great stress was laid, is the “pax”, or “ossulatorium” (instrumentum pacis). The growing veneration of saints and relics required an increase of reliquaries. One of the results of this was that these were no longer made as large and costly as in the Romanesque epoch. Combined with this was the striving for constantly new forms for the reliquaries, among which busts in particular now became very popular. The lofty Gothic altars with double folds or wings became in fact small galleries of busts of the saints. The number of cast statues of the saints and of the Blessed Virgin also increases very considerably from the fourteenth century. The material as well as the technique and decoration of the works of the goldsmith again experience a change. Copper, which has been almost a necessity for the bulky Romanesque reliquaries, now gives way to silver; this is employed especially for the figures in relief which were then much used, and which served more frequently than in the Romanesque period as statuettes for the decoration of shrines.

Very intimately connected with this change of material was an alternation in the mode of ornamentation. The cham- ployed enamels had lost its power of attraction, and indeed it could not be applied upon the thin sheets of silver; translucent enamel therefore took its place; this was applied by cutting the relief-like representation in the silver ground and pouring a transparent enamel over the relief, so that the different parts according as they are higher or lower produce the effect of light and shade in their various gradations. Siena has long been regarded as the starting-point of this new mode of ornamentation, because a chalice in Assisi made by the Siennese Guecco Manaja about 1290 is the oldest example of this process. From Italy it early spread to Germany where it flourished especially on the Upper Rhine, and to France.

The features of the religious metal-work of this age that more than any other distinguish it from the earlier productions are the superstructure and construction. The same difference prevails as between a Romanesque and a Gothic church. The ponderous Romanesque style is replaced by a pleasing lightness and mobility of form. However in the art of metalworking as in the other arts we must carefully distinguish within this period between the early Gothic work and the late. Of the former the work may be described as possessing, so to say, an aristocratic character, a certain ideal striving after the sublime; like the fairest period of chivalry, however, this striving lasts but a short time; it soon gives way to the homely and real actuality. The late Gothic metal-work throughout lacks the idealism of the early Gothic. This is due to a certain decadence of cultural development. The common people, who had grown in power, took pride, as the nobility had done before, in securing for themselves a lasting memorial by means of religious foundations and presents to churches. To dedicate magnificent, artistically executed works, however, their means were in many cases insufficient, thus giving rise to many works in metal of poor workmanship, especially chalices, mon-
metals, and reliquaries. So far as lightness of the structure in particular is concerned, this peculiarity is again best recognised in the reliquary and also in the monstrance. Very frequently since the fourteenth century the form chosen is that of two angels kneeling upon a base-plate and supporting the reliquary, sometimes holding it in a horizontal position as a casket, sometimes vertically as a tower. In Germany there are extant examples of this inversion of position, two reliquaries in the cathedral treasuries of Aachen, which are constructed in the form of chapels with towers abounding in open-work, and are borne by saints. Reliquaries in general assumed the form of churches in miniature; gabled hood-mouldings, pinnacles, finials, crockets, rampant arches and buttresses, in fact every form of Gothic cathedral are found in the shrines, of which the most important is the reliquary of St. Gertrude in Nivelles, the work of Nicholas in Douai and Jacquemart de Nivelles (1295). The same is true of the remaining works in metal.

The architectural ornaments forced themselves also upon artificers on which we would not expect them; thus the knob (node) of the chalice often became a small chapel with many sharp corners and edges, making the handling of the chalice more difficult. Likewise, the popular plastic figures were placed upon articles of use that require a heavy formation, such as book-covers. A beautiful silver book-cover from the Benedictines of St. Sava in the Black Forest is executed in this way with numerous figures of saints; they are found even upon the smaller articles of use, as upon a cloak-clasp in the cathedral of Aachen. The manufacture of the religious works is taken more and more out of the hands of the monks and clerics, who now furnish only the ideas, and gradually pass the work over to the hands of the lay gilds. By this statement of course we do not wish to imply that there were not individual artists still active in the convents, for that remains true even to the present day, but for the development of an entire period they are of no moment.

Among the few works of France, that have been preserved, the so-called "golden horse of Altötting" attained great fame; it is a half-worldly, half-religious ornament representing the veneration of the Madonna by King Charles VI, whose horse in the lower part of the picture is held by a squire (1404). In Germany we can find no evidence of such exactly defined schools of art as in the Romanesque age; the works still in existence are exceedingly numerous and form an extended series. In contrast with the preceding epochs Italy now took a pronounced lead in the execution of artistic metal-work for the Church; the Italian works are compact, they favour a strong substructure, which permits the application of the favourite translucent enamel; there is evident also a tendency to excessive ornamentation, when fixed forms are attained. Among the schools of Italy Siena was at first pre-eminent; from this city the goldsmith Boninsega was called to Venice in 1345 to make repairs there to the Pala d'Oro of St. Mark's. Siennese masters also began in 1287 the silver altar in the cathedral at Pistoia, which was finally completed in 1399 by Florentine goldsmiths and is the largest piece of work of the kind in the world. In the Florentine school, the silver altar of the baptistery, was begun in 1366 by Leonardo di Ser Giovanni and Berto di Gerti; this too was not completed until one hundred years later, when the Renaissance had already fully entered into Italian art.

Bronze casting also continued to produce numerous works of art in this period of the Church. North Germany and the Netherlands (Dinant) were most prominently active in this field. Here we must mention first of all the numerous baptismal fonts of bronze, which are decorated on their outer sheathing with representa-

tions in relief and architectural ornaments, next the seven-armed candelabra, door-knobs, water-vessels (aquamanile), lecterns, especially the beautiful eagle-lecterns. In Germany the names of many of the masters have been handed down; in Wittenberg, Wilkin (1342), in Eibing, Bernhuser, and in Lubeck and Kiel, Hans Apengeter. Lastly mention should be made of the bells which were also cast in bronze. While Germany distinguished itself by its religious works cast in bronze, it was surpassed by France in another branch of the metal-worker's art. Here in the beginning of the thirteenth century the art of the smith passed through its first period of full vigour. At that time, thanks to the highly developed technical processes, France produced metal-work for the doors of churches such as have never been produced since. Germany, England, and the Netherlands felt the favourable influence of the French art, which produced its magnificent works on the cathedrals at Rouen, Sens, Noyon, and especially on the cathedral at Paris. Here every wing of the folding doors has three iron bands, that serve also as hinges, divided into a thousand branches and decorated with birds of every kind and fantastic creatures. In addition to the metal-work of the doors the blacksmith furnished the Church with artistic chandeliers, railings, pedestals for the Eucharist candle, lamps, and lecterns. The first place in the manufacture of artistic railings undoubtedly belongs to Italy, where the high perfection attained by the art of the Italian blacksmiths may best be seen in Florence (San Croce), Verona, and Siena.

III. RENAISSANCE.—While the religious metal-work in the Gothic style had increased in quantity and especially at the expense of quality, a decided retrogression in respect to quantity is noticeable during the Renaissance. This is especially true of Germany. The distinguishing religious aspirations, the defection of many from the old religion and increasing indifference to religious faith had the effect of reducing the production of articles for church use to very small proportions. In Italy, it is true, we know the names of numerous artist goldsmiths—there are about 1000 of them—but there also the number of religious works of the Renaissance is very small. At the head of the new movement in metal-work for the Church we find the most distinguished sculptors, in fact the leading masters of the Renaissance preferred to execute their work in metal (bronze); we need mention here only the names of Ghiberti and Donatello, the former the creator of the famous bronze doors of the baptistery at Florence, the latter the maker of the high relief in bronze in Lucca; these works however belong to the domain of sculpture we must leave them out of consideration here.

The changes in style follow the course of the general evolution in art. The vertical forms of the Gothic...
style give way to the horizontal tendency, the forms become more vigorous and compact, the vessels acquire a more flexible silhouette. However, the early Renaissance left the forms of the commonest vessels, the chalices and crosses, almost untouched, inasmuch as the tradition of a thousand years made them appear sacred; we have numerous chalices of the Renaissance, the base of which shows the Moorish and Gothic foils and the trefoil knop, mentioned already. Not until the late Renaissance were the circular forms and volutes generally employed. In other respects the customary Renaissance ornaments, which are by no means the least charm of this style, are employed in ecclesiastical and worldly articles indifferently. Putti, hermae, caryatides, gargoyles, grotesques, acanthus leaves, funereal monuments, and grotesquely designed window tracings, such as columns, pillars, capitals, entablatures, balusters form an inexhaustible source of constant change.

Silver during the Renaissance no longer maintains the position it won for itself during the Gothic period. Several distinguished religious works in silver have been preserved, but they are far surpassed both numerically and artistically by the works in gold; the latter is covered with silver or gold. The artistic ornamentation of both ecclesiastical and secular metal-work consists especially of delicately executed representations in relief, which at first appear in moderation at the more important points, but later presupsumptuously cover the entire surface. At the same time, enamel was very frequently employed, sometimes in the pattern already mentioned tray enamel, which completely covers the portions in relief with a coloured surface, sometimes also the Venetian enamel, which flourished from about 1500-1550. It was used to coat jugs and bowls, candlesticks, candelabrum, and ciboria. Another favourite form of decoration consisted in the combination of metals and crystals; this type of decoration occurred occasionally, but was more systematically and artistically carried out in the Renaissance. The art of gem-engraving likewise was again practiced after ancient models upon cameos and gems. The ecclesiastical works of the Renaissance therefore often represent an enormous value. We need mention here only the value of a few papal tiaras. A tiara, which Sixtus IV had made by the Venetian goldsmith Bartolomeo di Tomaso, was valued at 110,000 ducats. Julius II confided to the Milanese jeweller Caradosso the making of a tiara valued at 200,000 ducats (nearly 200,000 dollars). Hardly any works of really marked importance. If we except the previously mentioned altar in Florence and Pisa, where the gilding of wood falls in the Renaissance. We may again mention a few reliquaries at Siena, which reveal a pronounced change compared with the monumental shrines of the Romanesque and Gothic periods. They are silver caskets with sides in openwork, permitting a view of the relics. The use of crystals is exemplified in a beautiful pax from Montecassino (now Berlin).

Elsewhere the influence of the Renaissance upon church metal-work was early apparent. In the beginning only the non-essentials were borrowed from the Italian Renaissance; it was the ornament that was copied; the fundamental forms long remained Gothic. Of the above-mentioned types the Germans added especially the scroll-work, which was by preference combined with the Moresco and then served as a pattern for the surface; it is not unknown in Italy, but in Germany it held almost undisputed sway for about thirty or forty years. In Germany during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the above-mentioned types the extraordinary fame by the manufacture of artistic metal-work; their products were eagerly sought after throughout the entire world. The Augsburg goldsmith, George Seld, in 1492 furnished one of the first Renaissance works in Germany, a silver altar in the Reichen Kapelle at Munich; here we find nude putti, flowers growing out of acanthus leaves, friezes and panels which breathe wholly the spirit of the Italian Renaissance. A goldsmith of Nuremburg, Melchior Bayo, in 1538, by order of King Sigismund I of Poland, made an altar of chased silver which is in the chapel of the Jagellons in the cathedral of Krakow. Besides these there are no flights of fancy in metal-work from this period. As is proved by the "Buch der Kühlen Gebeine" of Cardinal Albrecht of Mayence, a few predates indeed were intent on increasing the treasures of their churches in the new style, but as a rule the exigencies of the times did not permit the manufacture of larger works in metal. So far as the smaller vestments are concerned, we generally find in the middle of the sixteenth century, still show Gothic forms, as, for instance, a chalice of the well-known Gebhard von Mansfeld, Archbishop of Cologne, in the "grünen Gewölbe" at Dresden (about 1560). All the works of this period are surpassed by the productions which the goldsmith Anton Eisenhoit made about the year 1540 for Theodor von Pustettenberg, Prince Bishop of Paderborn; these are a chalice, a ciborium, book-cover, and a vessel for holy water. The articles are most exquisitely ornamented with noble Renaissance forms done in flat chasing. The most beautiful works of the Renaissance in Southern Germany, reliquaries, chalices, monstrances, etc., are in the Reichen Kapelle at Munich. French, like Italy, has a large amount of documentary evidence of the manufacture of metal-work for the Church, but the endless wars of Louis XIV and the Revolution consigned them almost without exception to the melting-pot. A chalice in the church of St-Jean-du-Doigt (about 1540), which has a stout knob transformed into a chapel, and the cup and base bend downward in the shape of clayey tendrils, is the only work which we are able to recognize.

 Besides the works of the goldsmith's art, the productions in base metal do not remain entirely unnoticed. These came not rarely from the workshops of the goldsmiths. The most important foundries were in Florence and Padua. It is not always easy to distinguish between the works of sculpture and those of the industrial arts. Certainly a large number of magnificent bronze railings belong to the latter— the most beautiful is in the cathedral at Prato, the work of Bruno di Ser Lapo Mazzei (1444)—as do also the candelabra, which, because of their elegance of form and delicate ornamentation, are very effective. The best known specimen is that in Florence at the Orsanmichele, II Santo at Padua, the remarkable piece of Riccio (1516). From bronze there were also manufactured for the service of the Church Sanctus bells, candlesticks, vessels for holy water, hanging lamps, about the services of which we need not here concern ourselves. We merely add that the works in iron are confined more particularly to the railings and side-chapels of the larger churches; they are of no interest, however, from the standpoint of the history of art.

The last periods of church metal-work can be concisely described. Like the whole of the baroque art, the metal-work of the Church of this epoch, when compared with the delicately balanced regularity of the Renaissance, shows a certain coarseness and unrest, which in the rococo develops onediesidedly into absolute irregularity, to be changed in the Classicism which followed, into the exact opposite, a pedantic, inflexible rigidity. These peculiarities of the new styles do not, of course, find expression in the goldsmith's art to the same extent as in the plastic arts. Nevertheless, the baroque becomes evident even in the smaller church utensils; it may, for instance, be clearly observed in the chalice, which in the baroque style is overloaded with broad, clumsy ornaments; in the rococo the forms became more deli
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Symeon (Συμεών ὁ μεταφράτης), the principal compiler of the legends of saints in the Menologion of the Byzantine Church. Through the importance of this collection his name has become one of the most famous among those of medieval Greek writers. The epithet Metaffrastes may be rendered Compiler; it is given to him from the usual name for such arrangements of saints’ lives (sermons, compila- tions). Little is known for certain about his life. His period is the latter half of the tenth century. In one of his leg- enes (the Life of St. Samson) he tells of the saint’s miracles continued down to his own time; that time is the reign of Romanos II (959–63) and of John I Tzimiskes (967–76). Michael Psellus (1018–78), who wrote in the life of St. Symeon (526–97) on the other saints in the collection, says he was a Logothete. In this case it means one of the Secretaries of State with the title Magister. Psellus also tells us that Symeon was a favourite of the emperor, at whose command he made his collection of legends. Ehrhard says that this emperor was Constantine VII (Porphyrogenetos, 912–59) who organized a compilation of all kinds of learning to form a kind of universal encyclopedia by the scholars of his Court (Krumbacher, "Byz. Lit.", 200). Ehrhard (loc. cit.) and most au- thorities now identify the Metaffrastes with Symeon Magister the Logothete, who wrote a chronicle under Nicephorus Phocas (963–9). Besides the identity of the author (as against the title), it is suggested that the two works (Chronicle and Legends) for this. A certain Arab chronicler, Yahya ibn Said of Antioch, in the eleventh century refers to "Simon, Secretary and Logothete, who composed the stories of the saints and their feasts" (Delahaye in "Revue des questions hist.", X, 84). Another point that fixes his time as the latter half of the tenth century is the fact that when the improved, the speech made by Constantine VII at the translation of the portrait of Christ from Edessa on 16 August, 944, is contained in Symeon’s part of the Menology ("Die Legendarissammlung," etc., pp. 48, 73). Formerly his period was generally thought to be earlier. In his life of St. Theoctistus of Lesbos he gives what seems to be a passage about the expedition of Amphilochius the elder, of which he says that he took part in the expedition of Admiral Himerios to Crete in 902. It is now proved that Symeon simply copied all this life, including the autobiographical note, from an earlier writer, Niketas (Ehrhard, "Byz. Lit.", p. 200).

Symeon’s chief work was a collection to which he owes his great reputation in the Byzantine Church, is the collection of Legends. But it is not easy to say how much of the Menology was really composed by him. On the one hand, in many cases he simply copied existing lives of saints; on the other, the collection has grown considerably since his time and all of it without discrimination goes by his name. Leo Allia- tius (op. cit.) ascribes 122 legends only to Symeon. Delehaye ("Les ménonologie grecs" in the "Analecta Bollandiana", XVI, 311–29), thinks that 148 or 150 are authentic and original. It may be noticed that the authentic ones are chiefly those in the early months of the year, from September (the Byzantine Calendar begins in September; the saints in the Menologies are arranged as their feasts occur). It is certain, that a number of these legends were written by Symeon from such sources as he found (partly oral tradition). The sitting of these from the rest still needs to be done (Ehrhard, I. c., 201–2). His reputation as an author has been restored by the latest students. At one time his name was a byword for absurdity in the art of metal-working. Whether this is to be crowned with lasting success, is a question for the future to decide.
has often been compared to the great Western compiler, Jacobus de Voragine (d. 1298). Some (Kondakov, Historia de l'art byzanțin, "Paris, 1888, 7, 66) prefer to make Bon Becke's continuator, Bonn, 1829, 603–760), reprinted in P. G., CIX, 633–632; also an Epitome of Canons (P. G., CXIV, 236–292), collections of maxims from St. Basil (P. G., XXXII, 1116–1381) and Macarius of Egypt (P. G., XXXIV, 841–965), some prayers and poems (P. G., CXIV, 209–225) and nine letters (P. G., CXIV, 282–236). Symeon Metaphrastes is a saint in the Orthodox Church. His feast is 28 November.


Adrian Fortescue.

Metaphysics, that portion of philosophy which treats of the most general and fundamental principles underlying all reality and all knowledge.

I. The name.—The term metaphysics is derived from the Greek μετά τὰ φυσικά, a title which, about the year 70 B.C., was prefixed by Andronicus of Rhodes to that collection of Aristotelian treatises which since the time of Aristotle had been preserved in the schools of the East, because he believed that that part of the Aristotelian corpus came naturally after the physical treatises, he entitled it "after the physics". This is the historical origin of the term. However, once the name was given, the commentators sought to find intrinsic reasons for its appropriateness. For instance, it was understood that after "the science of the world beyond nature" that is, the science of the immaterial. Again, it was understood to refer to the chronological or pedagogical order among our philosophical studies, so that the "metaphysical" sciences would mean, those which we study after having mastered the sciences which deal with the physical world (St. Thomas, "In Lib. Metaph. IV, 11). Indeed, an erroneous use of the term in current popular literature, there is a remnant of the notion that metaphysical means ultraphysical: thus, "metaphysical healing" means healing by means of remedies which are not physical.

II. Definition.—The term metaphysics, as used by one school of philosophers, is narrowed down to mean the science of mental phenomena and of the laws of mind. In this sense, it is employed, for instance, by Hamilton ("Lectures on Metaph.", Lect. VII) as synonymous with psychology. Hamilton holds that empirical psychology, or the phenomenology of mind, treats of the facts of consciousness, rational psychology, or the nomology of mind, treats of the laws of mental phenomena, and second psychology, or the treatises of the results derived from the study of the facts and laws of mind. This use of the term metaphysics is unfortunate because it rests on Descartes's false assumption that the method in metaphysics is subjective, in other words, that all the conclusions of metaphysics are based on the study of subjective, or mental, phenomena.

Taking a wider view of the scope and method of metaphysics, the followers of Aristotle and many who do not acknowledge Aristotle as a leader in philosophy define the science in terms of all reality, both objective and subjective. Here five forms of definition are offered, which ultimately mean one and the same thing: (1) Metaphysics is the science of being as being.—This is Aristotle's definition (συνοικὰ φύσεως ὑποκείμενον—Met., VI, 1026 a, 31). In this definition metaphysics is placed in the genus "science". As a science, it has, in common with other sciences, this characteristic that it seeks a knowledge of things in their causes. What is peculiar to metaphysics is the difference "of being as being". In this phrase are combined the material object and the formal object of metaphysics. The material object is being—the whole world of reality, whether subjective or objective, possible or actual, abstract or concrete, immaterial or material, infinite or finite. Everything that exists comes within the scope of metaphysical inquiry. Other sciences are restricted to only a part of this field. Metaphysics has its limited field of inquiry, mathematics is concerned only with those things which have quantity. Metaphysics knows no such restrictions. Its domain is all reality. For instance, the human soul and God, because they have neither colour nor weight, thermic nor electric properties, do not fall within the scope of many physicist's investigations. But then, the operations of quantity, they do not come within the field of inquiry of the mathematician. But, since they are beings, they do come within the domain of metaphysical investigation. The material object of metaphysics is, therefore, all being. As Aristotle says (Met., IV, 1004 a, 34): "It is the function of the philosopher to consider the nature of each formal object is also "being" or "beings." The formal object of any science is that particular phase, quality, or aspect of things which interests that science in a specific way. Man, for instance, is the material object of psychology, ethics, sociology, anthropology, physiology, and various other sciences. The formal object is not the same for all sciences. If the different sciences of the formal object of psychology is mental phenomena and the subject of them; the formal object of ethics is man's relation to his ultimate destiny; that of sociology is man's relation to his fellow-men in institutions, laws, customs, etc.; that of anthropology is the origin of man, distinction of races, etc.; that of philosophy is the world as a whole. Thus, for the physicist, the physical group generally is the so-called physical properties of bodies, such as light, sound, heat, molecular constitution, atomic structure, vital phenomena in general, etc. The formal object of the mathematical group is quantity; what interests the mathematician is not the colour, heat, etc., of an object, but its quantity. As Aristotle says (Met., VI, 1026 a, 31), it is considered in a specific way neither in the physical nor the mathematical qualities of things, but in their entity or beingness. If, then, physics is the science of being as affected by physical properties, and mathematics is the science of being as possessing quantity, metaphysics is the science of being as being. Since the material object of metaphysics is all being, the metaphysician is interested in everything that is or can be. Since the formal object of his study is again, being, the point of view of metaphysics is different from that of the other sciences. The metaphysician studies all reality; still, the resulting science is not a summing up of the departmental sciences which deal with portions of reality but a science of being as such, i.e., independent from that of the student of the departmental sciences. (2) Metaphysics is the science of immaterial being.—"The first science", says Aristotle (Met., VI, 1026 a, 31).
16), "deals with things which are both separate (from matter) and immovable". In this connexion the scholastics (cf. St. Thom., ibid.), distinguished two kinds of immaterial: (a) immaterial *quodae esse* or immaterial *esse*, such as God and the human soul, which exist without matter; (b) immaterial *quodae conceptum*, or concepts, such as substance, cause, quality, into the comprehension of which matter does not enter. Metaphysics, in so far as it treats of immaterial beings, is called special metaphysics and is divided into rational psychology, which treats of the human soul and the animal soul, and the metaphysics of the existence and attributes of God, and cosmology, which treats of the ultimate principles of the universe. Metaphysics, in so far as it treats of immanent concepts, of those general notions in which matter is not included, is called general metaphysics, or ontology, that is, the science of Being. Taking the term now in its widest sense, so as to include both general and special metaphysics, when we say that metaphysics is the science of the immaterial, we mean that whatever exists, whether it is an immaterial being or a material being, so long as it offers to our consideration immanent concepts, such as substance or cause, is the object of metaphysical investigation. In this way, it becomes evident that this definition concides with that given in the preceding paragraph.

(3) *Metaphysics is the science of the most abstract conceptions.*—All science, according to the scholastics, deals with the abstract. The knowledge of the concrete individual objects of our experience, with their ever changing qualities and the particular individuating characteristics, makes us what we are (for instance, the knowledge of this tree, of that flower, of this particular animal or person) may be very useful knowledge, but it is not scientific. Scientific knowledge begins, when we abstract from what makes the thing to be individual, when we know it in the general principles that constitute it. The first degree of abstraction consists in the purest of pure sciences, in the definition or in the problem, which abstract merely from the particularizing, individuating characteristics, and consider the general laws, or principles, of motion, light, heat, substantial change, etc. The mathematical sciences ascend higher in the scale of abstraction. They leave out of consideration not only the individuating qualities but also the physical, ethical, and metaphysical, and on quantity and its laws. The metaphysical sciences reach the highest point of abstraction. They precede, or abstract, not only from those qualities which physics and mathematics abstract from, but also leave out of consideration the determination of quantity. They consider only Being and its highest determinations, such as substance, cause, quality, action, etc. "There is a science", says Aristotle (Met. IV, 1003 a, 21) "which investigates being as being, and the attributes which belong to this in virtue of its own nature" (*tis ta uteiwmata kath' akrivem*). The objection therefore, that metaphysics is an abstract science, would, in the estimation of the scholastics, militate not against the identity of metaphysics with the sciences as well. The peculiarity of metaphysics is not that it is abstract, but that it carries the process of abstraction farther than do the other sciences. This, however, does not make it to be unreal. On the contrary, what is left out of consideration in metaphysics, namely individuating qualities, physical movement, and specific quantity, derive whatever reality they have as conceptions from the concept, Being, which is the object of metaphysics. Metaphysics, in fact, is the most real of all the sciences precisely because, by abstracting from everything else, it has centred, so to speak, its thought on Being, which is the source and root of reality everywhere else in the other sciences.

(4) *Metaphysics is the science of the most universal conceptions.*—This would follow from the considera-

*---*
matter and manifestations of matter, and then the assertion is merely of biographical interest; or it is an assertion, as being possible, but an expression of the impossibility of immaterial existence, and in that sense it is a statement which in itself has a metaphysical import. Materialism is, in fact, a metaphysical theory of reality and is a contribution to the science which it professes to reject. Philosophical agnosticism, which is derived ultimately from Kant, is doctrine of the unknowability of noumenal reality (Ding an sich), rejects metaphysics on the ground that while the immaterial does, indeed, exist, it is unknown and must remain unknowable to the speculative reason. Kant (see Kant) maintained that all metaphysical reasoning, since it attempts by means of the speculative reason to go beyond experience, is liable to fall into the trap of philosophy, in which the understanding imposes on the empirical data of knowledge the quality of that knowledge by making it to be transcendent, but do not extend it beyond the realm of actual sense experience. The followers of Kant stigmatise as intellectual formalism the view that the speculative reason does actually attain extrascientific knowledge. This is the contention of the modernists and other Catholic writers who are more or less influenced by Kant. These decay rational metaphysics and offer as a substitute a metaphysics based on sentiment, vital activity, or some other non-rational foundation.

The rejection of metaphysics by the materialist and the Kantian agnostic does not meet the full approval of all Kantians. The philosophy of the republic of the sciences, the idealist, having deprived it of its scientific character, elevates it to the rank of aesthetic pre-eminence side by side with poetry. He considers that it furnishes a point of view from which to contemplate the beauty, harmony, and value of those things which science merely explains. He holds that it is not the province of metaphysics to assign reasons or causes, but to furnish motives for action and enhance the value of reality. For him, its uplifting and regenerating function is entirely independent of its alleged ability to explain: he considers metaphysics to be, not an ontology, or science of reality, but a teleology, or application of the principle of purposiveness, which is a tendency of the human mind one will deny. It is only one function, however, and unless the doctrine of final causes has its foundation in a doctrine of formal and efficient causes, teleological metaphysics is a castle in the air. Finally, the positivist, and the scientist whom the positivist has influenced, reject metaphysics because all our knowledge is confined to facts and the relations among facts. To attempt to go beyond facts and the succession or concomitance of facts is to essay the impossible. Causes, essences, and so forth, are terms which clothe in fictitious garb our ignorance of the real scientific explanation. The whole gist of positivism is contained in Hume's verdict that "it is impossible to go beyond experience". This psychological dictum is accepted by the philosophical positivist, as the death sentence of metaphysics. With the scientist, however, other considerations weigh more than the psychological argument. The scientist points to the present condition of metaphysics; he calls attention to the fact that, while the physical sciences have advanced by leaps and bounds, the metaphysical sciences have made no progress at all, and are still beset with the most fundamental problems and has not even settled the questions on which its very existence depends.

The condition of metaphysics is, indeed, such as to invite the contempt and provoke the disdain of the scientist; the fault, however, may lie not so much in the claims of metaphysics as in the vagaries of the metaphysicians.

V. Relation of Metaphysics to Other Sciences.—The consideration of the relation in which metaphysics stands, or ought to stand, to the other sciences should result in a refutation of the positivist contention that metaphysics is useless. In the first place, metaphysics is the natural co-ordinating science which crowns the unifying efforts of the other sciences. It occupies in the highest place of knowledge the process of unification towards which the human mind tends irresistibly. Without it, the explanations and co-ordinations attained in the lower sciences would be, perhaps, satisfactory within the limits of those sciences, but would fail to meet the requirements of that unifying instinct which the mind tends to apply to the knowledge of the universe. So long as the mind of the knower is one, it is impossible not to attempt to bring under the most general conceptions and principles the conclusions of the various sciences. That is the task of metaphysics. Whenever we look around among the contents of the mind and try to discover order and hierarchical arrangement among them, we are attempting a system of metaphysics. In the next place, the process of explanation which belongs to each of the lower sciences, if pursued far enough, brings us face to face with the demand for a metaphysical explanation. Thus, the chemical problem of atomic or proto-atomic constitution of bodies leads inevitably to the question, What is matter? Likewise, the problem of the nature and origin of life brings us to the point where it is imperative to answer the query, What is life? The questions: What is substance? What is a cause? What is quantity? Are additional examples of problems to which physics, mathematics, etc., finally lead. Indeed, the world of science is completely surmounted by the process of metaphysical investigation. Each of these problems of investigation brings us to a highroad of inquiry which sooner or later crosses the border and leads us into metaphysics. When therefore, the scientist rejects metaphysics, he suppresses a natural and ineradicable tendency of the individual mind towards unification and, at the same time, he tries to put up in every highway and byway of his own science a barrier against further progress in the direction of rational explanation. Besides, the cultivation of the metaphysical habit of mind is productive of excellent results in the sphere of general culture. The faculty of appreciating principles as well as facts is a quality which cannot be absent from the mind without detriments to the formation of a comprehensive and full culture. The scientist who objects to metaphysics, rightly condemns the metaphysician who disdains to consider facts. He himself, unless he cultivate the metaphysical powers of his mind, is in danger of reaching the point where he is incapable of appreciating principles. Both the empirical talent for ascertaining facts and the metaphysical grasp of principles and laws are necessary for the rounding out of man's mental powers, and there is no reason why they should not both be cultivated.
neither express its premises nor deduce its conclusions in a scientific manner. Again, theology relies on metaphysics to prove certain truths, called the _principles_, which are not revealed but are nevertheless profound. This theme has been discussed in the context of the philosopher's work. It is only natural, therefore, that metaphysics and theology should have many points of contact, and that the latter should rely on the former. Finally, since all truth is one, both in the source from which it is derived, and in the subject, the human mind, which it adorns, there must be a kinship between two sciences which, like theology and metaphysics, treat of the most important conceptions of the human mind. The difference in the manner of treatment, theology relying on revelation, and metaphysics on reason alone, does not affect the unity of purpose and the final harmony of the conclusions of the two sciences.

But, while theology thus derives assistance from metaphysics, metaphysics, on the other hand, has derived advantages from its close association with theology. Pre-Christian philosophy failed to arrive at metaphysical determinations of the notions of substance and person. This defect was corrected, in part at least, by Origen, Clement, and Athanasius, and in part by their successors, the scholastics, by the impulse instilled into them to philosophize in the light of the requirements of theological speculation concerning the Blessed Trinity. Pre-Christian philosophy failed to give a coherent, satisfactory account of the origin of the world: Plato's myths and Aristotle's doctrine of the eternity of matter could not long continue to satisfy the Christian mind. It was, once more, the Albigenses who, in their investigation of the Holy Scriptures, elaborating the Biblical conception of creation _Ex nihilo_, gave an explanation of the origin of the universe which is satisfactory to the metaphysicist as well as to the theologian. Finally, the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, as discussed by the scholastics, gave occasion for a more defined and detailed discussion of the nature of accident in general and of quantity in particular.

VI. THE METHOD OF METAPHYSICS.— Among the objections most frequently urged against metaphysics, especially against scholastic metaphysics, is the unsound character of its method. The metaphysicist, we are told, pursues the a priori path of knowledge; he neglects or even condemns the use of the a posteriori empirical method which is employed with so much profit in the investigation of nature; he spins, as Bacon says, the threads of his metaphysical fabric from the contents of his own mind, as the spider spins her web from the substance of her body, instead of gathering it from every source in the world around him. It is the duty of the metaphysicist to look beyond metaphysical principles, as the bee gathers nectar from the flowers and elaborates it into honey. In order to clear up the misunderstanding which underlies this objection, it is necessary to remark that there are three kinds of method: (1) the a priori, which, assuming certain self-evident postulates, maximums, and definitions to be true, proceeds deductively to draw conclusions implied in those assumptions; (2) the subjective a posteriori method, which, from an examination of the phenomena of consciousness, builds up empirically, that is, inductively, conclusions based on those phenomena; (3) the objective a posteriori method, which builds on the facts of experience in general in the same way as the objective science builds on the facts of introspection. The second method is pre-eminently the method of the Cartesians, who, like their leader, Descartes, strive to build the whole edifice of philosophy on the foundation furnished by reflection on our thought-processes: _Cogito, ergo sum_. It is also the method of the Kantians, who, rejecting the psychological basis of metaphysics as unsubstantial, build on the moral basis, the categorical imperative: their line of reasoning is "I ought, therefore I am free", etc. The third is the method of those who, rejecting the Aristotelian conceptions, essence, substance, cause, etc., substitute so-called empirical conceptions of force, mass, and so forth, under which they attempt to subsume the core of metaphysical metaphysics or the conceptions peculiar to the various sciences.

The first method is admittedly unsound (in the popular sense of the word) and is adopted only by those philosophers who, like Plato, consider that the true source of philosophical knowledge is above us, not in the world around and beneath us. If the formula _universalia ante rem_ (see _Universalia_) is taken in the exclusive sense, then we may not look to experience, but to intuition of a higher order of truth, for our metaphysical principles. It is a calumny which originated in ignorance perhaps, more than in prejudice, that the scholastics followed this a priori method in metaphysics. True, the scholastic philosopher _quidquid recipitur per modum recipientis recipitur_, etc., and therefrom deduces metaphysical conclusions. If, however, we examine more closely, if we go back from the "Summa", or text-book, where the adage is quoted without proof, to the "Commentary on Aristotle", where the axiom is first introduced, we shall find that the truth is, that the scholastic argument, and is therefore, a legitimate premise from which to deduce other truths. In point of fact, the scholastics use a method which at once a priori and a posteriori, and the latter both in the objective and the subjective sense. In their exposition of truth they naturally use the a priori, or deductive, method. In their treatment of the substance of truth, they naturally both the world of mental phenomena within us, and the world of physical phenomena without us, for the purpose of building up inductively those metaphysical principles from which they proceed. It may be conceded that many of the later scholastics are too ready to invoke authority instead of investigating; it may be conceded that the scholastics were too dependent on books, especially on Aristotle's works, for their knowledge of nature. But, in principle, at least, the best representatives of scholasticism recognized that in philosophy the argument from authority is the weakest argument, and if the circumstances in which they lived and wrote made it imperative on them to master the contents of Aristotle's writings on natural science, it must, nevertheless, be granted by every fair minded critic that metaphysics at least they improved on the doctrines of the Stagirite.

VII. HISTORY OF METAPHYSICS.—The history of metaphysics naturally falls into the same divisions as the history of philosophy in general. In a brief outline of the course which metaphysical speculation has followed, it will be possible to consider only the principal stages, namely (1) Hindu philosophy, (2) Greek philosophy, (3) Early Christian philosophy, (4) Medieval philosophy, (5) Modern philosophy.

(1) Hindu Philosophy.—Of all the peoples of antiquity, the Hindus were the most successful in rising immediately from the mythological explanation of the universe to an explanation in terms of metaphysics. Apparently without passing through the intermediary stage of scientific explanation, they reached at once the heights of the metaphysical point of view. From polytheism or henotheism they proceeded very early to monotheism, and found that to the mind or central conception of reality. Their starting point was the realization that man is born into a state of bondage
and that his chief business in life is to deliver himself from that condition by means of knowledge. The knowledge, they taught, which avails most in the struggle for freedom is this: the world of sense phenomena is an illusion (mythos), all truths, the reality, is one supreme substance, the soul is part of this real substance, and will ultimately return to the Whole. The real substance is, as Max Müller remarks, spoken of as a neuter, and in this doctrine "is contained in a whole system of philosophy" ("Six Systems of Indian Philosophy", London, 1899, p. 60). The first, and most important of all truths, then, is that reality is one, and that each of us is identical with the All: "That art thou" is the highest expression of self-knowledge, and the gate to all salutary truth. Thus, the Hindus, actuated by an ethical, or ascetic, motive, attained a metaphysical formula to which they reduced all reality.

(2) Greek Philosophy. — The first Greek philosophers were students of nature. They were actuated not by an ethical motive, but by a kind of scientific curiosity to know the origins of things. There was no metaphysician among the Ionians (see IONIAN SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY). Out of the problem of origins, however, the metaphysical problem was developed by the Eleatics and the Stoics. These philosophers considered that the explanations of the Ionians — that the world originated from water or air — were too naive, relied too much on the verdict of the senses. Consequently, they began to contrast the real truth which the mind (soul) sees, and the illusory truth (phantasma) which appears to the senses. The Eleatics, on the one hand, asserted that the only real element, which they called Being, is alone exists, and that change, motion, and multiplicity are illusions. Heraclitus, on the other hand, reached the conclusion that what mind reveals is change, which alone is real, while permanency is only apparent, is, in fact, an illusion of the senses. Thus, these thinkers thrust into the forefront the problem of change and permanency, and the problem of reality, wholly free from the limitations which confined the earlier Ionians to a physical view of the problems of philosophy. They formulated metaphysical principles of reality, but both in the language which they used and in the mode of thought which they adopted, they seemed to be unable to rise above the consideration of material, and physical, all. Socrates, however, did immense service to metaphysics by bringing out clearly the problem of change.

Socrates was primarily an ethical teacher. Still, in laying the foundation of ethics he formulated a theory of knowledge which had immediate application to the problem of metaphysics. He taught that the contrast and apparently irreconcilable contradiction between the verdict of the mind and the deliverance of the senses disappear if we determine the scientific conditions of true knowledge. He held that these conditions are summed up in the processes of induction and definition. His conclusion, therefore, is, that out of the data of the senses, which presents the only reality, we may form concepts, which are the elements of true scientific knowledge. He himself applied the doctrine to ethics.

Plato, the pupil of Socrates, carried the Socratic teaching into the region of metaphysics. If knowledge through concepts is the only true knowledge, it follows, says Plato, that the concept represents the only reality, and all the reality, in the object of our knowledge. The sum of the reality of a thing is, therefore the Idea. Corresponding to the internal, or psychological, world of our concepts is not only the world of our sense experience (the shadow-world of phenomena), but also the world of Ideas, of which our world of concepts is only a reflection, and the world of sense phenomena, a shadow. That which corresponds to what it is, the essence, we should call it, is the Idea of that thing existing in the world above us. In the

"thing" itself, the phenomenon presented by the senses, there is a participation of the Idea, limited, disfigured and debased by union with a negative principle of limitation called matter. The metaphysical conceptions of reality also, that were the Ideas, are positive factors and this negative principle. From the Ideas come all that is positive, permanent, intelligible, eternal in the world. From the negative principle come imperfection, negation, change, and liability to dissolution. Thus, profiting by the epistemological doctrines of Socrates, without losing sight of the antagonistic teachings of his master, Heraclitus, Plato evolved his theory of Ideas as a metaphysical solution of the problem of change, which had baffled his predecessors.

Aristotle also was a follower of Socrates. He was influenced, too, by the theory of Ideas advocated by his master, Plato. For, although he rejected that theory, he did so after a study of it which enabled him to view the problem of change in the light of metaphysical principles. Like Plato, he accepted the Socratic doctrine that the only true knowledge is knowledge of concepts. Like Plato, too, he inferred from this that the concept must represent the reality of a thing. But unlike Plato, he made at this point an important distinction. Plato said that what a concept represents is in the thing which it constitutes, not as an Idea, but as an essence. He considers that the Platonic world of Ideas is a meaningless duplication of things: the world of essences is in, not above, nor beyond, the world of phenomena: there is, consequently, no contradiction between sense-experience and intellectual conceptions. The apprehension of a plurality of things is known by abstraction from those individuating qualities, which are presented in sense-knowledge; the knowledge of them is ultimately empirical, and not to be explained by an intuition which we are alleged to have enjoyed in a previous existence. In the essence of material things Aristotle could distinguish number, form, and matter. He distinguished the principle of form, which is the source of perfection, determinateness, activity and of all positive qualities, and the Matter, which is the source of imperfection, indetermination, passivity and of all the limitations and privations of a thing. Coming now to the orderland of metaphysics and physics, Aristotle defined the nature of being: being is a subject of reality, and of all the principles of cause, Material, Formal, Efficient and Final (see CAUSE). In addition to these contributions to the solution of the problem of change, which had, by historical evolution, become the central problem of metaphysics, Aristotle contributed to metaphysics a discussion of the nature of Being in general, and drew up a scheme of classification of things which is known as his system of Categories. He is least satisfactory in his treatment of the problem of the existence and nature of God, a question in which, as he himself admits, all metaphysical speculation culminates.

After the time of Aristotle, philosophy among the Greeks began to become more and more interested in science and human conduct. The Stoics and the Epicureans, who were the chief representatives of this tendency, devoted attention to questions of metaphysics, only so far as they considered that such questions may influence human happiness. As a result of this subdivision of metaphysics to ethics, the pantheistic materialism of the Stoics and the materialistic monism of the Epicureans fall far short of the perfection which the doctrines of Plato and Aristotle attained. Contemporaneously with the Stoic and Epicurean schools, a new school of Platonism, generally called Neo-Platonism, interested itself very much in problems of asceticism and mysticism, and, in connexion with the problems of the ancient pagans, gave a new turn to the drift of metaphysical speculation. The Neo-Platonists, influenced by the monism of the Orientalists, and, later by that of the Christians, took up the task of explaining how
the manifold, diversified, imperfect world originated from the One, Unchangeable, and Perfect Being. They exaggerated the Platonic doctrine of matter to the point of maintaining that all evil, moral as well as physical, originates from a material source. At the same time, they identified the spiritual world which they called *duales* (spirits) all actuality, intelligence, and force in the whole universe. These intelligences were derived, they said, from the One by a process of emanation, which is akin to the "streaming forth" of light from the illuminating body. This system of metaphysics teaches, therefore, that the One, and intelligences derived from the One, are the only positive principles, while matter is the only negative principle of things. This is the system which was most widely accepted in pagan circles during the first centuries of the Christian era.

(3) Early Christian Philosophy.—The first heretics among the Christian thinkers were influence in their philosophy by Neo-Platonism. For the most part, they adopted the Gnostic view (see Gnosticism) that in the last appeal, the test of Christian truth is not the official teaching of the Church or the exoteric doctrine of the gospels, but a secret gnostos, a body of doctrine imparted by Christ to the chosen few. This body of doctrine was in reality a modified Neo-Platonism. Its more specific tenet was that evil was the work of the devil. The problem of evil thus came to occupy an important place in the philosophical systems of orthodox Christian thinkers down to the time of St. Augustine. Other problems, too, claimed special attention, notably the question of the origin of the universe. From the theological controversies concerning the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, arose the discussion of the meaning of nature, substance, and person. From all these sources sprang the Christian Neo-Platonism of the great Alexandrian School, which included Clement and Origen, and the later phase of Christian Philosophy of the fourth and fifth centuries. In the philosophy of St. Augustine we have the greatest constructive effort of the Christian mind during the Patristic Era. It is a philosophy which centres in the problems arising from the nature of evil, and the nature and destiny of the human soul. The most crucial of these problems is that of the existence of evil. How can it be explained? Man is to be considered as an animal, and in the nature of things, evil exists. This problem was not discussed by the Later Schoolmen. The problem of evil is justified by the gradation of beings which results from the existence of imperfection, and which is essential to the harmony and variety of the universe in general. Another question which attends a good deal of prominence in St. Augustine's metaphysics is that of the origin of the world. All things, he teaches, were created at the beginning, material creatures as well as abstract. On the one hand, Buent and other scholastics, and men in a chronological series is merely the development in time of those "seeds of things" which were implanted in the material world at the beginning. However, St. Augustine is careful to make an exception in the case of the individual human soul. He avoids the doctrine of pre-existence which Origen had taught, and maintains that the individual soul originates at the same time as the body, although he is not prepared to decide definitively whether it originates by a distinct creative act or is derived from the souls of the child's parents (see Traducianism).

(4) Medieval Philosophy.—The first scholastic philosophers devoted their attention to the discussion of metaphysics and its problems. They used the metaphysical system which was studied in the schools, such as Porphyry's "Isagoge", and Boethius's translation of portions of Aristotle's "Organon". From these discussions they passed to problems of psychology, but it was not until the end of the twelfth century, when Aristotle's metaphysical treatise and his works on psychology became accessible in Latin, that scholastic metaphysics rose to the dignity and proportions of a system. By way of exception, John the Scot (see Eriugena), as early as the first half of the ninth century, developed a highly wrought system of metaphysical speculation characterized by idealism, pantheism, and Neo-Platonic mysticism. In the eleventh century the school of Chartres, under the influence of Platonism, discussed in a metaphysical spirit the problems of the nature of reality and the origin of the universe.

The philosophy of the thirteenth century, represented by Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure, Roger Bacon, Albert the Great, St. Thomas, and Duns Scotus, accorded to metaphysics its place as the science which completes and crowns the efforts of the mind to attain a knowledge of things human and divine. It acknowledged the importance of the relation which metaphysics bears, on the one hand, to the other portions of philosophy, and, on the other hand, to the science of theology. Fundamentally Aristotelian in its conception, the metaphysics of the golden age of scholasticism departed from Aristotle's teaching only to supply the defects and correct the faults which it detected in Aristotle's philosophy. Thus, it worked out on Aristotelian lines the problems of person and nature, substance and accident, cause and effect; it took up and carried to higher stages of development St. Augustine's recalculation of evil with the goodness of God; it elaborated in detail the question of the nature of matter and the origin of the universe by God's creative act. At the same time, the metaphysics of the schools was obliged to face new problems which were thrust on the attention of the schoolmen by the exegetical and educational activity of the universities. The line of distinction between Theism and Pantheism, discussed the question of fatalism and free will, and rejected the Arabian interpretation of Aristotle which jeopardized the doctrine of personal immortality. Towards the end of the scholastic period the appearance of the anti-metaphysical nominalism of Ockham and the scepticism of Descartes led the later schoolmen to adopt an extremely a priorism in philosophy, which more than any other single cause contributed to bring about the antagonism between metaphysics and natural science, which marks the era of scientific discovery. This condition, though widespread, was not, however, universal. Men like Suarez and other great commentators continued down to the seventeenth century to present in their metaphysical treatises the best traditions of the scholasticism of the thirteenth century.

(5) Modern Philosophy.—At the beginning of the modern era we find a divergence of opinion concerning the scope and value of metaphysical speculation. On the one hand, Descartes, and other metaphysicians, used metaphysics to designate the science of the essential properties of bodies, is opposed to the metaphysical philosophy of the scholastics, and chiefly because that philosophy gave too much prominence to final causes and the study of the mind. On the other hand, Leibniz, declaring that "philosophy is a tree, which has metaphysics for its root", understands that the science of metaphysics is based exclusively on the data of the subjective consciousness. Spinoza accepts this restriction, implicitly at least, although his explicit aim in philosophy is ethical, namely to present that view of reality which will lead to the deliverance of the soul from bondage. Leibniz takes a more open attitude towards metaphysics, and it is a metaphysics which will reconcile the idealism of Plato with the results of scientific research, and he aims at harmony.
the materialism of the atomists with the spiritual-ism of the scholastics. Locke, by limiting all our knowledge to the two sources, sensation and reflection, precludes the possibility of metaphysical speculation beyond the facts of experience and of consciousness: in fact, he maintains (Essay, IV, B) that all metaphys-ical discussion is “merely a word-twisting and, therefore “trifling”, have only a hypothetical value. This line of thought is taken up by Hume, who emphatically declares that “it is impossible to go beyond experience”, and by Mill, who maintains the hypothetical nature of all so-called necessary truth, mathematical as well as metaphysical. The same position is taken by the school of the “Neoclassical” school of the eighteenth century. Berkeley, although his professed aim was merely “to remove the mist and veil of words” which hindered the clear vision of the truth, passed from empirical materialism to a system of Platonic mysticism based on the metaphysical principle of causality.

Beginning with Kant, the question of the existence and scope of metaphysical science assumes a new phase. Metaphysics is now the science which claims to know things in themselves, and as Kant sees it, all post-Cartesian metaphysics is wrong in its starting-point. Kant holds that both the empiricist’s rejection of metaphysics and the dogmatist’s defence of it are wrong. The empiricist is wrong in supposing that we cannot go beyond experience: the dogmatist is wrong in affirming that we can go beyond experience by means of the theoretical reason. The practical reason, the faculty of moral consciousness, can alone take us beyond experience, and lead us to a knowledge of things in themselves. Practical reason, therefore, or the moral law, of which we are immediately conscious, is the only foundation of metaphysical science. The successors of Kant, namely, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer, and Von Hartmann, no matter how much they may differ in other respects, hold that the aim of metaphysics is to attain the ultra-empirical, or absolute, reality, whether this be called self (Fichte), the absolute, spirit or Idea (Hegel), the Will (Schopenhauer), or the Unconscious (Von Hartmann). Another group, the empirico-critics, who also acknowledge their dependence on Kant, assign to metaphysics the task of discussing the fundamental principles of knowledge by means of a critical examination of experience. Finally, there is the school of the Schellingian, which, in the only way, an inclination to use the word metaphysics to designate any view of reality which, transcending the limits of the particular sciences, strives to combine and relate the results of those sciences in a synthetic formula (Weltanschauung).

English philosophers either define metaphysics in terms of mental phenomena, as Hamilton does, or restrict its field of inquiry to the problem of the value of knowledge, thus confounding it with epistemology, or go over to the Hegelian point of view that metaphysics is the science of the genesis and development of dynamic categories of reality. The evolutionist school, represented by Herbert Spencer, while they deny the completeness, all rationality, attempt a general synthesis of all truth under the evolutionist formula, which is in reality metaphysics in disguise. Their effort in this direction is, at least, an acknowledgement of the justice of the scholastic claim that there must be a hegemonic science which unifies and co-ordinates in an articulated system the conclusions of all sciences, all reasoning, all tendencies of those sciences towards specialization which ends in fragmentation.

In so far as pragmatism, represented by James, Dewey, and Schiller, rejects absolute truth, it may be said to cut the ground from under metaphysics. Nevertheless, the latest phase of pragmatism, in which interest is shifted from the epistemological problem to the question, What is reality? is manifestly a step towards a rehabilitation of metaphysics. An analysis of reality is followed inevitably by an attempt to synthesize. The pragmatic synthesis, naturally, will have for its foundation neither the law of identity, that being is being, nor the law of contradiction, that two opposite terms cannot be simultaneously true, nor the law of the excluded middle, akin to that of the Woth-Theoris of Lotze. Of quite special interest is the attempt on the part of Professor Royce to interpret reality in terms of “loyalty”. With the exception, then, of Trendelenburg’s “Studies” and critical expositions of the text of Aristotle, the only philosophical literature in recent times which attempts the restoration of the nature and scope of metaphysics, is that which has come from the pens of the Neo-Scholastics. The Neo-Scholastic doctrine on at least one point in metaphysics is given in the following paragraph.

VIII. Doctrine of Being.—The three ideas which are most important in any system of metaphysics are Being, Substance, and Cause. These have a decisive influence, and may be said to determine the character of a metaphysical system. Substance and Cause are treated elsewhere under separate titles (see Cause and Substance). It will, therefore, be sufficient here to give the outlines of the scholastic doctrine of Being, which, indeed, is the most fundamental of the three, and decide what the scholastics teach regarding Substance and Cause.

(1) Description of Being.—Being cannot be defined: (a) because a definition, according to the scholastic formula, must be “by proximate genus and ultimate difference”, and Being, having the widest extension, cannot be included in any genus; (b) because a definition is the analytico-comprehensive of the concept. The scholastics teach regarding Being, having the least comprehension, is, as it were, indivisible in its comprehension, resisting all efforts to resolve it into simpler thought elements. Nevertheless, Being may be described. The word “Being”, taken either as a participle or as a noun, has reference to the “act” of existence. Whatever exists, therefore, is a Being, whether it exists in the mind or outside the mind, whether it is actual or only potential, whether it requires a subject in which to inhere or is capable of subsisting without a subject of inherence. Thus, the broadest division of Being is into, notional, which exists only in the mind (ens rationis), and, real, which exists independently of the created mind (ens rei). Realities of the real, or potential, are potential and the actual. This is an important point of scholastic teaching, which is sometimes overlooked in the exposition and still more in the criticism of scholasticism. For the scholastics, the real world extends far beyond the actual world of our experience or even of possible experience. Beyond the realm of actually existing things there are not merely tendencies, potentials, and possibilities which are truly real. The oak is really present, though only potentially, in the acorn; the painting is really, though only potentially, present, in the mind of the artist; and so, in every case, before the effect becomes actual it is really present in the cause in the measure in which its actual existence depends on the ex.
dent, body, plant, tree, etc. In the first place, the predicate being is never univocally affirmed of lower concepts, because it is not a genus. Neither is it predicated equivocally, because its meaning when predicated of substance, for example, is not entirely distinct from anything distinct from being added to being, what is added is "nothing", and there is no addition. The schoolmen, therefore, teach that the lower concept simply brings out in an explicit manner a mode or modes of being which are contained implicitly but not expressed in the higher concept, Being. The comprehension, for example, of substance is greater than that of being. Nevertheless it is not correct to say that, Substance = Being + a, for if a is distinct from the term Being, to which it is added, it must be Nothing. The truth, then, is that Substance brings out explicitly a mode (namely the power of existing without a subject in which to inhere) which is neither explicitly affirmed nor explicitly denied but only implicitly contained in the concept of Being.

(3) Being and Nothing.—Being, therefore, has a comprehension, which, though it is the least of all comprehensions, is definite. It is not a bare, empty concept, and, therefore, equal to "nothing", as the Hegelians teach. This doctrine of the scholastics is the line of demarcation between Aristotelianism on the one hand and Hegelianism on the other. Hegel denies that the concept of Being has a definite comprehension, that, therefore, the fundamental law of thought as well as the basic principle of reality is the identity of Being with itself: Being = Being. A is A, or Everything is what it is. Hegel does not deny that this Aristotelian principle is true. He holds, however, that Being has an indepen-dent comprehension, a comprehension, a concept, dynamic or, as it were, fluent. Therefore, he says, the principle Being = Being. A is A, or Everything is what it is, is only part of the truth, for Being is also equal to Nothing, A = not.-A, Everything is its opposite. The full truth is: Being = Becoming; no static or fixed formula is true; everything is constantly passing into new analogies and consequences which result from this fundamental divergence of doctrine regarding Being are enormous. Not the least serious of these is the Hegelian conclusion that all reality is dynamic and that God Himself is a process.

(4) Being, Existence, and Essence.—As wisdom (sapience) is that by which a person is wise (sapere), so essence (essentia) is that by which a thing is (esse). If one inquires what is the intrinsic cause of a person being wise, the answer is, wisdom; if one asks what is the intrinsic cause of existence, the answer is, essence. Essence, therefore, is that by which a thing is what it is. It is the source of all the necessary and universal properties of a thing, and is itself necessary, universal, eternal. The act of being, in other words, refers to existence, in the same way as the act to which wisdom refers, is the exercise of wisdom (sapere). Both existence and essence are realities, the one in the ontitative order, the other in the qualitative order. Of course, the existence of a notional being (ens rationis) is only notional; its essence, too, is notional. But in the case of a real, created by God, the existence is one kind of reality, a real actuality, and the essence is another kind of reality, a reality in the potential order. This doctrine of the real distinction between essence and existence in real created beings is not admitted by all scholastic philosophers. Suarez, for instance, and his school, hold that the distinction is only logical or notional; the Scotists, too, maintain that the distinction in question is less than real. The Thomists, on the contrary, hold that in God alone essence and existence are identical, that in all creatures there is a real distinction, because in creatures existence is participated, diversified, and multiplied, not by reason of itself but by reason of the essence which it has. The question of the nature of the question itself, but also concerning the interpretation of the words of St. Thomas, although there seems very little ground for denying that in the work "De Ente et Essentia" the Angelic Doctor holds a real distinction between essence and existence.

(5) Transcendental Properties of Being.—Equally extraneous with the concept of Being are the concepts good, true, one, and beautiful. Every being is good, true, one, and beautiful, in the metaphysical sense, or as the scholastics expressed it, Being and Good are convertible, Being and True are convertible, etc. (Bonum et ens convertuntur, etc.). Goodness, in this sense, means the fullness of entity or perfection which belongs to each being in its own, New York (1887). Translation. (Oxford, 1908); commentaries by St. Thomas, S. Thomas Opera Omnia, XXXV (Paris, 1875); SYLVESTER MAURUS, Aristotelis Opera (Rome, 1885), etc.; WALLACE, Oneness and Phil. of Aristotle (Cambridge, 1884); PIAT, Aristotle (Paris, 1903).
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Metastasio, Pietro, Italian poet, b. at Rome, 1698; d. at Vienna, 1782. Of humble origin, his father, once a Papal soldier, was later a pork-butcher; Metastasio was placed in the shop of a goldsmith to learn his craft. By some chance he attracted the attention of the jurist, liltterateur, Vincenzo Gravina, who took him in charge, and Grezizing his name of Trapassi, into the syndic, he gave him a solid education. At his death in 1718 he left to his protegé a considerable sum of money, which the latter soon dissipated. Then he was compelled to apprentice himself at Naples to a lawyer, who, however, found the apprentice more prone to write verses than to study legal codes. The beginning of Metastasio's real career is marked by the composition, at the request of the Vicerey of Naples, of his musical drama, the "Orti Espe- ridi", which had signal success. The leading part therein was played by the famous actress, la Romanina (Mariana Benti-Bulgarelli). She at once became attached to the young poet, commissioned him to write a new play, the "Didone abandona", had him taught music by a noted teacher, and took him to Florence and Venice with her on her professional tours.

At Vienna the Italian melodramatist, Apostol Zeno, was about to relinquish his post as imperial poet, and in 1730 he recommended that Metastasio be appointed his successor. With this recommendation and with the aid of the Countess of Althann, who remained his patroness during her lifetime, he obtained the appointment. Thereafter, and especially during the decade between 1730 and 1740, Metastasio was engaged in the composition of his many melodramas (over seventy in number), his oratorios, cantate, canzonette, etc. Among the most noted of his melodramas—which announce the coming opera—are: "Endimione", "Orti Espe-ridi", "Galatea", "Angelica", "Didone", "Siroe", "Ca-tone", "Artaserse", "Adriano in Ven-" ice with her on her professional tours.

Metallopolis, a titular see of Phrygia Pacatiana, in Asia Minor. The inscriptions make known a Phrygian town named Motella, which name is connected with the Phrygian feminine proper name Motalis and the Cilician masculine Momales, as also with Mutulis, or Mt'lli, the king of Commagene, and with the Greek Comagene.

Some of these inscriptions were found in the village of Medea, in the vilayet of Brousse, which evidently preserves the ancient name. Motella seems to be the town which Hierocles (Synedemus, 668, 6) calls Pulcherianopolis; it may be supposed to have been raised to the rank of a bishopric by the Byzantine Patriarch, 414-52, and its suffragans in 553, Justinian raised Hieropolis to metropolitan rank, and attached to it a certain number of suffragans sees previously dependent on Laodicea. Among these are the "Notitiae Episcopatum" mention, from the ninth to the twelfth or thirteenth century, this same Motella, which they call Metallopolis, and even once Metallopolis. An inscription informs us of Bishop Michael, in 596, and another, of Bishop Cyriacus, perhaps in 667. At the Council of Nicea, 787, the see was represented by Eudoxius, a priest and monk. Bishop Michael attended the two councils of Constantinople in 869 and 879.

Quenin. Oriens Christianus. t. 826 (very incomplete): RAMAY, Cities and Bishops of Phrygia, 109, 121, 141, 158, 158.

Petitred. Metempsychosis (Gr. μεταμόρφωσις. Lat. metempsychos-is: Fr. metempsycose: Ger. seelenwanderung), in other words the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, teaches that the same soul inhabits in succession the bodies of different beings, both men and animals. It was a tenet common to many systems of philosophic thought and religious belief widely separated from each other both geographically and historically. Although in modern times it is associated among civilized races almost exclusively with the countries of Asia and particularly with India, there is evidence that at one period or another it has flourished in almost every part of the world; and it still prevails in various forms among savage nations scattered over the globe. This universality seems to mark it as one of those spontaneous or instinctive beliefs by which man's nature responds to the deep and urgent problems of existence; whilst the numerous and richly-coloured forms in which it assumes is a reflection of the mind and the many-coloured mythology in which it has clothed itself, show it to be capable of powerfully appealing to the imagination, and of adapting itself with great versatility to widely different types of mind. The explanation of this success seems to lie partly in its being an expression of the fundamental belief in-
mortality, partly in its comprehensiveness, binding together, as for the most part it seems to do, all individual existences in one single, unbroken scheme; partly also in the unrestrained liberty which it leaves to the mythologising fancy.

History.—Egypt. Herodotus tells us in a well-known passage that the Egyptians were the first to assert the immortality of the soul, and that it passes on the death of the body into another animal; and that when it has gone the round of all forms of life on land, in water, and in air, then it once more enters a human body born for it; and this cycle of the soul takes place in three thousand years" (ii. 123). That the doctrine first originated that the Egyptians are unlikely. It also most certainly passed from Egypt into Greece, but the same belief had sprung up independently in many nations from a very early date. The accounts of Egyptian metempsychosis vary considerably: indeed such a doctrine was bound to undergo modifications according to changes in the national religion. In the "Book of the Dead," 3 it is connected with the notion of a judgment after death, transmigration into infra-human forms being a punishment for sin. Certain animals were recognized by the Egyptians as the abode of specially wicked persons and were on this account, according to Plutarch, preferred for sacrificial purposes. In Herodotus' account given above, this ethical note is not made. The form of Egyptian immortality is an elaborate and necessary cosmic process. Plato's version mediates between these two views. He represents the Egyptians as teaching that ordinary mortals will, after a cycle of ten thousand years, return to the human form, but that an adept in philosophy may hope to accomplish the process in three thousand years. There was also a higher form of Egyptian immortality, the individual being regarded as an emanation from a single universal principle to which it was destined to return after having completed its "cycle of necessity." There are traces of this doctrine of a cosmic cycle in the Fourth Eclogue of Vergil. It has been thought that the custom of embalming the dead was connected with this form of the doctrine, the object being to preserve the body intact for the return of the soul. It is probable, indeed, that the belief in such a return helped to confirm the practice, but it can hardly have provided the sole motive, since we find that other animals were also frequently embalmed.

India.—The doctrine of transmigration is not found in the oldest of the sacred books of India, viz., the Rig-Veda; but in the later works it appears as an uncontradicted dogma, especially in the Upanishads, in which it is one of the two great religions of India. (1) Brahmans. In Brahmans, we find the doctrine of world-cycles, of annihilations and restorations destined to recur at enormous intervals of time; and of this general movement the fortunes of the soul are but an incident. At the same time, transmigrations are determined by moral worth. Every act has its reward in the next life. By irresistible law, evil deeds beget unhappiness, sooner or later; these, indeed, are nothing else but the slowly-ripened fruit of conduct, which every man must eat. They thus explain the anomalies of experience presented in the misfortunes of the good and the prosperity of the wicked. Each is "eating the fruit of his past actions." Actions done perhaps in some far-remote existence. Such a belief may tend to patience and resignation in present suffering, but it has a distinctly unpleasant effect upon the Brahmanical outlook on the future. A pious Brahman cannot assure himself of happiness in his next incarnation; there may be the penalty of great unknown sin still to be faced. But gratitude is union with the Divine, born from the series of births, but no degree of actual holiness can guarantee this, since one is always exposed to the danger of being thrown back either by sin past or sin to come, the fruit of which will have to be eaten, and so on, we might be tempted to imagine, ad infinitum. Hence a great fear of re-incarnation prevails.

(2) Buddhism.—Brahmanism is bound up with caste, and is therefore strongly aristocratic, insisting much on innate superiorities. Buddhism, on the contrary, cute through caste-divisions and asserts the paramount importance of "works," of individual effort, though always with a background of fatalism which the denial of a personal Providence entails. According to the Buddhist doctrine, the ambition to rise to the summit of existence must infallibly be fulfilled; and the mission of Guatama was to teach the way to its attainment, i.e., to Buddha-ship and Nirvana. It is only through a long series of existences that this consummation can be reached. Guatama himself had as many as five hundred and fifty transmigrations in the Buddhist chronology in the Bennurahuc 4.

The characteristic feature in Buddhist metempsychosis is the doctrine of Karma, which is a subtle substitute for the conception of personal continuity. According to this view it is not the concrete individuality of the soul that survives, and migrates into a new life, but only the karmas, or action, i.e., the sum of the man's deeds, his merits, the ethical resultant of his
previous life, its total value, stripped of its former individuation, which is regarded as accidental. As the karma is greater or less, so will the next transmigration be a promotion or a degradation. At times this degradation may be so extreme that it was embodied in an inanimate form, as in the case of Gautama's disciple who, for negligence in his master's service, was reduced after death to the form of a broomstick.

Later Jewish Teaching.—The notion of soul-wandering is familiar to the Jewish Rabbis. They distinguish two kinds of sin: (1) Guf, the body, in which the soul was tied down to a life-tenancy of a single body; (2) Ibbur, in which souls may inhabit bodies by temporary possession without passing through birth and death. Josephus tells us that transmigration was a doctrine of the Pharisees, who taught that the righteous should be allowed to return to life, while the wicked were to be doomed to eternal imprisonment. It was their gloomy conception of Sheol, like the gloomy Greek conception of Hades, that forced them to this shift for a compensation to virtue. On the other hand some of the Talmudists invoke endless transmigration as a penalty for crime. The description of the soul's journeys over land and sea are eloquent of a wealth of imagery verging on the grotesque. The retributive purpose was rigorously maintained. "If a man hath committed one sin more than his good works, he is condemned to transformation into some shape of lower life." Not only so, but if his guilt had been extreme, he might be doomed to an inanimate existence. The following is an extract from the "guiltiest of the guilty". "The dark tormentors rush after them with goads and whips of fire; their chase is ceaseless; they hunt them from the plain to the mountain, from the mountain to the river, from the river to the ocean, from the ocean round the circle of the earth. Thus the tormented fly in terror, and the tormentors follow in vengeance until the time decreed is done. Then the doomed sink into dust and ashes. Another beginning of existence, the commencement of a second trial, awaits them. They become clay, they take the nature of the stone and the mineral; they are water, fire, air; they roll in the thunder; they float in the cloud; they rush and fly. Bodily existence, according to the Gnostics, is the gullet of the guilty." The dark tormentors rush after them with goads and whips of fire; their chase is ceaseless; they hunt them from the plain to the mountain, from the mountain to the river, from the river to the ocean, from the ocean round the circle of the earth. Thus the tormented fly in terror, and the tormentors follow in vengeance until the time decreed is done. Then the doomed sink into dust and ashes. Another beginning of existence, the commencement of a second trial, awaits them. They become clay, they take the nature of the stone and the mineral; they are water, fire, air; they roll in the thunder; they float in the cloud; they rush and fly. Bodily existence, according to the Gnostics, is the gullet of the guilty.

Advocates of metempsychosis have not been wanting in modern times, but there is none who speaks with much conviction. The greatest name is Lessing, and his critical mind seems to have been chiefly attracted by the doctrine, from a point of view into which it had fallen, and the inconclusiveness of the arguments used against it. It was also maintained by Fourier in France and Soame Jenyns in England. Leibnitz and others have maintained that all souls were created from the beginning of the world; but this does not involve migrations.

Savage Races.—Savage races is a touchy word very briefly on the abundant data furnished by modern anthropological research. Belief in transmigration has been found, as stated above, in every part of the globe and at every stage of culture. It must have been almost universal at one time among the tribes of North America, and it has been found also in Mexico, Brazil, and in the various parts of the American continent; it has also been found among the aborigines of Australia and New Zealand, in the Sandwich Islands and many parts of Africa. It often takes the form of a belief in the return of long-departed ancestors, and thus provides a simple explanation of the strange facts of heredity. On the birth of a child this parents eagerly believe to be the reincarnation of its identity, which, when discovered, will determine the future of the child and its place in their affections. Sometimes the mother is informed beforehand in a dream which ancestor of the house is about to be born of her. The belief in the soul as an independent reality is common among savage races. The departed soul was thought to have walked through the world and then a time after death. Hence, e. g., among the Algonquins, if a speedy return was desired, as in the case of little children, the body was buried by the roadside that it might find a mother in some of the passers-by. A curious freak of superstition is the belief in many of the dark races, e. g., in Australia, that their fair-skinned brethren from the other world are men of their own race. Among the uneducated classes of India, as Sir A. Lyall tells us, the notion that witches and sorcerers, living or dead, have the power of possessing the bodies of animals still prevails. A similar idea prompted the Sandwich Islanders to throw the bodies of their dead to the sharks in the hope of thus rendering them less hostile to mankind. Combined with this, there is the imperative moral demand for an equitable future retribution of rewards and punishments in accordance with good or ill conduct here.
The doctrine of transmigration satisfies in some degree both these virtually instinctive faiths. (3) As mentioned above, it offers a plausible explanation of the phenomena of heredity. (4) It also provides an explanation of some features of the infra-rational creation which seems to ape in so many points the good and evil qualities of human nature. It appears a natural assumption to adopt the view that whatever a human being sins are, in fact, nothing else than embodiments of the human characters which they typify. The world thus seems to become, through and through, moral and human. Indeed, where the belief in a personal Providence is unfamilial or but feebly grasped, some form of metempsychosis, understood as a kind of ethical egoism in the very concrete and almost materialistic sense, assumed as a necessary making good of the doctrine of the unity in the universe is at least an organic and necessary closing up of the whole system.

Harvey, Manual of Buddhism (London, 1863); Beardsmore, Histoire du Manichæisme (Amsterdam, 1734-9); Dubois, People of India; Banks, History of the Jews, tr. TAYLOR (London, 1885); Traditions of the Robinsons Quarterly Review, April, 1833); Max Muller, Chips from a German Workshop (London, 1857); Alien, Doctrine of a Future Life (New York, 1866); Stockel, History of Philosophy, tr. FINLAY (Dublin, 1887); Tytler, Primitive Culture (London, 1871); Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians (London, 1884); Lyell, Ancient races (London, 1882); MacDonnell, The Ancient Indian Conception of the Soul in Journal of Theological Studies (1900).

MICHAEL MAHER.

Methodism, Sir Thomas, knight, confessor of the Faith, d. in York Castle, 1573. He was eldest son of Thomas Metham, of Metham, Yorkshire, and Grace, daughter of Thomas Pudsey, of Barford, and was twice married, first to Dorothy, daughter of George Darcy and Meinnell, and then to Edith, daughter of Nicholas Palmes of Naburn. He was a devoted youth of the knight of the carpet, 2 Oct., 1553, the day after Queen Mary’s coronation. Through his second son by his first wife, George, he was grandfather of Father Thomas, of Metham, the Ditch. By 1 Aug., 1565, he and his second wife had been sent to gaol “for contempt of Her Majesty’s ordinances concerning the administration of divine service and the sacraments.” On 6 Feb. 1569-70 an unknown correspondent writes to Sir William Cecil from York—

“We have here Sir Thomas Metham, a most wifful papist, who utterly refuses to come to service, receive the Communion or read any books except approved by the Church of Rome, or to be conferred with at all. He refuses to be tried before the Commissioners for cause ecclesiastical; he uses the corrupt Lutonvaine books, and maintains at Lutonvaine two of his sons, with whom he corresponds. It is four years since he and his wife were first caught, and since he was committed to ward, since which he has daily grown more wealthy and wifful, and now seems utterly incorrigible. He does much hurt here, and is reverenced by the papists as a pillar of their faith. I caused him to be committed to the Castle, where he remains and does harm, yet would have done more if he had lived at large. If you would be a man of his removal, you would take away a great occasion of evil in these parts.” In 1587 Lady Metham was still a recusant.


JOHN B. WAINWRIGHT.

Methodism, a religious movement which was originated in 1739 by John Wesley in the Anglican Church, and subsequently gave rise to numerous separate denominations.

General Position and Peculiarities.—The fact that John Wesley and Methodism considered religion primarily as practical, not dogmatic, probably accounts for the absence of any formal Methodist creed. The “General Rules,” issued by John and Charles Wesley on 1 May, 1743, stated the conditions of admission into the societies organized by them and known as the “United Societies”. They bear an almost exclusively practical character, and require no doctrinal test of the candidates. Methodism, however, developed its own theological system as expressed in two principal standards of orthodoxy. The first is the “Twenty-five Articles” of religion. They are an abridgment and adaptation of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Established Church of England and form the only doctrinal standard strictly binding on American Methodists. Twenty-four of these articles were prepared by John Wesley for the Church in America and adopted at the Conference of Baltimore in 1784. The article which recognizes the political independence of the United States (Art. XXIX) was added in 1804. The second standard is John Wesley’s published sermons and his “Notes on the New Testament”. These writings were imposed by him on the British Methodists in his “Deed of Declaration” and accepted by the “Legal Hundred”. The American Church, while not strictly bound to them, highly esteems and extensively uses them. More fundamental for all Methodists than these standards are the inspired Scriptures, which are declared by them to be the sole and sufficient rule of belief and practice. The dogmas of the Trinity and the Divinity of Jesus Christ are upheld. The universality of original sin and the consequent partial deterioration of human nature find their efficacious remedy in the universal distribution of grace. Man’s free co-operation with this Divine gift is recognized. The power of sin, which is offered to all, may be freely rejected. There is no room in Methodism for the rigorous doctrine of predetermination as understood by Calvinism. While the doctrine of justification by faith alone is taught, the performance of good works enjoined by God is commended, but the doctrine of works of supererogation is completely repudiated.

Only two sacraments are admitted: Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. Baptism does not produce sanctifying grace in the soul, but strengthens its faith, and is the sign of a regeneration which has already taken place in the recipient. Its administration to infants is commanded because they are already members of the Kingdom of God. The Eucharist is a memorial of the Passion and Death of Jesus Christ, who is not really present under the species of bread and wine, but is received in a spiritual manner by believers. The sacrament is administered under both kinds to the laity. The “witness of the Spirit” to the individual believer is the guarantee of the communion. These are distinctive doctrines of Methodism. This assurance is a certainty of present pardon, not of final perseverance. It is experienced independently of the sacraments through the immediate testimony of the Holy Spirit, and does not preclude the possibility of future transgressions. Transgressions of an involuntary character are also compatible with another characteristic doctrine of Methodism that of perfection or complete sanctification. The Christian, it is maintained, may in his life reach a state of holiness which excludes all voluntary offence against God, but still admits of growth in grace. It is therefore a state of perfectibility rather than of stationary perfection. The invocation of saints and the veneration of relics and images are rejected. While the Eucharist is denied in the Twenty-five Articles (Art. XIV), an intermediate state of purification, for persons who never heard of Christ, is admitted to-day by some Methodists. In its work of conversion Methodism is aggressive and largely appeals to religious sentiment; camp-meetings and revivals are important forms of evangelism. At least in America, the religious service which Wesley imposed upon his followers were the strict observance of the Lord’s Day, the use of few words in buying and selling, and abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, from all purely worldly amusements, and from costly apparel. The church service which
he prepared for them was an abridgment and modification of the Book of Common Prayer, but it never came into universal use, sentiment among Methodists being rather unfavourable to any set form of liturgy. In America the minister is divided into two classes: (a) two 'pastoral sessions', which settle clerical and disciplinary questions, and in which laymen are excluded; (b) the 'representative session', in which clergy and laity discuss financial and external administrative questions. In the American Methodist Episcopal Church the administrative system is organized as follows: (1) the 'Quarterly Conference', similar in composition to the circuit-meeting. It controls the affairs of every individual church, and holds its deliberations under the direction of the 'district superintendent' or his representative; (2) the 'Annual Conference', at which several 'districts' are represented by their itinerant preachers under the presidency of the bishop. It elects preachers, pronounces upon candidates for ordination, and enjoys disciplinary power; (3) the 'Quadrennial General Conference', endowed with the highest legislative and judicial authority and the right of episcopal elections. In recent years the holding of General Methodist conferences has been inaugurated. They are representative assemblies of the various Methodist denominations, but have no legislative authority. The first section of the conference was held in London in 1850, the second met in Washington in 1891, and the third again in London in 1901. Toronto, Canada, will be the meeting-place of the fourth conference in 1911.

III. History. — (1) In the British Isles. — The names of three ordained clergymen of the Anglican Church are prominent in the early history of Methodist movement. John Wesley was the founder, organizer, and propagator of the movement; John and Charles Wesley were his brothers, the hymn-writer, and George Whitefield, the eloquent preacher and revivalist. John and Charles Wesley were born at Epworth, Lincolnshire, the former on 17 June, 1703, and the latter on 18 December, 1707 (O. S.). In 1714 John began his theological studies at Oxford. In 1720 he went to Oxford to continue his studies. He was ordained to the diaconate in 1725, and chosen fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, in the following year. His ordination on 22 September, 1728, was both preceded and followed by a period of ministerial activity in his father's parish at Epworth. In February, 1728 (or 29), he joined the little band of students organized by his brother Charles for the purpose of studying the Scriptures, and practising their religious duties with greater fidelity. John became the leader of this group called in derision by fellow-students 'the holy club', 'the Methodists'. It is to this that Methodism owes its name, but not to the association of John Wesley; it was disband ed. John and Charles Wesley proceeded to London where they received a call to repair as missionaries to the Colony of Georgia. They sailed from Gravesend on 21 October, 1735, and on 5 February, 1736, landed at Savannah. The deep religious impression made upon John by some Moravian fellow-townsmen at the meeting of the General Conference (Spanenberg) in Georgia went not without influence on Methodism. Returning to England in 1738, whither his brother had preceded him, he openly declared that he who had tried to convert others was himself not yet converted. In London he met another Moravian, Peter Böhler, attended the meetings of the Moravian Fetter Lane Society, and was converted (i.e., obtained and experienced saving faith) on 24 May, 1738. He then proceeded to Herrnhut in Saxony to make a study of the chief settlement of the Moravians. In 1739 Wesley organized the first Methodist Society, laid the foundation of the first separate place of worship at Bristol, and also opened a chapel (The Foundery) in London. As the pupils of the Established Church were chidden with Whitefield, the latter took the decisive step of preach-
methwism almost immediately followed his example. At the very inception of the Methodist movement an important doctrinal controversy arose between Whitfield and John Wesley regarding predestination. The former held Calvinistic views, believing in limited election and salvation, while the latter emphasized the doctrine of universal redemption. This difference in opinion placed a permanent characteristic doctrinal difference between Arminian Methodism and the Calvinistic Methodist Connexion. Whitfield gave his support to the latter movement which owed its name to the protection and liberal financial assistance of the Countess of Huntingdon (1707–91).

Although Wesley always intended to remain within the Church of England, circumstances gradually led him to give his evangelical movement a separate organization. The exclusion of his followers from the sacraments by the Anglican clergy in 1740 overcame his hesitation to administer them in his own meeting-rooms. The increase in the number of Societies led the following year to the institution of the lay preachers, who became an important factor in the success of the Methodist propaganda. The year 1742 saw the first Annual Conference held. Ten years later the first annual conference was held. Desirous of ensuring the perpetuation of his work, he legally constituted it his successor in 1784. By a deed of declaration filed in the High Court of Chancery, he vested the right of appointing ministers and preachers in the conference composed of one hundred preachers. This "Legislated" enjoyed, in respect to the conference, the power of filling vacancies and of expelling unworthy members. On the refusal of the Bishop of London to ordain two ministers and a superintendent for America, Wesley, convinced that bishop and presbyter enjoyed equal power in the matter, performed the ordination himself (1784).

Important problems calling for solution arose immediately after Wesley's death. In the first place the want of his personal direction had to be supplied. This was effected in 1791 by the division of the country into districts and the institution of the district conferences. Wesley's disciples finally acquired power under the jurisdiction of the conference. As the administration of the sacraments by Methodist clergymen had not yet become the universal rule, the churches that did not enjoy this privilege insisted upon its concession. The question was permanently settled by the "Plan of Pacification" in 1798. It granted the right of administering the sacraments to all churches in which the majority of the trustees, stewards, and leaders pronounced in favour of such practices. The insistent demand of Alexander Kilham (1762–98) and his followers for more extensive rights for the laity received a temporary and partly favourable answer at the important conference of Leeds in 1797. The establishment of an organ in Brunswick Chapel at Leeds (1828) and the foundation of a theological school for the formation of young preachers (1834) were merely occasions which brought to a head the growing discontent with Bunting and the central authority. The controversies which resulted in these two cases were of but minor importance; they were overshadowed by events in the years 1849–56. This period of strife witnessed the circulation of the so-called "Fly-Sheet", directed against Bunting's personal rule, the expulsion of the persons responsible for their publication, and the loss of at least 100,000 members to the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion. Some of these affiliated with minor branches, but the majority was part of the Methodist Church.

The controversies were followed by a period of peaceful evolution extending to our own day. The increase in the number of theological seminaries among British Methodists has emphasized the distinction between clergy and laity and points to more complete internal organization. A fact which reveals a similar tendency is the institution of deaconesses. They were introduced in the Wesleyan Methodist Church in 1890.

(2) Methodism in the United States.—The history of Methodism in the United States does not date back to the visit of John and Charles Wesley to Georgia, but begins only in 1766. In that year Philip Embury, a local preacher, at the request of Mrs. Barbara Heck, delivered his first sermon in his own house at New York. They had both come to America in 1760 from Ireland, whither their Palatine ancestors had fled from the devastating wars of Louis XIV. Only four persons were present at the first sermon, but the number soon increased, especially after the arrival of Captain Thomas Webb, another local preacher. The latter displayed a stirring zeal, and in 1768 the first Methodist church in the country was organized. Almost simultaneous with this introduction of Methodism into New York was its planting in Maryland. Webb introduced it in Philadelphia, and it spread to New Jersey and Virginia. In 1769 Wesley, in response to repeated appeals for helpers, sent over two preachers, Joseph Filmoor and Richard Boardman. The latter was ordained at Philadelphia (1771) and Thomas Rankin (1772). The first conference convened at Philadelphia in 1773, recognized the authority of John Wesley, and prohibited the administration of the sacraments by Methodist preachers. The total membership reported was 1160. An increase was recorded in the two following conferences, also held at Philadelphia, in 1774 and 1775 respectively. But the Revolution impeded the progress of Methodism. Owing to the nationality of most of its preachers and to the publication of Wesley's pamphlet against the independence of the colonies, it was looked upon as an English product and treated accordingly. Coke arrived in New York in November, 1784, and that same year what has become known as the Christian conference was convened at Baltimore. From it dates the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Wesley's plans and instructions were laid before this assembly, and his articles of faith and his liturgy adopted. As Abury refused to be ordained without previous election and a unanimous choice, a title for which, against Wesley's will, that of bishop was substituted in 1788. The rapid increase of the denomination about this time is indicated by the membership of 66,000 reported to the conference of 1792. The growth of the Church continued with the increase in population; but questions of expediency, race, and government caused secessions. The slavery agitation especially resulted in momentous consequences for the denomination. It began at a very early date, but reached a crisis only towards the middle of the nineteenth century. At the general conference held in New York in 1844, Bishop J. O. Andrew was suspended from the exer-
slave-holding states from the general body now appeared unavoidable, and a "Plan of Separation" was elaborated and accepted. The Southern delegates held a convention at Louisville, Kentucky, in 1845, at which the "Methodist Episcopal Church, South" was formed. The new organization, after a period of progress, suffered heavily during the Civil War. Some branches of Methodism in the Northern States and some Southern branches of Episcopalian Methodism have assumed a very friendly character. There is a large measure of cooperation particularly in the foreign mission field. A joint commission on federation is in existence and in May, 1910, it recommended the creation of a federal council (-i.e., a joint court of law) for the federation in the conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

(3) Methodism in Other Countries.—(a) American.—The first apostle of Methodism in Newfoundland was Lawrence Coughlan, who began his work there in 1765. It was only in 1785, however, that the country received a regular preacher. The evangelization of Nova Scotia, where the first Methodists settled in 1771, was begun later (1781), but was carried on more systematically. In the year 1786 a provincial conference was held at Halifax. In spite of their early relations with American Methodism, Newfoundland and the eastern provinces of Canada were after 1799 supplied with preachers from England, and came under English jurisdiction. In 1835 the connexion held a conference, the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of Eastern British America. The Provinces of Ontario and Quebec received Methodism at an early date from the United States. Philip Embury and Barbara Heck moved to Montreal in 1774, and William Losee was in 1790 appointed preacher to these provinces. The War of 1812-4 interrupted the work undertaken by the Methodist Episcopal Church in this section. The settlement of numerous English Methodists in these provinces after the restoration of peace brought about difficulties respecting allegiance and jurisdiction between the English and American branches. The result was that the Methodist Episcopal Church organized its congregations into a separate conference in 1824, and two years later granted them complete independence. Immigration also brought members of the minor Methodist bodies to Canada: the Wesleyan New Connexion, the Bible Christians, and the Primitive Methodists. But in 1874 the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Canada and the Primitive Methodist Church of Canada were combined. The other separate bodies joined the union a little later (1883-4), thus forming the "Methodist Church of Canada," which includes all the white congregations of the Dominion. The "British Methodist Episcopal Church," which still maintains a separate existence, has only coloured membership. It was formerly a part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and gained complete independence in 1886. Bermuda, where George Whitefield preached in 1748 and J. Stephenson appeared as the first regular preacher in 1799, forms at present a district of the Methodist Church of Canada. South America was entered in 1835, when the Rev. F. E. Pitts visited Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Ayres, and other places, and organized several societies. The special Southern American Conference was established in 1893, and supplemented in 1897 by the Western South American Mission Conference. Missionary work was inaugurated in Mexico in 1873 by William Butler.

(b) European.—Methodism was introduced into France but it has never succeeded in getting a strong foothold there. In 1852 France was constituted a separate conference affiliated to British Methodism. In 1907 the American Church organized a conference there. From France Methodism spread to Italy in 1852. Some years later (1861) two missionaries, Green and Piggott, were sent from England to Florence and founded several stations in Northern Italy. The Methodist Episcopal Church started a missionary enterprise in Italy in 1871, but has never attained great success. The first Methodist missionary to Germany was G. Müller. He started his preaching in 1830 and gained some adherents mainly in Württemberg. Methodist missions are maintained also in Switzerland, Scandinavia, Russia, Bulgaria, Spain, and Portugal.

(c) Australasian, Asiatic and African.—Methodism has had considerable success in Australasia. It appeared at an early date, not only on the Australian continent but also in some of the South Sea Islands. The first class was formed in Sydney in 1812, and the first conference in the colony was held in 1813. The Church spread to Tasmania in 1820, to Tonga in 1822, to New Zealand in 1823, and in 1835 Cargill and Cross began their evangelistic work in the Fiji Islands. In 1854 Australian Methodism was formed into an affiliated conference of England, and in 1876 became independent.

The foundation of the first Methodist missions in Asia (1814) was due to the initiative of Thomas Coke. Embarking on 30 December, 1813, at the head of a band of six missionaries, he died on the voyage, but the undertaking succeeded. The representatives of English Methodism were joined in 1856 by William Butler of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1817 this same Church sent J. D. Collins, M. C. White, and Matthew Machin to China. The Church of the Methodists was founded in the Philippine Islands and in Japan, where the Methodist Church of Japan was organized in 1907.

George Warren left England for Sierra Leone in 1811. The American Church entered the field in 1833. South Africa, where Methodism is particularly well represented, was erected in 1882 into an affiliated conference of the English Church.

IV. Other Methodist Bodies.—Secessions from the main bodies of Methodism followed almost immediately upon Wesley's death. The following originated in England:

(1) The Methodist New Connexion was founded at Leicester in 1797 by Alexander Kilham (1762-98); hence its members are also known as "Kilhamites." It was the first organized secession from the main body of English Methodism, and started its separate existence with 5000 members. Its foundation was occasioned by the conference's refusal to grant laymen the extensive rights in church government claimed for them by Kilham. The sect never acquired any considerable body of followers.

(2) The Primitive Methodists, who met with greater success than the New Connexion, were organized in 1810. Camp-meetings had been introduced into England from America, but in 1807 the conference pronounced against them. Two local preachers, Hugh Bourne and William Clowes, disregarding this decision, publicly held meetings and were expelled. They then established this new body, characterized by the preponderating influence it grants laymen in church government, the admission of women to the pulpit, and great simplicity in ecclesiastical and private life. According to the "Methodist Year-book" (1910) it has 219,343 members.

The Irish Primitive Wesleyan Methodists must not be confounded with the "Primitive Methodists" just spoken of. The former were founded in 1816 by Adam Averell, and in 1878 again united with the Wesleyan Methodists.

(3) The Bible Christians, also called Brynites from the name of their founder William O'Bryan, were organized as a separate body by C. H. Cowell in 1816. Like the Primitive Methodists, they gave great influence in church affairs to laymen and liberty of preaching to women. Although they spread from England to the colonies, their aggregate membership was never very large.

(4) The Wesleyan Reform Union grew out of the
pastoral supervision of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but in 1820 formed an independent Church differing but little from the parent body (commun. 545,681).

(8) The Union American Methodist Episcopal Church, organized in 1813 at Wilmington, Delaware, had for its founder the coloured preacher, Peter Spencer (membership, 18,500).

(9) The African Methodist Episcopal Church has existed as an independent organization since 1816. Its foundation was due to a desire for more extensive privileges and greater freedom of action among a number of coloured Methodists of Philadelphia. It does not differ in important points from the Methodist Episcopal Church (membership, 452,126).

(10) The African Union Methodist Protestant Church also dates back to 1816; it rejects the episcopacy, itinerancy, and a paid ministry (membership, 4000).

(11) The Zion Union Apostolic Church was founded in Virginia in 1869. In its organization it closely resembles the Methodist Episcopal Church (communicants, 3059).

(12) The Coloured Methodist Episcopal Church is merely a branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, organized on a Separate Church basis in 1870 for negroes (membership, 233,911).

(13) The Congregational Methodists, Coloured, differ only in race from the Congregational Methodists (communicants, 319).

(14) The Evangelist Missionary Church was organized in 1856 in Ohio by members of the African Methodist Episcopal Church (membership, 500), but the Bible, and inclines to the admission of only one person in God, that of Jesus Christ.

V. Educational and Social Activities.—The founders of Methodism had enjoyed the advantages of a university training, and must have realized the priceless value of education. The fact, however, that the early Methodists overlooked the educational element in religion tended to make a deep and extensive knowledge of doctrinal principles seem superfluous. The extraordinary success of his preaching which urgently demanded ministers for the ever-increasing number of his followers, led to the appointment, in the early history of Methodism, of preachers who might be able to command the people and be remarkable for their theological learning. Indeed, for a comparatively long period, the opposition of Methodists to schools of theology was pronounced. The establishment of the first institution of the kind in 1834 at Haxton, England, caused a split in the denomination. At the present day, however, the need of systematic theological training is supplied by numerous schools. In England the chief institutions are located at Richmond, Didsbury, Headingly, and Handsworth. American Methodists founded their first theological school in 1841 at Newbury, Vermont. It was removed to Concord, New Hampshire, in 1847, and has formed since 1867 part of Dartmouth College. From these institutions were subsequently added, among them Garrett Biblical Institute (1854) at Evanston, Illinois, and Drew Theological Seminary (1867) at Madison, New Jersey. While Methodism has no parochial school system, its first denominational institution of learning dates back to 1740, when John Wesley took over a school at Kingswood. It was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, that a vigorous educational movement set in to continue up to the present day. An idea of the efforts made in this direction by Methodists may be gained by a reference to the statistics published in the "Methodist Year-Book" (1910), pp. 108–13. According to the reports there given, the Methodist Episcopal Church (one of the other branches also support their schools) maintains 197 educational institutions, including 50 colleges and universities, 47 classical seminaries, 8 institutions ex-
exclusively for women, 23 theological institutions (some of them forming part of the universities already mentioned), 63 foreign mission schools, and 4 missionary institutes and Bible training schools. An educational program for young men had been launched, but all the branches of American Methodism, is the exclusively post-graduate "American University". A site of ninety-two acres was purchased in 1890 in the suburbs of Washington, D. C., and the university was organized the following year. It is not to be opened in any of its departments until its endowment "be not less than $500,000". The two-acre "College estate". The dissemination of religious literature is obtained by the foundation of "Book Concern" (located at New York and Cincinnati for the Methodist Episcopal Church; at Nashville, Tennessee, for the Methodist Episcopal Church South) and a periodical press, for the publications of which the title of "Advocates" is particularly popular. The young people are banded together for the promotion of personal piety and charitable work in the prosperous Epworth League founded in 1889 at Cleveland, Ohio, for the Methodist Episcopal Church, and organized in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1891. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the denomination extended its social work considerably by the founding of orphanages, and coal and gas hospitals were introduced in 1881 with the incorporation of the Methodist Episcopal Hospital at Brooklyn.

VI. General Statistics.—According to the "Methodist Year-book" (New York, 1910) the Wesleyan Methodists have 520,808 church members (including probationers) in Great Britain, 29,531 in Ireland, 143,467 in the foreign missions and 117,146 in South Africa. The Australasian Methodist Church has a membership of 150,751, and the Church of Canada one of 333,892. In the United States Methodism (all branches) numbers, according to Dr. Carroll, 6,477,224 communicants. Of these 3,159,913 belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church and 1,780,778 to the Methodist Episcopal Church South.
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N. A. WEBER.

Methodius, Saint. See Cyril and Methodius, Saints.

Methodius I, Patriarch of Constantinople (842-846), defender of images during the second Iconoclast persecution, b. at Syracuse, towards the end of the eighth century; d. at Constantinople, 14 June, 846. The son of a rich family, he came, as a young man, to Constantinople intending to obtain a place at Court. But having entered a monastery. Under the Emperor Leo V (the Armenian, 813-820) the Iconoclast persecution broke out for the second time. Themons were nearly all staunch defenders of the images; Methodius stood by his order and distinguished himself by his opposition to the Government. In 815 the Patriarch Nicephorus I (806-814) was deposed and then restored through the influence of the Iconoclast laws; in his place Theodotus I (815-821) was intruded. In the same year Methodius went to Rome, apparently sent by the deposed patriarch, to report the matter to the pope (Paschal I, 817-824). He stayed in Rome till Leo V was murdered in 820 and succeeded by Michael II (820-829). Hoping for better things from the new emperor, Methodius then went back to Constantinople bearing a letter in which the pope tried to persuade Michael to change the policy of the Government and restore the Patriarch Nicephorus. But Michael only increased the ferocity of the persecution. As soon as Methodius had delivered his letter and exorted the emperor to act accordingly, he was arrested, his property was plundered (with 70 stripes), taken to the island Antigoni in the Bosporus, and there imprisoned in a disused tomb. The tomb must be conceived as a building of a certain size; Methodius lived seven years in it. In 828 Michael II, not long before his death, mitigated the persecution and proclaimed a general amnesty. Profiting by this, Methodius was set free, and on his return to Constantinople almost worn out by his privations. His spirit was unbroken and he took up the defence of the holy images as zealously as before.

Michael II was succeeded by his son Theophilus (829-842), who caused the last and fiercest persecution of image-worshippers. Methodius again withheld the emperor to his face, was again scourged and imprisoned under the palace. But the same night he escaped, helped by his friends in the city, who hid him in their house and bound up his wounds. For this the Government confiscated their property. But seeing that Methodius was not to be overcome by punishment, the emperor tried to convince him by argument. The result of their discussion was that Methodius was summoned to render the reasons of the profession of faith towards the end of the reign the persecution was mitigated. Theophilus died in 842 and at once the whole situation was changed. His wife, Theodora, became regent for her son Michael III (the Drunkard, 842-867). She had always been an image-worshipper in secret, but now that she had the power she at once began to restore images, set free the confounded Methodius, and bring back everything to the conditions of the Second Nicene Council (787). The Patriarch of Constantinople, John VII (832-842), was an Iconoclast set up by the late Government. As he persisted in his heresy he was deposed and Methodius was made patriarch in his place (842-846). In these he successfully resisted his expressed resolution in his restoration. He summoned a synod at Constantinople (842) that approved of John VII's deposition and his own succession. It had no new laws to make about images. The decrees of Nicæa II that had received the assent of the pope and the entire Church as those of an Ecumenical Council were put in (New York, 1892); ALEXANDER, Hist. of the Methodist Episcopal Church South in American Church Hist. Series, XI (New York, 1894); DRINQUE, Hist. of Methodist Reform (Baltimore, 1890); SUTHERLAND, Methodist in Canada (London, 1905).
Theophilius out of hell. It is told in the Synaxarion for the feast of Orthodoxy.

St. Methodius is reputed to have written many works. Of these only a few sermons and letters are extant (in Migne, P. C., 1272-1325). An account of the martyrdom of Denis the Areopagite by him is in Migne, P. C., 1325-1333. While Methodius was Bishop of Lycia in N. C. Falconius, "S. Nicolai acta primigenia" (Naples, 1751), 39-74. For other fragments and scholia, see Krumbacher, "Byzantinische Litteratur" (Munich, 2nd ed., 1897), 167.


ADRIAN FORTESECUE.

Methodius of Olympus, Saint, Bishop and ecclesiastical author. Date of birth unknown; d. a martyr, probably in 311. Concerning the life of this first scientific opponent of Origen very few reports have been handed down; and even these short accounts present many difficulties. Eusebius has not mentioned him in his "Church History", probably because he opposed various theories of Origen. We are indebted to St. Jerome for the earliest accounts of him (On the Perfection of the Reader, xi). Another author, Methodius was Bishop of Olympus in Lycia and afterwards Bishop of Tyre. But the latter statement is not reliable; no later Greek author knows anything of his being Bishop of Tyre; and according to Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., VIII, xiii), Tyranno was Bishop of Tyre during the Diocletian persecution and died a martyr; after the persecution methodius was elected Bishop of Tyre. Jerome further states that Methodius suffered martyrdom at the end of the last persecution, i. e., under Maximinus Daja (311). Although he then adds, "that some assert", that this may have happened under Decius and Valerian at Chalcis, this statement (ut ali affirmant) is adduced by Eusebius as uncertain, is not to be accepted. Various attempts have been made to clear up the error concerning the mention of Tyre as a subsequent bishopric of Methodius; it is possible that he was transported to Tyre during the persecution and died there.

Methodius had a very comprehensive philosophical education, and was an important theologian, as well as an prolific and polished author. Chronologically, his works can only be assigned in a general way to the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century. He became of special importance in the history of theological literature, in that he successfully combated various erroneous views of the great Alexandrian, Origen. He particularly attacked his doctrine that man's body at the resurrection is not the same body as he had in life; also his idea of the world's eternity and the erroneous notions it involved. Nevertheless he recognized the great services of Origen in ecclesiastical theology. Like him, he is strongly influenced by Plato's philosophy, and uses to a great extent the allegorical explanation of Scripture. Of his numerous works only one has come down to us complete in a Greek text, viz., the dialogue on virginity, under the title: "Symposium, or on Virginity" (Συμπόσιον ἐν τῇ νυφίᾳ) in P. G., XVIII, 27-220. In the dialogue, composed with reference to Plato's "Banquet", he depicts a festive meal of ten virgins in the garden of Adonis, in which each of the participants proclaims the ideals of Christian virginity and its sublime excellence. It concludes with a hymn on Christ as the Bridegroom of the Church. Larger fragments are preserved of several other writings in Greek; we know of other works from old versions in Slavonian, though some are abridged.

The following works are in the form of dialogue: (1) "On Free Will" (ἐν τῷ ἀλλοθρεύσει), an important treatise attacking the Gnostic view of the origin of evil and in proof of the freedom of the human will; (2) "On the Resurrection" (Σύμποσιον ἐν τῇ αναστάσει), in which the doctrine that the same body that man has in life will be awakened to incorruptibility at the resurrection is specially put forward in opposition to Origen. While others in the Greek text of both these writings are preserved, we have only Slavonian versions of the four following shorter treatises: (3) "De vita", on life and rational action, which exhorts in particular to contentedness in this life and to the hope of the life to come; (4) "De cibis", on the discrimination of foods (among the Jews, and on the consumption of meat); (5) "De lepore", an etiological explanation of the Old Testament food-legislation and the red cow (Num., xix); (6) "De sanguisuga", on the leech in Proverbs (Prov., xxx, 15 sq.) and on the text, "the heavens show forth the glory of God" (Ps. xviii, 2). Of other writings, no longer extant, Jerome mentions (loc. cit.) a voluminous work against Porphyry, the Neoplatonist who had published a book against Christianity; a treatise on the "Pythonissa" directed against Origen, commentaries on Genesis and the Canticle of Canticles. The latter authors a work "On a dialogue "Xenon" are attributed to Methodius; in the latter he opposes the doctrine of Origen on the eternity of the world. New editions of his works are: P. G., XVIII; Jahn, "S. Methodii Opera et S. Methodii Platonis" (Halle, 1865); Bonwetsch, "Methodius von Olympus: I, Schriften" (Leipzig, 1891).

Methodius of Olympus, Bishop of Olympus in the Komolou (1887; issued in book form, Mainz, 1888): BONOVENTA, Die Methodius von Olympus (Berlin, 1903); FISCHER, Methodius von Olympus und M. der Kadous (Freiburg, 1905); FENDT, Sünde und Busse in den Schriften des Methodius von Olympus in der Katalikos, 7 (1897); HAMM, Die Vater des christlichen Exegeten (Freiburg i. B., 1896), 489 eqq.; HAMM, Geschichte der exeklischen Literatur, I, 489 sqq.; I, 147 sqq.; BARDELMES, Patrologie, 1, 331, 335, 381; KURIN, Patrologie, I (Faberbon, 1904), 491 sqq.

J. P. KIRCH.

Methuselah. See Mithusalea.

Methyyna, a titular see in the island of Lesbos. It was once the second city of the island, and enjoyed great prosperity. In the Peloponnesian War it played an important rôle (Thucydidcs, III, ii, 18; vi, 85; vii, 57; Xenophon, Hellen., I, vi, 14), and in Christian times it similarly distinguished itself in its resistance to the Turks. The ancient poets praise the excellence of Methymna (Virgil, Georgics, II, 90; Ovid, Am., I, 57; Horace, Sat., II, 8, 50; Odes, I, 17, 21). Methymna was the birthplace of the poet Arion and probably also of the historian Myrillus. For a list of the bishops of Methymna see Le Quien, "Orients Christi", I, 961-964. One of them, Gabriel, in the seventeenth century united with Rome (Allatius, De ecclesiis consensione, I, 7). The town is mentioned by the "Enthosis" of pseudo-Epiphanius as an autoclerical archdiocese, and about 1084 was made a metropolitana see under Alexius I Comnenus. It has retained this rank in the Orthodox Church, though for Catholics it is now a mere titular archdiocese. To-day it bears the name of Molivo, and with the places dependent upon it numbers 37,000 inhabitants, of whom 29,000 are Orthodox Greeks, 9000 Musalmans, and 40 Catholics. The last named are dependent on the Diocese of Smyrna. Molivo is a kastri of the sanjak of Metelin in the vilayet of Rhodes. Situated at the southern extremity of the island of Mitylene, nearly thirty miles from Metelin and five naval miles from the Asiatic continent, Molivo is a barren site on the slope of a hill formed of basaltic rocks.

Le Quien, Orients Christi, I, 961-964; GAMS, Series episcoporum, 449; CUCINETT, La Turquie d'Ailleurs, I (Paris, 1872), 496.

S. SALAVILLER.
Metrophanes of Smyrna, leader of the faithful Ignatian bishops at the time of the Photian schism (867). Baronius (Ann. Eccl., ad an. 843, 1) says that his mother was the woman who was bribed to bring a false accusation of rape against the Patriarch Methodius I (842-846) during the reign of Michael III. If this be true he was a native of Constantinople. In 857, when Ignatius was deposed, Metrophanes was already Metropolitan of Smyrna. He was strongly opposed to Photius. For a short time he wavered, as Photius promised not to attack Ignatius' rights, but, as soon as he had gained the slightest indication that Photius would renounce the claims to Constantinople, went back to his former attitude, from which nothing could make him wavering again. Metrophanes was the leader of the bishops who excommunicated Photius in 858; they declared themselves excommunicate if ever they recognized him. This somewhat rash pledge explains his attitude later. He was chained and imprisoned, then sent into exile by the Government. After Photius' first fall (867) Metrophanes came back to his see. He was present at the eighth general council (Constantinople, IV, 869), opened the session with a speech and was one of the judges who condemned Photius. When Ignatius died in 877 and Photius succeeded lawfully with the consent of John VI, Metrophanes still refused his recognition, which conduct he was again banished. At the Photian Synod of 879 a certain Nicetas appears as Metropolitan of Smyrna; meanwhile Metrophanes lay sick at Constantinople. In 880 as he still refused to have anything to do with Photius he was excommunicated by the papal legates. After that he disappears. It is uncertain whether he still retained his see at Photius' second fall or whether he died in exile. A letter of his to a patriarch, Manuel, is extant, written in 870, in which he gives his reasons for his opposition to Photius (in Manni, XIV, 414). Other works attributed to him but strongly Photian in tone ("Against the New Manicheans", i.e., the Latins, and "On the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone") are certainly apocryphal.

See Fabricius-Harles, Bibliotheca Graecae (Hamburg, 1790-1809), XI, 700.
Her Genrother, Photius (Regensburg, 1867), vol. I and II, passim.

ADRIAN FORTEUECE.

Metrople, a titular episcopal see and suffragan of Ephesus. Strabo (XIV, 1, 2; XV, 1, 5), who speaks of its celebrated wines, places this city between Ephesus and Smyrna, at one hundred and twenty stadia (nearly fourteen miles) from the former. It is first mentioned in Pliny, "Historia Naturalis", V, 29, and in Ptolemy (V, ii, 14) unless here the reference be to Metrople in Phrygia. A similar allusion is made in "Corpus inscript. Latin," (III, 79, 91), and in Quen (Oros, I, 709) indicates only two of its bishops: Marcellinus at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 and John at the pseudo-Council of Ephesus in 878, but from the "Notitia episcopatuum" we know that in the fourteenth century the diocese was still in existence. Metrople is now completely destroyed, its ruins being visible in a place called Tra-tsa in the nahié of Torbali and the vilayet (Turkish province) of Smyrna, quite close to the river Cay-trus. The neighbouring village of Torbali has been built up with stone once used in the structures of ancient Metrople and, at Tratse, there may still be seen a portion of its wall, also its theatre and acropolis, the latter formed of huge blocks, while the olive groves are dotted with architectural ruins. This Metrople, however, must not be confounded with two cities of the same name, one of which was in Phrygia and the other in Iberia.


S. VAILLÉE.

Metropolitan, in ecclesiastical language whatever relates to the metropolis, the principal city, or see, of an ecclesiastical province; thus we speak of a metropolitan church, a metropolitan chapter, a metropolitan official, etc. The word metropolitan, used without any qualifying, means the bishop of the metropolitan see, now usually styled archbishop. The term metropolitan (Métopolitain, Metropolita) is also employed, especially in the Eastern Churches (see Archbishop). The entire body of rights and duties which canon law attributes to the metropolitan, or archbishop as such, i.e., not for his own diocese, but for those suffragans to him and forming his ecclesiastical province, is known as metropolitan jurisdiction. The effective authority of metropolitan bishops over their provinces has gradually diminished in the course of centuries, and they do not now exercise even so much as was accorded them by the Council of Trent; every bishop being more strongly and more directly bound to Rome is so much the less bound to his province and its metropolitan. The jurisdiction of the latter over his suffragans dioceses is in a sense ordinary, being established by law; but it is mediate and restricted to the objects provided for by the canons. Since the Council of Trent the rights of the metropolitan have been reduced to the following:

(1) He convokes and presides at the provincial council, at which all the suffragans must appear, save legitimate excuse, and which must be held every three years (Conc. Trid., sess. XXIV, c. ii, De ref.). The same holds for other provincial meetings of bishops.

(2) He retains, in theory, the right of canonical visitation of his suffragan dioceses, but on two conditions which make the right practically inoperative: he must not act personally in the visitation of a suffragan diocese, and the visitation must be authorized by the provincial council. In the course of this visitation, the metropolitan, like the bishop, has the right of "proclamation", i.e., he and his retinue must be received and entertained at the expense of the churches visited. Moreover, he can absolve "in foro conscientiae" (ibid., iii).

(3) He is exhorted (Exh. 11) to visit his suffragans dioceses, and the visitation must be authorized by the provincial council. In the course of this visitation, the metropolitan, like the bishop, has the right of "proclamation", i.e., he and his retinue must be received and entertained at the expense of the churches visited. Moreover, he can absolve "in foro conscientiae" (ibid., iii).

The metropolitan has no judicial authority over his suffragans, major or minor, but that reserved to the Holy See, and minor ones to the provincial council (Cass. XXIV, c. v.; but he is still the judge of second instance for causes, civil or criminal, adjudicated in the first instance by the officials of his suffragans and appealed to his tribunal. Hence results a certain inequality for matters adjudicated in the first instance in the archdiocese, and to redress this various concessions have now been provided. But the nomination of two officials by the archbishop, one diocesan, the other metropolitan, with appeal from the one to the other, is not admissible. This practice was used in France under the old regime, but was not general, and even the Gallicans held it to be "an innovation with canonic law and the ecclesiastiques de France", E. V, 13). On this principle the nullity of Napoleon's marriage was decided by the diocesan and the metropolitan officials of Paris, 1810 (Schnitzer, "Kathol. Ehrehe", Freiburg, 1898, 660). The metropolitan tribunal may also try as at first instance cases not terminated within two years by a bishop's tribunal (Cass. XXIV, c. xx).

In regard to devotion (q. v.), the metropolitan may nominate the vicar capitular of a vacant diocese, if the chapter has failed to nominate within eight days (Cass. XXIV, c. xvi). In like manner he has the right to fill open benefices (i.e., those of free collation) which his suffragans have left unfilled after six months; as a canonically institute candidate presented by patrons if the bishop allows two months to pass without instituting.
Metropolitanum. See Metropolitan.

Metternich, Klemens Lothar Wenzel, Prince von, statesman; b. at Coblenz, 15 May, 1773; d. at Vienna, 11 June, 1859; son of Count Georg, Austrian envoy of the Court of Vienna at Coblenz, and Maria Beatrix, née Countess von Kagenke. He studied philosophy at the University of Strasburg, and law and diplomacy at Mainz. A journey to England completed his education. Metternich began his public career as Austrian ambassador to the Court of Dresden. Though he had for several years prepared himself for a diplomatic career, he was especially fortunate in being immediately appointed to so prominent a position. Only two years later he was made ambassador to Berlin. The emperor considered it very important to have a minister at Berlin who could gain the favour of the Court and the principal Prussian statesmen, and who knew how to combine "great powers of observation with a moderate and agreeable manner". Metternich had already proved that he possessed these qualities. Napoleon was then emperor with the new empire at the zenith of its power. The Emperor Francis needed his ablest ambassador at Napoleon's Court, and in May, 1806, he sent Metternich to Paris. Metternich found himself in the difficult position of representing Austria in the face of the overweening threats and ambitious plans of Napoleon at the height of his power. He did so with dignity and firmness, as his report of his important audience with Napoleon on 15 August, 1808, shows. The year 1809 is marked by the great war between Austria and France. The German States were called upon to join her, but only the Tyrol responded. On 13 May Vienna was besieged by the French, but eight days later Napoleon was defeated by the Archduke Charles at Aspern. Metternich, treated as a prisoner of state by Napoleon, was finally released in July in exchange for members of the French nobility. After the battle of Wagram Austria's position was hopeless. Its army was cut off from Hungary and compelled to retreat to Moravia and Bohemia. A great statesman was needed to save the situation. On 4 August the Emperor Francis appointed Metternich as minister of state to confer with Napoleon, and on 8 October, minister of the imperial household. For the Treaty of Schönbrunn (14 October), Austria was greatly reduced in size, and reached the greatest depths of its humiliation. But the moment of its degradation saw the beginning of its rise. The two-headed eagle soared to the loftiest heights, and it was Metternich who gave it the strength for its flight. For nearly forty years he directed Austrian foreign policy, and established tolerable relations with the French Emperor. Napoleon desired by means of a new marriage to ally himself with one of the old European dynasties in the hope to raise himself and to provide an heir for the imperial throne. He obtained a divorce from Josephine of Austria. Though at present it seems to become more and more probable that Napoleon's union with Josephine was a valid marriage, nevertheless it is certain that when Napoleon wedded Maria Louise (11 March, 1810) the Court of Vienna and the Paul Curius were absolutely convinced of the unlawfulness of Napoleon's first alliance. Napoleon's connexion with the imperial family of Austria had no influence on politics. Fate led the French Emperor, after ruining so many others, to ruin himself. At Schönbrunn he pronounced the temporal sovereignty of the Roman See to be at an end, and in reply to the pope's excommunication he remarked: "This will not cause the arms to drop from the hands of my grenadiers." Although he imprisoned the pope, in the Russian campaign on the Bresina the arms did drop from the frozen hands of his grenadiers. As the crisis approached the decision lay with Austria. From a quarter past eleven in the morning until half past eight in the evening Metternich was closeted with Napoleon (Dresden, 26 June, 1813). "Our conference consisted of the strangest farrago of heterogeneous subjects, characterized now by extreme friendliness, now by the most violent outbursts of fury". Napoleon raged, threatened, and kept up like a chafed lion. Metternich remained calm. Napoleon let his hat, which he was holding under his arm, drop to the floor. Metternich did not stoop to pick it up. The emperor also tried persuasion. "Your sovereigns," he said, "who were born to their thrones cannot comprehend the feelings that move me. To them it is nothing to return to their capitals defeated. But I am a soldier. I need honour and glory. I cannot reappear among my people devoid of prestige. I must remain great, admired, covered with glory." For that reason, he said, he could not accept the proposed conditions of peace. Metternich replied, "But when will this condition of things cease, in which defeat and victory are alike reasons for continuing these dismal wars? If victorious, you insist upon the fruits of your victory; if defeated, you are determined to rise again." Napoleon made various offers for Austria's neutrality, but Metternich declined all bargaining, and Napoleon's oft-repeated threat, "We shall meet in Vienna", was his farewell to Metternich. Metternich gave the signal for war, and Schwechat and the decisive battle of Leipzig. The Emperor Francis raised his "beloved Count Metternich" to the rank of Austrian prince. "Your able efforts in conducting the department with which I entrusted you in difficult times are now, at a moment highly decisive in the world's destiny, happily crowned with success."

Klemens Lothar Wenzel von Metternich

Painting by Sir Thomas Lawrence
It constantly required all of Metternich's most brilliant qualities to preserve harmony. One of his favourite means was to provide festivities of all sorts. They have often been criticised as if they had been the object of the congress, and not a means to attain its end. Metternich succeeded finally in bringing every difficulty. The Emperor Francis expressed his satisfaction with Metternich's services in securing peace and order in Europe, and especially in restoring to Austria its ancient pre-eminence. The rearrangement of German and Italian affairs gave but little satisfaction to either side, but henceforth Metternich was the leading statesman of Europe. For the settlement of questions still pending and other difficulties that arose, the following congresses were held: Aix-la-Chapelle, 1818; Karlsbad (a conference of ministers), 1819; Vienna, 1820; Troppau, 1820; Laibach, 1821; and Verona, 1822. The Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, at which the monarchs of Austria, Prussia, and Russia were personally present, devoted its attention to the adjustment of the relations of the powers to France, though Metternich also emphasised the dangers arising from demagogic agitation, and expressed his suspicions that its focus was in Germany. When, not long after, the Russian Councillor, Kolombe, was assassinated by the student, Sond, Metternich in two succeeding congresses of German states took measures to put an end to the political troubles in Germany. All publications of less than twenty folios were to be subject to censorship; government officers were to be placed at the universities to supervise them; in the several states the constitutions providing for diets in accordance with ancient usage were suppressed; representatives of German states not represented at Karlsbad took measures to put an end to the political troubles in Germany. Since England's and Russia's resistance, Metternich at the two succeeding congresses successfully carried his proposition to intervene in behalf of the Italian states, which were threatened and hard pressed by the revolution. This measure brought upon Austria the hatred of the Italian people, and especially of Naples. Napoleon I, on the occasion of freeing Greece from the Turkish yoke, Austria showing herself to be a decided friend of the Turks. The result was a blow to Metternich's policy. He had dropped from the high-water mark of his influence. Thereafter Russia's influence increased.

Since the death of Prince Kaunitz (1794) the position of the German chancellor had been vacant, but in 1821 Metternich was invested with that office. "Your deserts have been increased by the uninterrupted seal, the ability and fearlessness with which, especially in the last two years, you devoted yourself to the preservation of general order and the triumph of law over the disorderly doings of disturbers of the peace in the states at home and abroad." Under the Emperor Ferdinand I after 1835, the direction of affairs, after the emperor himself, was in the hands of a council consisting of the Archduke Ludwig (uncle of the emperor), the state chancellor Metternich, and the court chancellor Kolowrat. Metternich's influence over Austria's internal affairs was less than is generally supposed. In 1835, one of his ministers, John Legros (Geschichte der Revolution, p. 19): "In matters of internal administration the prince was seldom heard, and was purposely kept away from them." In this department after 1826, it was the minister Count Kolowrat whose influence was decisive. Many envied Metternich his pre-eminence. The aristocracy always saw themselves in him, and the nobles looked with resentment upon the preference shown foreigners in the state chancery (Friedrich Gents, Adam Müller, Friedrich Schlegel, Jarka). Grillparzer, director of archives in the Hofkammer, expressed himself very harshly on that point in 1839, though it must be noted that Grillparzer had been highly incensed. In all these matters Kolowrat had the advantage of Metternich. He was even considered capable of granting, or, at least, of preparing a constitution, and was thought to be inclined to do so.

As time passed, "the Metternich system" came to be held more and more responsible for everything unpleasant, and its author to be hated and attacked, mainly in Britain and France. In regard to his "Political Testament": "To me the word freedom has not the value of a starting-point, but of an actual goal to be striven for. The word order designates the starting-point. It is only on order that freedom can be based. Without order as a foundation the cry for freedom is nothing more than the endeavour of some party or other for an end it has in view. When actually carried out in practice, that cry for freedom will inevitably express itself in tyranny. At all times and in all situations I was a man of order, yet my endeavours were always for true and not for pretended liberty." These words are the key to the understanding and appreciation of Metternich's actions.

Two more passages characteristic of the great statesman's temper of mind may be cited: "Admirers of the press honour it with the title, 'representative of public opinion', though everything written in the papers is nothing but the expression of those who write. Will the value of the expression of public opinion be increased if we place the European Governments, even of a Republican Government? Surely not! Yet every obscure journalist claims this value for his own products. What a confusion of ideals!" No less just and important a remark is the following on state religion: "The downfall of empire always directly depends upon the spread of unbelief. But it is the union of true virtue and religious belief, the first of virtues, is the strongest power. It alone curbs attack and makes resistance irresistible. Religion cannot decline in a nation without causing that nation's strength also to decline, and the fall of states does not proceed in arithmetical progression according to the law of falling bodies, but rapidly leads to destruction." These two passages show the strength of his character and his abiding belief in the soundness of the old political order in Vienna, the state chancellor, who preferred to sacrifice himself rather than others, immediately resigned his position. He went to England, Brussels, and Schloss Johannisberg. From the last place he returned to Vienna in 1851, and eight years later died in his palace on the Rennweg at the age of eighty-six. When Napoleon I came to Austria in 1848, he found him in a storm of revolution. Engaged in Vienna, the state chancellor, who preferred to sacrifice himself rather than others, immediately resigned his position. He went to England, Brussels, and Schloss Johannisberg. From the last place he returned to Vienna in 1851, and eight years later died in his palace on the Rennweg at the age of eighty-six. When Napoleon I came to Austria in 1848, he found him in a storm of revolution. Metternich's influence increased.

Since the death of Prince Kaunitz (1794) the position of the German chancellor had been vacant, but in 1821 Metternich was invested with that office. "Your deserts have been increased by the uninterrupted seal, the ability and fearlessness with which, especially in the last two years, you devoted yourself to the preservation of general order and the triumph of law over the disorderly doings of disturbers of the peace in the states at home and abroad." Under the Emperor Ferdinand I after 1835, the direction of affairs, after the emperor himself, was in the hands of a council consisting of the Archduke Ludwig (uncle of the emperor), the state chancellor Metternich, and the court chancellor Kolowrat. Metternich's influence over Austria's internal affairs was less than is generally supposed. In 1835, one of his ministers, John Legros (Geschichte der Revolution, p. 19): "In matters of internal administration the prince was seldom heard, and was purposely kept away from them." In this department after 1826, it was the minister Count Kolowrat whose influence was decisive. Many envied Metternich his pre-eminence. The aristocracy always saw themselves in him, and the nobles looked with resentment upon the preference shown foreigners in the state chancery (Friedrich Gents, Adam Müller, Friedrich Schlegel, Jarka). Grillparzer, director of archives in the Hofkammer, expressed himself very harshly on that point in 1839, though it must be noted that Grillparzer had been highly incensed. In all these matters Kolowrat had the advantage of Metternich. He was even considered capable of granting, or, at least, of preparing a constitution, and was thought to be inclined to do so.

As time passed, "the Metternich system" came to be held more and more responsible for everything unpleasant, and its author to be hated and attacked, mainly in Britain and France. In regard to his "Political Testament": "To me the word freedom has not the value of a starting-point, but of an actual goal to be striven for. The word order designates the starting-point. It is only on order that freedom can be based. Without order as a foundation the cry for freedom is nothing more than the endeavour of some party or other for an end it has in view. When actually carried out in practice, that cry for freedom will inevitably express itself in tyranny. At all times and in all situations I was a man of order, yet my endeavours were always for true and not for pretended liberty." These words are the key to the understanding and appreciation of Metternich's actions.

Two more passages characteristic of the great statesman's temper of mind may be cited: "Admirers of the press honour it with the title, 'representative of public opinion', though everything written in the papers is nothing but the expression of those who write. Will the value of the expression of public opinion be increased if we place the European Governments, even of a Republican Government? Surely not! Yet every obscure journalist claims this value for his own products. What a confusion of ideals!" No less just and important a remark is the following on state religion: "The downfall of empire always directly depends upon the spread of unbelief. But it is the union of true virtue and religious belief, the first of virtues, is the strongest power. It alone curbs attack and makes resistance irresistible. Religion cannot decline in a nation without causing that nation's strength also to decline, and the fall of states does not proceed in arithmetical progression according to the law of falling bodies, but rapidly leads to destruction." These two passages show the strength of his character and his abiding belief in the soundness of the old political order in Vienna, the state chancellor, who preferred to sacrifice himself rather than others, immediately resigned his position. He went to England, Brussels, and Schloss Johannisberg. From the last place he returned to Vienna in 1851, and eight years later died in his palace on the Rennweg at the age of eighty-six. When Napoleon I came to Austria in 1848, he found him in a storm of revolution. Engaged in Vienna, the state chancellor, who preferred to sacrifice himself rather than others, immediately resigned his position. He went to England, Brussels, and Schloss Johannisberg. From the last place he returned to Vienna in 1851, and eight years later died in his palace on the Rennweg at the age of eighty-six. When Napoleon I came to Austria in 1848, he found him in a storm of revolution.
tion of Metternich’s writings (1848–53) (pp. 421–586), and of the year of his death (1859) (pp. 589–627).

Fürst Clemens von Metternich in Der Kulturkampf, I (1870), 753, 755; Friedlaender, R. (Vienna, 1871); Havelberg, Metternich und seine Zeit, 1773–1859, II (Vienna and Leipzig, 1906—); Wünsch, Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserums Österreich, XVIII (1888), 340.

C. WOLFBOURGER.

Metz, town and bishopric in Lorraine.

I. THE TOWN OF METZ.—In ancient times Metz, then known as Divodurum, was the capital of the Celtic Mediomatrici, and at the beginning of the Christian era was already occupied by the Romans. As the junction of several military roads, and as a well-fortified town, it soon became of great importance. One of the earliest strongholds to surrender to the Germans, it survived the attacks of the Huns, and finally passed, about the end of the fifth century, through peaceful negotiations into the hands of the Franks. Theodoric of Austrasia chose it in 511 as his residence; the reign of Queen Brunhild reflected great splendour on the town. Though the first Christian churches were to be found outside the city, the existence in the fifth century of the oratory of St. Stephen within the city walls has been fully proved. In the beginning of the seventh century the oldest monastic establishment, the monastery of St. Gereon and St. Placidus (now the Peter and Paul) under the Carolingians, the town preserved the good-will of the rulers, whose family seat was near by; Charles the Bald was crowned in the Basilica, and here Louis the Pious and his son Drogo are buried. In 843 Metz became the capital of the Kingdom of Lorraine, and several diets and councils were held there. Not far from the church of St. Victor, the product of the Metz schools of writing and painting, such as the famous “Trier Ada” manuscript and the Sacramentary of Drogo (now at Paris), are evidence of the active intellectual lives that were led.

In 870 the town became part of the East Frank kingdom, and belonged (911–25) as part of Lorraine to the empire, to liquidate the power of the bishops in the city became greater when Adalbert I (928–62) obtained a share of the privileges of the counts; until the twelfth century, therefore, the history of the town is practically identical with that of the bishops (see below). In 1039 a splendid edifice was built to take the place of the old church of St. Stephen. In the 13th century the cathedral was raised. In 1207 the clergy rebelled against the bishop, who had also a controlling influence in the selection of the presiding officer of the board of aldermen, which first appears in the eleventh century. The twenty-five representatives sent by the various parishes held an independent position; in judicial matters they helped the Tredcem jurati and formed the democratic element of the system of government. The other municipal authorities were considerable in importance, and were represented by the crier, who held a vote, and the head of the organization, who had no vote. The head-alderman was selected from distinguished families to protect the interests of their relatives. The other body of burgesses, called a Commune, also appears as a Parage from the year 1297; in the individual offices it was represented by double the number of members that each of the older families possessed. Making common cause with the family unions and the Commune the burgesses found it advantageous to gradually increase the powers of the city as opposed to the bishop, and also to keep the control of the municipal government fully in their hands and out of that of the powerful growing guilds, so that until the sixteenth century Metz remained a purely aristocratic organization. In 1300 the Parages gained the right to fill the office of head-alderman, during the fourteenth century the right to elect the Tredcem jurati, and in 1383 the right of coinage. The guilds, which during the fourteenth century had attained great independence, were completely suppressed (1383), and the last revolutionary attempt of the artisans to seize control of the city government (1405) was put down with much bloodshed.

The city had often to fight for its freedom; from 1324–27 against the Dukes of Luxembourg and Lorraine, as well as against the Archbishop of Trier; in 1363 and 1365 against the band of English mercenaries under Arnold of Cervola, in the fifteenth century France and the Duke of Burgundy, who sought to annex Metz to the lands of at least wanted to exercise a protectorate. Nevertheless it maintained its independence, even though at great cost, and remained, outwardly at least, part of the German Empire, whose ruler, however, concerned himself very little with this important frontier stronghold. Charles IV in 1354 and 1356 held brilliant diets here, at the latter of which was promulgated the famous statute known as the “Golden Bull.” The town therefore felt that it occupied an almost independent position between France and Germany, and wanted most of all to evade the obligation of imperial taxes and attendance at the diet. The estrangement between it and the German States daily became wider, and financial affairs came to be in a crisis. In 1552 the political and religious troubles of 1552 the Protestant party in Germany betrayed Metz to France. By an agreement of the German princes, Moritz of Saxony, William of Hesse, John Albrecht of Mecklenburg, and George Frederick of Brandenburg, with Henry II of France, ratified by the death of King Charles (1515), Metz was formally transferred to France, the gates of the city were opened (10 April), and Henry took possession as vicarius sacri imperii et urbis protector (18 April). The Duke of Guise, commander of the garrison, restored the old fortifications and added new ones, and successfully resisted the attacks of the Habsburgs (1556–61). Metz remained French. The recognition by the empire of the illegal surrender came at the conclusion of the Peace of Westphalia. By the construction of the citadel (1555–62) the new government secured itself against the citizens, who were discontented with the turn of events. Important internal changes soon followed. Paris took over the authority of the French king, whose representative was the governor. The head-alderman, now appointed by the governor, was replaced (1640) by a Royalist mayor. The aldermen were also appointed by the governor and henceforth drawn from the whole body of burgesses; in 1633 the judgeship passed to the Parliament. The powers of the Tredcem jurati were also restricted, in 1634 totally abolished, and replaced by the Bailliage royal.

Among the cities of Lorraine, Metz held a prominent position during the French occupation for two reasons: in the first place it became one of the most important fortresses through the work of Vauban (1674–1707), and became the capital of the temporal province of the three bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, which France had seized (1552) and, by the Peace of Westphalia, retained. In 1633 there was created for this “Province des trois évêchés” (also called “Généralité des trois évêchés” or “Intendance de Metz”), a supreme council to act for the purpose of the archbishop and the Parliament. In 1681 the Chambre Royale, the notable Assembly chamber, whose business it was to decide what fees belonged to the three bishoprics which Louis XIV claimed for France, was made a part of this Parliament, which lasted, after a temporary dissolution (1771–75), until the final settlement by the National Assembly in 1789, whereupon the division of the land into departments and districts followed.
Mets became the capital of the Department of Moselle, created in 1790. The revolution brought great calamity upon the city. In the campaigns of 1814 and 1815 the German army of investment was commanded by Prince Frederick Charles of Prussia; as the few sorties of the garrison were unable to break the German lines, Mets was forced to surrender (27 October), with the result that 6000 French officers and 170,000 men were taken prisoners. By the Treaty of Frankfort, Mets became once more a German city, and since then has been made a most important garrison and a first-class fortress. The city, after the levelling of the fortifications on the south and east (1899), secured space for growth and development. In 1905 the city had 60,419 inhabitants, of whom 43,082 were Catholics, 15,556 Protestants, and 1691 Jews; by 1910 the number of inhabitants, through the absorption of the adjacent district, increased to 64,247. Since these quarrels between the emperor and the bishop, but Stephen once more restored the sovereignty of the bishops. Bishop Bertrand (1179-1212) gave the city the system of government described above. Under his successor Conrad I of Scharfenberg (1212-24) the first settlements of the new orders of Mendicant Friars, the Franciscans outside the city walls of the city, as well as the homes of numerous mendicants, were made in the city. With John of Assenmont (1224-38), the first bishop to be elected solely by cathedral chapter, and Jacob of Lorraine (1239-60), who once more upheld the rights of the bishops against the city, the development of the temporal possessions of the bishopric came to a halt. These temporal possessions of the bishopric, the so-called Tanzmesser, the land and buildings, were in the hands of the Carolingians, always friendly to Mets. In 770 it received full rights over the property of the Senones Abbey under Drogo, over the Mauritius Abbey, in 923 over Zabern, in 931 over Saarburg, and many others. On the dissolution of the old countships in the tenth century, the bishopric, subject only to the imperial government, took over the ecclesiastical acquisitions in the old District of Moselle, in the Saar District, and in the Blies District. The most important acquisitions at that time and later were Rémy (984), Saarbrücken (998), the lordship of Pütlingen (1135), and Lützelburg (1143), the see of the countship of Dagsburg (1225), the lordship of Frankrey (1228), and the patrimony of the Abbey of St. Stephen. Throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries began the decline of these possessions, principally on account of the quarrels of almost all the bishops; namely, Rainald of Bar (1302-16), Adhemar of Monteil (1327-61), under whom the present cathedral was begun, Dietrich IV Bayer of Boppard (1365-84) with the Dukes of Lorraine, the Archbishops of Mayence, and Luxembourg. During the thirteenth century sovereignty over the city of Mets and its environs (the pays Messin) was lost; the continual need of money by the bishops and the cathedral chapter forced them to pledge the title deeds of their domains, feuds, and taxes to the Dukes of Lorraine, the Counts of Bar, the city of Metz, and even to the burgesses. Another element was the fact that during the great Western Schism, for a long time two bishops had made the diocese a scene of strife, until Rudolf of Coucy received general recognition (1387-1415). His successors Conrad II Bayer of Boppard (1415-59), and George I of Bavaria (1459-84) were the last German bishops of the old see, and once more the city took on the maintenance of a loyal sentiment in the city and see. With Henry II of Lorraine (1484-1505) began and continued during the next one hundred and twenty years,
the long line of bishops of the ducal house of Lorraine which had incessantly aimed to increase its domains at the expense of the bishopric and was well supported therein by the kindred bishops through the transcription of bishops appointed by the Cardinal of Lorraine, retained only the temporal administration of the bishopric, and appointed in succession as bishops for the spiritual government, Cardinal Robert of Lenoncourt (1551–55) who after the reversion of the city of Metz to France tried to enforce the bishops' claim to sovereignty over the city and declared himself Prince and Seigneur de la ville, Francis de Beauquere de Pégullion (1555–68), and Cardinal Louis of Lorraine (1568–78). Others who also worked conscientiously, by furthering the internal reforms in conformity with the decrees of the Council of Trent, were Charles II of Lorraine (1578–1607); Cardinal Anna von Glivy (1608–12), and Henry of Bourbon, duke of Anjou and brothers; 13 bishops of the see the see was transferred to France in accordance with the Peace of Westphalia. Through sales, mortgages, and loans, the temporal property had become very much dismembered; but France wanted as far as possible to re-establish a complete district out of the transferred district Metenais. The Assembly Civil of the mother-house at the time determined that the churches, parishes and benefices had belonged to the newly acquired district, and confiscated a considerable number owing to the frivolous Assembly quarrel. The Province des Trois évêchés (see above) was formed out of the territorial provinces of the bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, also out of lands relinquished by the Spaniards.

In 1711, the cardinals of the right of the episcopal see at once broke out, which right Louis XIV claimed and in 1664 obtained from Alexander VII. As a general rule the crown nominated worthy prelates for the bishopric; George II of Aubusson (1668–97), Henri Charles du Cambout (1697–1732) and Claude de Rouvray Saint-Simon (1733–90) who died 1793. The last prince-bishop, Cardinal Louis de Montmorency-Laval (1761–1902) fled to Germany on the outbreak of the French revolution (d. 1805 at Altona). The Revolution and the Constitution civile du clergé broke up the old organization of the dioceses and installed a constitutional bishop, who, however, in 1793, was thrown into jail. The Concordat between the pope and Napoleon (1801) restored the bishopric with a different diocese, the three Departments of Moselle, Ardennes, and Forêts were allotted to it, and it was placed under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Besançon. Peter Francis Bienaimé (1802–09), the first bishop of the new diocese, divided the diocese into 123 parishes and 319 churches. In 1817 that portion of the Departments of Ardennes and Forêts which became Prussian territory was separated (the bishop was Joseph Jauffret, 1806–23) and in 1821 the remainder of Ardennes and Forêts, so that Metz had only 30 parishes and 418 subordinate parishes. After Jauffret, who instituted the yearly diocesan synod, came in 1841 Jean-François Besançon (1841–62), then Paul George Marie Dupont des Loges (1843–86), founder of the boys' training school in Montigny near Metz. In 1871 the diocese became part of the German Empire, and the new Lorraine became also the boundaries of the bishopric. In 1874 it was separated from the Metropolitane province and placed immediately under the Holy See. The Kulturkampf destroyed many institutions in Mosels founded by the Catholics and bishops of that city. On the death of Dupont des Loges, who on account of his outspoken French opinions, was always at loggerheads with the German Government, succeeded in 1886 Ludwig Fleck, coadjutor bishop from 1881, and after him the present Abbot of Maria-Laach (b. 16 October, 1855).

The present Diocese of Metz comprising the District of Lorraine covers an area of 2400 square miles and on 1 December, 1905, numbered 533,389 Catholics, 74,167 Protestants, 10,600 Dissenters, and 7165 Jews. The see is divided into 4 archidioceses, and 36 eparchies besides 233 missions; 903 secular, and 36 regular, priests. The bishop has 3 vicars-general. The Cathedral Chapter consists of 9 titular and 24 honorary canons. The diocesan institutions are the seminary for priests at Metz with 10 professors, the small seminary at Montigny near Metz, the cathedral school of St. Arnulf at Metz, and St. Augustine's Institute at Bitsch. The following orders and congregations had houses in 1910 in the diocese: the Conventuals, 1 house with 7 fathers, and 7 brothers; the Franciscans, 1 house, 4 fathers, and 6 brothers; the Redemptorists, 1 house, 11 fathers, and 4 brothers; the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, 1 house, 6 fathers, 2 brothers; the Missionary Brothers of St. Mary of the Holy Angels, 1 house, 20 brothers; the Brothers of Mercy, 3 houses, and 13 brothers. Orders of nuns: the Benedictine Abbey at Oriocourt, 36 sisters; 21 Barefoot Carmelites of Metz; 37 Sisters of the Visitations of Metz; 554 Sisters of Sainte Chrétienée, the mother-house at Metz, and 25 convents; 715 Sisters of Providence, with the mother-house at Metz, and 93 convents; 581 Sisters of Divine Providence with the mother-house at Metz, and 116 convents; 96 Sisters of Christian Doctrine, 4 convents; 40 Sisters of Compassion with 1 branch; 62 Sisters of the Good Shepherd, 2 houses; 25 Sisters of the Poor Child Jesus at Plappeville; 14 Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Mary at Vic; 47 Dominicans, 5 houses; 124 Sisters of the Maternity, 6 houses; 144 Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, 17 branches; 77 Sisters of Charity, the mother-house at Strasbourg, 11 houses; 81 Borromees, 9 convents; 20 Little Sisters of the Poor at Metz; 23 Sisters of Hope at Metz; 18 Sisters of the Divine Saviour, 3 houses; 80 Servants of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, 5 branches; 73 Franciscans of the Holy Hearts of Jesus and Mary; 67 Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi from the mother-house at Luxembourg in Retel; 13 Tertiaries of St. Francis, 3 houses, 2 servants of Mary from the mother-house of St. Firmin at Nancy, 1 house. The most important churches of the dioceses are the cathedral of St. Stephen, a magnificent Gothic structure, the main parts of which were built in the fourteenth century; it was completed in 1346 and in 1875 it was completely restored; the Gothic churches of Metz, St. Vincent (thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), St. Martin (twelfth and thirteenth centuries), St. Segolana (thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), the collegiate church at Gorze (twelfth century), the late Gothic parish church at Mörchingen, the church of St. Peter at Pont Fesquet.

Histoire Générale de Metz par des religieux Bénédictins (6 vols., Metz, 1790–99); d'Hannocceller, Metz anciens (2 vols., Metz, 1856); Weissbach, Gesch. der Städt Metz (3 vols., Metz, 1878–79); Sanderland, Die Immunität von Metz (Mets, 1887); Krahe, Kunst und Alterthum in Lothringen (Strasbourg, 1889); Technischer Führer durch Metz (Mets, 1894); Kramm, Metz, seine Geschichte und Sammlungen (Mets, 1907). Historien: L'Auvraye (Mets, 1837–67); Memoires de l'Académie de Metz (Mets, 1819–); Jahresberichte der Gesellschaft für Lothringische Altertumskunde (Mets, 1882); Gallia Christiana, XIII; L'arcueil Diocese de Metz et Pouilly de ce diocés (Nancy, 1872); Doering, Metz und seine Dietes, 2 vols.; Kramm, Metz, seine Geschichte und Sammlungen (Mets, 1886); Revue archeologique de Metz (Mets, 1900–1985); Fritsch, u. v. in Die katholische Kirche unserer Zeit (2 vols., München, 1886); Brevier d'un erudit, 2 vols. (Strasbourg, 1898; 434 pages). Chronologie des Besitzes des Kirchen (2 vols., 687–1000), ed. von Fricke (Strasbourg, 1909).
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Meuleman, BRICE. See Calcutta, Archdiocese of.
MEXICO

(Mexico, or Meun.), Jean Clopinel de, French poet, b. c. 1260 in the little city of Meung-sur-Loire; d. at Paris between 1305 and 1320. He took the name of his native city, but received from his contemporaries the nickname Clopinel (dopirin, to limp) because he was lame. Such nicknames were very common in the Middle Ages and were used in lieu of patronymics, the custom of which was not yet established. Jean de Meun's condition has been a much debated question. It seems certain today that he was born of well-to-do parents, received a very good education, and, about 1300, was a wealthy burgess of Paris, a steady and pious man who enjoyed the esteem of his fellow citizens and the friendship of many a noble lord. He translated the "De rerum natura" of Vergil, and composed in French verses a Testament in which he reproves women and the friars. His fame rests on a work of his earlier years, the completion of the "Roman de la Rose", which had been left unfinished by Guillaume de Lorris. As it stood, the latter's work was a sort of didactic poem in which he used allegorical characters to describe the forms, the phases, and the progress of love. His aim seemed to have been to compose a treatise on the art of loving for the use of the noble lords and ladies of the thirteenth century. To the 4669 verses of his predecessor, Jean de Meun added more than 18,000 and made the poem a sort of cyclus. He added 5200 of his own. He quoted, translated, and imitated all the writers then known: Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Virgil, Ovid, Augustine, Juvenal, Livy, Abelard, Roger Bacon. Of the 18,000 verses which he has written, it has been possible to assign 12,000 to their authors. All the characters became so many pedants who discoursed on all sorts of remote and remote subjects: the origin of the state, the origin of the royal power, instinct, justice, the nature of evil, marriage, property, the conflict between the regular and the secular clergy, between the friars and the university, etc. The book is full of attacks on all classes and duties of society: the magistrates, the soldiers, the nobles, the monks, tithes, feudal rights, property. De Meun's talent is vigorous, but his style is often cynical and reminds the reader of the worst pages of Rabelais.

PARIS, Jean de Meun in Hist., litteraire de la France, XXVIII (Paris, 1890); A. Chabot de Ch. de Meun et de la Rose: 9 Formes de Bibl. de l'ecole des chartes (Paris, 1860); LANGLIAUX, Origines et sources du Roman de la Rose (Paris, 1890).

PIERRE MARIQUE.

Mexico.—GEOGRAPHY.—The Republic of Mexico is situated at the extreme point of the North American continent, bounded on the north by the United States, on the east by the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean Sea, British Honduras, and Guatemala, and on the south and west by the Pacific Ocean. It comprises an area of 767,000 square miles, with a population of 12,604,000, of whom 2,062,000 are whites or creoles, 7,380,000 half-breeds or mestizos, 4,082,000 Indians, and about 80,000 negroes. Among the whites there are approximately 60,000 foreigners, the greater number being North Americans, Central Americans, Spaniards, French, Italians, etc. The form of government is republican; its head is a president, who is elected every six years; the legislature consists of two bodies, senate and chamber of deputies; and there is a supreme court. The republic is composed of twenty-seven states, three territories, and a federal district. The territory of Quintana Roo, created in 1902, was a part of the State of Yucatan. The names of the states, with population, area in square miles, capital, and number of people, are given in the accompanying table.

The Cordillera of the Andes which crosses the narrow isthmus that unites the Americas, branches out into two ranges when it reaches the peak of Zapotepeque (10,000 feet), in the State of Oaxaca; the eastern branch terminates at the Rio Bravo (or Rio Grande), in the State of Coahuila, and the western branch extends through the States of Chihuahua and Sonora and merges into the Rocky Mountain system in the United States. In the Mexican territory the two ranges are so closely united as to form almost a compact whole, occupying nearly all the region from ocean to ocean, forming the vast tablelands that extend from Oaxaca and Coahuila, leaving but a narrow strip of land along the coast line. On the eastern coast the land slopes almost imperceptibly to the Gulf, whereas on the western the descent is sharp and abrupt. This accounts for the few good ports on the Gulf side, and the abundance of harbours and sheltered bays on the Pacific shore. The highest peaks of these vast mountain ranges are: Popocatepetl (17,800 feet), Citaltepetl, or Peak of Orizaba (17,000 feet), Ixtaccihuatl (16,100 feet). To this physical configuration of the land, the absence in Mexico of any water systems of importance, is due to the principal rivers, none of which carries a great volume of water, are the Bravo, Pánuco, and Grijalva, emptying into the Gulf of Mexico; while the Rio Grande, the Rio Mayo, and Yaque, emptying into the Pacific. Very few islands are to be found on the eastern coast of Mexico, quite unlike the Pacific shore, which along the coast of the peninsula of Lower California is dotted with small islands. The four seasons of the year, common to most countries, are unknown in Mexico, owing to the entirely different climate of the regions. Common usage has divided the year into two distinct seasons, the rainy and the dry season, the former extending from May to October. During this entire time there are daily showers, which not infrequently are heavy downpours. The other six months are dry, not a drop of rain falling, at least on the tablelands. The climate of the coast region is always very warm, while that of the tablelands is temperate. The phenomenon of frost in December and January on the tablelands of Mexico, Puebla, and Toluca, situated at an altitude of more than 6000 feet above the sea level, is due not so much to extremes of climate as to the rarity of the air causing a rapid condensation of the vapours. Collection of the tables is not possible yet because the time of the Conquest are still in existence; the principal ones are: the Mexicana, Asteca, or Nahoa, in the States of Mexico, Morelos, Jalisco; the Tarasca, or Michoacana, in the State of Michoacan; the Otomi in San Luis Potosi, in Guanajuato and Querétaro; the Opata-Pima, in Sonora, Chihuahua, and Durango; the
Mixteco-Teototec in Oaxaca; the Mixe, or Zoque, in parts of Oaxaca, Vera Cruz, and Chiapas; the Chontal and Huave, in Tabasco, Oaxaca, and Chiapas; the Maya in Yucatan. Among the less important races are the Tarascans, Michoacane, and the Cuitlatecos, or Cuitlapecas, Tamaulipas, the Totonaca in the center of the State of Vera Cruz, the Matalsinca in the State of Mexico, and the Guaycurue and Laimones in Lower California. Remarkable ruins, found in many parts of the republic, bear witness to the degree of civilization to which these nations had attained. Chief among these may be mentioned those of Uxmal, Sacbe, and Tamoanchan, Yucatan (Maya nation), those of Palenque and Milla in Oaxaca (Teotopotec nation), the baths of Netzahucayotl in Texcoco (Chichimeca-Nahoe nation), and the pyramids of Teotihuacan (Tolttec nation). The separation of Church and State has been established by law, but the religion of the country is Catholic, there being actually very few who profess any other. Railroads, 14,857 miles; telegraph lines, 40,640 miles. In 1907 the product of the mines amounted to $33,078,500, $42,723,500 of this being gold, $19,048,000 silver, and $12,404,000 copper. In 1908 $12,001,000, $3,300,000 gold and $3,701,000 silver, was minted. The principal products besides minerals are corn, cotton, agave plant (henequen), wheat, sugar, coffee, cabinet woods, tobacco, and hides.

History.—Pre-Cortés Period.—The chronology and historical documents of the Aztecs give us a more or less clear account of their history for eight centuries prior to the conquest, but these refer only to their own history and that of the tribes living in close proximity to them, little or nothing being said of the origin of the Otomies, Olomecs, Cuitlatecos, and Michoacane. According to Clavijero the Toltecs came to Mexico about A.D. 648, the Chichimecs in 1170, and the Aztecs in 1196. That their ancestors came from other lands, is asserted by all these tribes in their traditions, and the north is generally the direction from which they say they came. The lands of the Aztecs and the first immigrants to Mexico came from Asia, either by way of Behring Strait, or across the Pacific Ocean. The theory that these people had some close connection with the Egyptians and other peoples of Asia and Africa has some substantiating evidence in the ruins still extant, the pyramids, the exact and complicated method of computing time, the cryptoglyphs, and conchoidal flint (with those of the ancient Egyptians), seen in the mural paintings in the ruins of Chichen-Itza. It seems that the Otomies were the oldest nations of Anahuac, and the Itzacs of Yucatan. These were followed by the Mayas in Yucatan, and in Anahuac the Toltecs, the Chichimecs, and Nahoaes, with their allies from the Tepanecas, Chichimecas, Tepecanes, Acolhuas, Tlahuicas, Tlaxcaltecos, and Aztecs. The last-named founded the city of Tenochtitlan, or Mexitli, in 1325, and gradually, overpowering the other tribes, extended their empire north as far as the Kingdom of Michoacan, and the domain of the savage Otomies, east to the Gulf, west to the Pacific, and south to Nicaragua. This was the extent of the Aztec empire at the time of the Spanish invasion in 1519.

Language and religion.—Nahuatl, or Aztec, somewhat modified in the region of the central tableland, was the official language of the empire, but many other dialects were in use in other sections. The principal ones were: Tarascan in Michoacan, Mayan in Yucatan, Otomian in the northern limits of the empire, Mixteco-Teototec and Chontal in Oaxaca, and Chiapanecan and Tzental in Chiapas and Tabasco. The religion of all these nations was a monstrous polytheism. Human sacrifice was a feature of the worship of nearly all the tribes, but in none did it assume the proportions of the Aztecs. Among the Aztecs, their great teocalli, or temple, at the capital. Father Motolinia in his letter of 2 January, 1553, to the Emperor Charles V, speaking of the human sacrifices with which the Emperor Ahuitzotl (1486-1502) celebrated the opening of the great temple in Mexico, says: "In a sacrificial service lasting three or four days 80,400 were sacrificed. This was in the temple of Tlacochcalco, four streets walking single file until they reached the idols." Father Duran, speaking of this same sacrifice and of the great number of victims, adds: "Which to me seemed so incredible, that, if history and the fact that I found it recorded in many places outside of history, both in writing and pictorially represented, did not compel me to believe it, I very much not dare to assert it." The Vatican and Tellerian manuscripts give the number of victims as 20,000; this number seems more probable.

Upon this occasion victims were simultaneously sacrificed in fourteen principal temples of the city. In the great teocalli, there were four groups of sacrifices, and the same was probably the case in other places; the time for the sacrifices was from sunrise to sunset, about thirteen hours, each victim required about five minutes, so that computing by this standard the number of victims might easily reach the above-mentioned number. Father Mendietz, as well as Father Motolinia and other authorities, agree in affirming that the number of victims annually sacrificed to Huitzilopochtli, by the Aztecs, was in the year of sacrifice 1519, reached the number of 15,000 to 20,000. To the student of Aztec history this will not appear unlikely, for they kept up a continuous warfare with their neighbours, not so much to extend their empire as for the avowed purpose of securing victims for the sacrifices. Indeed, their idea was not so much to kill as to take their prisoners, to sacrifice them. In the meantime, the Kingdom of Michoacan and the Republic of Tlaxcala, situated in the very heart of the Aztec empire, only a few miles from the capital, owed their independence, and the Spaniards many of their victories. Hernan Cortes may for this reason have escaped death under the Indians by the number of victims and the siege of the capital. Notwithstanding the hideous form of worship and the bloody sacrifices, the peoples of ancient Mexico preserved a series of traditions which may be classified as Biblical and Christian; the Biblical traditions are undoubtedly the remnants of the religious beliefs of the first races who migrated to these shores: this is true while the origin of the Christian traditions will be explained later.

Biblical Traditions. — (1) Idea of the Unity of God.—The Aztecs gave the name of Teotl to a supreme, invisible, eternal being, whom they never attempted to portray in visible form, and whom they called Toque-Nahuaque, Creator of all things, Ipameomani, He by whom all things we live. This god was called Chihua, Chihua, Hunab, and the second woman, the woman was called Cihuacohuatli, the snake woman. (2) Creation.—Among the Aztecs the idea of the creation had been preserved. They believed that Toque-Nahuaque created a man and woman. Then came the flood, and the sun and the moon; the woman was called Cihuacohuatli, the snake woman. (3) Deluge.—Among the Michoacans we find traditions of the Deluge. Tespi, to escape from drowning in a terrible deluge that occurred, embarked in a boat shaped like a box, with his wife and children, many species of animals, and provisions of grain and seeds. When the rain had abated and the flood subsided, he liberated a bird called an aura, a water bird, which did not return. Then others were released, and all but the humming bird failed to return. The illustration on the following page of an Aztec hieroglyphic taken from the Vatican manuscript represents the Deluge as conceived by the Aztecs. The god of the earth was the house with the head and hand of a woman projecting to signify the submersion of all dwellings and their in—
habitants. The two fish swimming in the water signify, besides the fact that they were saved, that all men were transformed into Tlacaminchic, fish-people, according to the Aztec tradition. In the midst of the waters floats a hollow wooden canoe, Acalitl, occupied by a man and woman, the only privileged pair to escape the disaster. The goddess Chalchihuitlicue, as though descending from the heavens in a flash of lightning, surrounded by her symbols of rain and water, presides over the scene. The date of the Deluge is marked at the right with the sign Matlactliatl of the month Atemoatli (3 January); the duration of the flood is marked by the sign to the left. Each major circle finished with a feathered end, equals 400, and each minor circle indicates a unit, so that together they equal 4008 years.

(4) Tower of Babel.—In the commentary on the Vatican manuscript mention is made of the epoch after Atonatiuh, that is the Deluge, when giants inhabited the earth, and of the giant Xelhus, who, after the waters had subsided, went to Cholollan, where he began to build the great pyramid out of huge bricks of sun-baked clay (adobes), made in Tlatmanalco at the base of the Cocotl mountain, and conveyed to the site of the pyramids by hand. A line of men extended from place to place, and the bricks were passed from hand to hand. The gods, seeing that the pyramid threatened to touch the sky, were displeased and rained down fire from the heavens, destroying many and dispersing the rest. (5) Confusion of Tongues. —Tecunicalli and Yoquicheztal, the man and woman who were saved from the flood, according to the Aztec tradition, landed on the mountain that had been a sea. They had many children, but they were all dumb until a dove from the branches of a tree taught them to speak. Their tongues, however, were so diverse that they could not understand one another.

Christian Traditions.—In the history of the nations of ancient Mexico, the coming of Quetzalcoatl made a great stir. He was said to have come from the Province of Pánuco, a white man, of great stature, broad brow, large eyes, long black hair, rounded beard, and dressed in a tunic covered with black and red crosses. Chaste, intelligent, and just, a lover of peace, versed in the sciences and arts, he preached by his example and doctrine a new religion which inculcated faith in the one God, love and reverence for the Divinity, practice of virtue, and hatred of vice. He predicted that in the course of time white men with beards, like himself, would come from the East, would take possession of their country, overthrow their idols, and establish a new religion. Expelled from Tollan, he sought refuge in Cholollan, but, being pursued even here by the Tollans, he passed on to Yucatan, where, under the name of Kukulcan, he repeated the predictions he had made in Anahuac, introduced the veneration of the Cross, and preached Christian doctrine. Later he set sail from the Gulf of Mexico, going towards the East, to his own land, as he himself said. The opinion of ancient writers that this person was the Apostle Thomas is now universally rejected, and the most probable explanation of the identity of Quetzalcoatl is that he was an Icelandic or Norse priest of the tenth or eleventh century, who, on one of their bold voyages of adventure, accidentally discovered this new land or, shipwrecked in the Gulf, drifted to the coast of Panama. Christian traditions, above all that of the veneration of the Cross, date in Anahuac and Yucatan from the coming of Quetzalcoatl. In Yucatan the followers of Francisco Hernández de Córdoba found crosses which were the object of adoration. With regard to the Cross of Cosumel, the Indians said that a man more resplendent than the sun had died upon it. The Mayas preserved a rite suggestive of baptism and confession, and among the Totonacos an imitation of communion was practised, the bread which was used was called Toyolliaitlacual, i.e., food of our soul. Crosses were also found in Querétaro, Tepic, Tongoistetec, and Metztitlan.

No better authority can be cited, in connexion with the famous Cross of Palenque, which is herewith reproduced than the learned archaeologist, Orozco y Berra. He says: "The civilization indicated by the ruins of Palenque and of Yucatan, differs in every respect, language, writing, architecture, dress, customs, habits, and theogony, from that of the Aztecs. If there are some points of resemblance they can be traced to the epoch of Kukulcan, when there was some intercourse between the two nations. There is also historical proof that the Cross of Palenque is of much more ancient origin than that of the Toltecs. From this it may be inferred that the Cross of Palenque does not owe its origin to the same source as the crosses of Mexico and Cozumel, that is, to the coming of Kukulcan, or Quetzalcoatl, and consequently has no Christian significance such as those of other Mexican Indians."
Colonial Period — (1) Conquerors and Conquered. —
With the capture of Cuaxhutemotzin, 13 August, 1521, the Aztec empire came to an end, and with it Nahoa civilization, if such may be called the attainments of a nation which, although preserving in some of the branches of human knowledge remnants of an ancient culture, lacked nevertheless many of the essentials of civilization, practised human sacrifice, polygamy, and slavery, and kept up an incessant warfare with their neighbours for the avowed purpose of providing victims to be sacrificed in a fruitless endeavour to satiate the thirst for blood of their false gods. Most historians attribute the victories of the Spanish conquerors to the firearms they carried, the horses they rode, the horse being entirely unknown to the Indians, the steel armour they wore, and the help of the Indian allies. No doubt all these contributed in a measure, but not as much as is represented. Of the 500 or 600 men that composed the first expedition, only thirteen carried firearms, and these were heavy, cumbersome pieces, hard to manage as were all the firearms of that time. The artillery train was primitive, and its capacity limited, and always accompanied the main column. The detachments which were sent out to subjugate or pacify the villages, and which had sharp encounters, could not hamper their movements in this way. The horsemen were but sixteen in all, and after their first astonishment, not unmixed with awe, the natives soon learned that they could be felled by a single blow. Except officers, few of the Spaniards wore armour, the majority had quilted cotton suits, and for arms the sword and buckler; the horsemen were armed with lances.

As to weapons, the Indians were quite as well provided as the Spaniards; thick wooden helmets covered with leather protected the head, and all carried the chimaotl, a strong shield large enough to almost cover the entire breast. The allies no doubt helped, but in the stubbornly fought battles with the Tlaxcallaces, the Spaniards won singlehanded; their Indian allies in the very heat of battle thinking more of pillage than of fighting, during the siege, when the Spanish cause seemed doomed, the allies forsook them. When later they returned they were such a hindrance on the narrow causeway, that in order to fight freely, the Spaniards were obliged to send them to the rear. The Spanish victories were due more to the mode of Indian warfare and in some cases, as in that of Otumba, to Cortés’s indomitable courage and strategy. As has already been said, the Indians did not fight to conquer but to take their enemies prisoners, and the battles after the first assault became a series of confused hand-to-hand fights without order or harmony on the part of the Indians, whereas the Spaniards preserved their unity and fought under the direction of their leader. Valour was not wanting on either side, but the Indians yielded to the temptation of an easy flight, while the Spaniards fought with the courage of desperation; knowing well that the sacrificial stone was the fate that awaited the prisoner, with them it was to conquer or to die. Historians have been so carried away with the military exploits of Cortés that the men who fought with him, sharing all his dangers, have been overlooked. Greed for gold was not the sole dominant motive of their actions, as has been so persistently asserted; it was a strange mixture of indomitable cour-
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age, harshness, tireless energy, cupiditis, licentiousness, Spanish loyalty, and religious spirit. Some of those who had fought most valiantly and who received their share of the spoils, judging their gains ill gotten, laid aside their worldly possessions acquired at such a high price, and embraced the religious life. Later they emerged from the cloister transformed into missionaries, full of zeal and bringing to the arduous task of evangelizing the Indians, the same valour, disregard of fatigue, and untiring energy they had previously displayed in the army of discovery and conquest.

With the fall of the great Tenochtitlan, the first period may be said to close. This was followed by many expeditions of discovery and conquest, ending for the most part in the founding of colonies. Alvarado penetrated as far as Guatemala; Cristóbal de Olid reached Honduras, Montejo, father and son, accomplished the conquest of Yucatan; Cortés went as far as Lower California. Nuño de Guzmán, the conqueror of Michoacan (or Tarasco Kingdom) and the founder of the city of Guadalajara, whose career might have been so distinguished for glory, allowed his cruel, avaricious disposition to overrule all his actions. Fleeing from Mexico to avoid the storm that his evil deeds had brought upon him, he encountered Tarag...
axan II, alias Calzontain, the King of Michoacan; he seized him, plundered his train, tortured and finally put him to death. Pursuing his way he left a trail of ashes and blood through the whole Tarasco Kingdom. The saintly Vasco de Quiroga, first Bishop of Michoacan, with difficulty effaced the traces of this bloody march. Nuño penetrated beyond Sinaloa, suppressing with an iron hand the discontent in his mixed troupe. Retracing his steps, he founded the city of Guadalajara. At enmity with Cortés, unrecognized by the Audiencia and the viceroy, cursed by his victims, he returned to Mexico, to be seized, imprisoned, and transported to Spain, where he died in poverty and want. Nuño was succeeded by the mild, winning Cristóbal de Olarte. By the close of the sixteenth century the conquest from Guatemala to New Mexico had been practically accomplished.

In New Spain, no Sayri Tupac nor Tupac Amaru ever arose to attempt to overthrow the Spaniards, as in Peru. The Indians conquered by Cortés and the commanders who followed him remained submissive.

There were occasional uprisings among the Northern Indians, but never serious enough to affect the peace of the colony in general. Neither had the Government to contend with any disloyalty among its own subjects; the Spaniards of New Spain never belied the proverbial Spanish loyalty. The king received from the hands of Cortés and those who continued his work a vast empire almost free of expense to the royal exchequer. All that was required seemed to be to take possession of the new territories added to the Crown; but the situation was not without its difficulties. For the conquest a military commander had been sufficient; the new empire would require a Government. In the methods employed to organize this new empire, Spain has frequently been charged with cruelty. There was cruelty, and at times extreme cruelty, cannot be denied. The execution of Cuahutemoc and the horrible death of Tongoaxan II will ever disgrace the memory of Cortés and Nuño de Guzmán. The slavery to which the Indians were reduced during the early years of the conquest, their distribution among the plantations, the contemptuous disregard of the conquerors for the lives of Indians, looking upon them at first as irrational beings, are blots which can hardly be effaced from the history of the Spanish conquest in America. But the impartial historian may well call attention to certain facts and thus enable the reader, viewing the question from every aspect, to form a correct historical opinion.

Neither the home Government nor the Spanish nation was ever an accomplice in these deeds of cruelty of the Spaniards in New Spain. Spain, it is true, rewarded the conquerors of Mexico just as nations to-day honour the victorious generals who have left in their wake devastated lands and battlefields staining the dead. These expeditions of conquest were the natural outcome of circumstances; they were carried out under royal command, and were no more piratical expeditions than they would be now. Spain did not fail to demand a strict account from all who, after the submission of the people, exceeded the limits of their authority, and she used every measure within her reach, though not always successfully, to obtain fair treatment for the conquered Indians. Innumerable royal decrees and laws enjoining just and equitable treatment for the Indians, were issued to the viceroys and governors of America. Through the aid of the missionaries, the Spanish Government obtained from Paul III (17 June, 1537), the Bull which gave to the Indians equal rights, treating them like the white man, and proclaimed them capable of receiving the Christian faith and its sacraments, thus destroying the pernicious opinion that they were irrational beings. Severe laws were promulgated against those who should attempt to enslave the Indians, and the Government ordered that slaves should be brought from Africa (as was the custom of the period), rather than that Spanish subjects should become slaves.

With regard to encomiendas (a system of patents involving virtual enslavement of the Indians) no one who has read the life of Fray Bartolomé de las Casas can be ignorant of the earnest effort made by the Government to do away with them, and as this was impossible, and as the attempt was creating disorder (in Ulúa), the Government tried by every means to alleviate the condition of the Indians, and to save them as much as possible from harsh treatment by their masters. If the excesses of some of the conquerors stood out in such bold relief, it is because of the unceasing protests of the many Spaniards who were not their partisans. The most vehement accusers of the Spaniards base their assertions on the writings of Spaniards themselves, particularly those of the fiery Las Casas, to whom the Government appears to have allowed free speech. The missionaries were equally vehement, often making unreasonable demands, and showing themselves more bitter towards their own countrymen than the Indians had been. Even Philip II suffered in silence this torrent of complaint and abuse of his Government, and tolerated charges which, in similar circumstances, in the realm of the haughty Elizabeth would have been dearly paid by those complaining. A laudable sentiment of fairness and compassion towards the vanquished race inspired these writings, and their very nature and purpose precluded all mention of any deeds of kindness and humanity. The gruesome picture that has resulted from this makes it appear that in that army of conquerors and colonizers there was not a single one who was a Christian and a man. In their zeal for justice the Spaniards have really cast dishonour on their country, and this must ever redound to their glory.

(2) Evangelization and Conversion of the Indians.—In the ranks of the Spaniards there were several priests, but little could be done during the first stormy period. When the conquest had been effected, and order restored, the Franciscans were the first to offer themselves for the work. Three Franciscans, among them the famous lay brother Peter of Ghent (Pedro de Gante), kinsman of the Emperor Charles V, had preceded the first twelve Franciscans who formally took possession of the missions in 1524. Upon the arrival of the latter, they joined their ranks, and
the superior, Fray Martín de Valencia, appointed them to various places near the City of Mexico, where they begazed on the council, to test the presch. At first, especially among the adults, little could be accomplished, as they did not know the language, so they turned their attention to the children. There their zeal was rewarded with more success, the children being more docile and less imbued with the effects of idolatrous worship. By degrees they gained ground, and before long the world, to test for baptism, the number increasing daily until within a few years the greater portion of the inhabitants of the newly conquered territory had received baptism. The apparition, in 1531, of Our Lady of Guadalupe to the Indian Juan Diego had a powerful effect, the increase in conversions being very noticeable after that time.

In some respects it may not be without interest to note the particular bias which the religion of the Indians assumed. Thus, for example, the Christianity of the Indian is essentially sad and sombre. This has been attributed to the occasion on which Christianity was introduced among them, to racial traits, to the impression indelibly imprinted upon them by their ancient rites, and to the fact that the Indian sees in the crucifix the actual evidences of insult and abuse, of suffering and dejection. The crucifixes in the Indian churches are repulsive, and only in rare instances have the priests succeeded in improving or changing these images. Devotion to some particular saint, above all to the Apostle St. James, may also be noted. Their ancient polytheism had taught them that the favour of each god who possessed special prerogatives was to be sought, which explains the many and varied propitiatory sacrifices of their religion, and the new converts probably did not at first understand the relative position of the saints, nor the distinction between the adoration due to God and the reverence due to the saints. Hearing the Spaniards speak constantly of the Apostle St. James, they became convinced that he was some sort of divine protector of the conquerors, to be justly feared by their enemies, and that it was therefore necessary to gain his favour. Hence the great devotion that the Indians had for St. James, the numerous churches dedicated to him, and the statues of him in so many churches, mounted on a white horse, with drawn sword, in the act of charging.

A much debated question at that time was whether conquest should precede conversion, or whether the
efforts of the missionaries alone would suffice to subjugate and bring the Indians to a Christian and civilized mode of life. The former theory had been applied to the first nations, which the missionaries found conquered and pacified when they began their work among them. The question presented itself when expeditions against the Indians of the northern part of Mexico were being planned. The independent state of these tribes was a constant menace to the peace and progress of the colony in the south, and the rich mines known to exist there were also an inducement. The system adopted, which seems to have been enjoined by royal mandate, was to send armed expeditions, accompanied always by several missionaries, to take possession of the territory and to establish garrisons and forts to hold it. By this arrangement the cross and the sword went hand in hand, but the missionaries of through the efforts of Father Salvatierra, and to him and the famous Father Kino is due the discovery that Lower California was a peninsula, and not an island, as had been supposed during a century and a half. When the Jesuits were expelled from all the Spanish colonies by Charles III, many of their missions were abandoned, others were taken in charge by the missionaries of the College of Our Lady of Guadalupe in Zacatecas; Towards the close of the eighteenth century the Franciscans, handicapped for so many years by the advantages and discensions of the era, returned with renewed life and vigour to the work of the missions, and took charge of many of the deserted missions of California. They sent many worthy successors of the first Franciscans, among them the well-known Fray Junipero Serra, founder of the missions of Upper California.

(3) The Destruction of the Aztec Hieroglyphics.—The general opinion of the ordinary student of Mexican history, after reading the works of Prescott, Bancroft, Robertson, and others, is that the first missionaries and the first Bishop of Mexico, Juan de Zumárraga, were responsible for the destruction of the hieroglyphic annals of the Aztecs. Expressions such as the following, occur frequently: "The fanaticism of the first missionaries"; "the Omar of the new continent". If we look carefully into the sources from which these opinions have been taken we shall see that these charges are entirely unfounded or, at least, greatly exaggerated. To make this point clear, we shall at the beginning set aside such writers as Prescott, H. H. Bancroft, Lucas Alamán, Humboldt, Clavigero, Robertson, Gemelli, Siguenza, Herrera, and others, who, although learned men, from the very circumstances of having written at a time far removed from the era of the conquest and evangelization of Mexico, perhaps never having visited the country itself, have necessarily confined themselves to repeating tales which others have with greater or less accuracy related. Aside these, there still remain thirteen writers, some of them contemporary with the conquest and others practically contemporaneous, who have seen the work of the missionaries and witnessed the events immediately following the conquest. Of these, thirteen, six may still be eliminated as treating purely of the destruction of idols and sculptural arts, and three more, who concerned themselves with manuscripts and hieroglyphics. These are Fray Martín de Valencia, Superior of the first Franciscans, Fray Pedro de Gante, Fray Toribio de Benavente, Fray Jerónimo de Mendibérica, the letter of the bishops to the Emperor Charles V (1537), and his reply. Of the seven remaining authors five wrote at the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth, such as Sahagún (1550-80), Torquemada (his works were published in 1615), Durán (1519-80), Ixtlilxochitl (1600-15), and J. B. Pomar (1582). Two authorities of the time of the conquest are the codex called "Libro de Oro" (Golden Book), 1530-34, and the letter of Bishop Zumárraga to the General Chapter of Tolosa, written at the end of the year 1531.

Before treating each of these authorities separately it may be as well to establish some important facts. According to Sahagún, in the time of the native Mexican King Itzcóatl (1427-40) a number of paintings had been burnt to keep them from falling into the hands of the conquerors, who might have treated them with disrespect. This may be called the first destruction. Ixtlilxochitl (Fernando de Alba) asserts that when the Tlaxcaltecs entered Tecoaco in company with Cortés (31 December, 1520) they "set fire to everything belonging to King Netzahualpilli, and thus burnt the royal archives of all New Spain" (second destruction). Mendibérica, in alluding to the burning of the Spaniards many paintings were hidden and locked up, to save them from the ravages of war; the owners dying or moving away, these papers were
lost (third destruction). Hernán Cortés, in order to take the City of Mexico, had to demolish almost the whole of it, including the Teocalli; many writings must have been destroyed then (fourth destruction).

All this was previous to the coming of the first missionaries. No evidence is to be found in any of the writers of the period that either the missionaries or Bishop Zumarraga burnt anything in Mexico, Texcoco, or Atzcapotzalco, that might even remotely be called a literary monument. On the contrary, Fray Jerónimo de Mendiesta, one of the first Franciscans, in the prologue of the second volume of his "Historia Eclesiástica Indiana" states that far from the first friars destroying Indian manuscripts, their superior, Fray Martín de Valencia, and the president of the Second Audiencia, D. Sebastián Ramírez de Fuen Leal, commissioned Fray Andrés del Olmo, in 1533, to write a book on Indian antiquities. This he did having seen "all the pictures representing ancient rites and customs, owned by the caciques and other persons of importance in these provinces," and having received ready answers and explanations from all the oldest inhabitants whom he questioned. Moreover, in 1533 or 1534, the painting to which the name of Codex Zumárraga has been given was being studied and explained, notwithstanding the horror it must have inspired from being stained with human blood. At Bishop Zumárraga did not reach Mexico until 1528, he cannot be blamed or held responsible for what had happened previously. In the years 1529 and 1530 he had more than enough to do in opposing the excesses of the First Audiencia, and anyone who is familiar with the history of this period will know that he had other matters than the burning of manuscripts to worry about. It is nothing of entire archives, as some writers assert—to occupy him. At the close of the year 1531 he was recalled to Spain, and did not return until late in the year 1534. At this time no hieroglyphic records were destroyed, but, as we have already stated, they were being collected and interpreted. This being the case, let us now examine the testimony which has been quoted against the missionaries and Bishop Zumárraga.

J. B. Pomar, who, like Ixtlilxochitl, was a descendant of the kings of Texcoco, may be set aside at once. He states that in Texcoco the Indians themselves burnt the paintings that had earlier escaped the incendiary of the Tlaxalttecas, for fear Bishop Zumárraga might attribute to them idolatrous worship, because at that time D. Carlos Ometochtinz, son of Netzahualpilli, was accused of idolatry. It was not, therefore, a question of an act of Bishop Zumárraga, but of a fear, well or ill-founded, on the part of the Indians. The Texcocanos, seeing that their lord was indicted for idolatry, and fearing that the investigations might incriminate them, and find them altogether faultless, hastened to shield themselves by burning some paintings, the character of which is not known. They may in reality have been representations of idolatrous and superstitious rites, and not annals of historic value. As regards other authors who were almost contemporary with the conquest, it must be noted that within a few years they began investigations concerning Indian antiquities and naturally turned to the hieroglyphics that had been preserved, seeking explanations from the Indians who were most versed in deciphering these. But they had already lost in great part the knowledge of the meaning of these figures, which had been transmitted by tradition only. Ixtlilxochitl asserts that out of a gathering of the principal Indians of New Spain, who had a reputation for knowing their history, he found only two who had full knowledge and understanding of the paintings and signs. Urged by the interpreters to explain certain points which they did not understand, they felt great repugnance in confessing their ignorance, and in order to confound them, it had recourse to the convenient alternative of laying the blame on the scarcity of pictures. Their desire to shield their ancestors for their failure to record some facts of importance induced them to exaggerate the part taken by Bishop Zumárraga and the missionaries.

Fray Durán, the cautious Fray Sahagún, and Ixtlilxochitl do not accuse Bishop Zumárraga, but attribute everything to the missionaries. Fray Torquemada blames the missionaries and Bishop Zumárraga, pointing to the archives of Atzcapotzalco as destroyed by him. This, however, appears utterly unlikely as no former writer ever mentioned the archives of Atzcapotzalco, and it is quite possible no such archives ever existed. Moreover, had there been any truth in this accusation, Ixtlilxochitl, who was in search of these proofs, would have related it in his works; as it is, he does not even mention it. Finally, it must be borne in mind that Torquemada only gathered together the writings of the early missionaries, and interwove his works with fragments of these writings. He could not find such a charge against Bishop Zumárraga because it was not there. As regards the first missionaries, we have already mentioned the value they placed upon the pictures and the use they made of the hieroglyphics. Two documents of the time of the Conquest may be cited in this connexion: the "Libro de Oro" (Golden Book) and the letter of Bishop Zumárraga to the Chapter of Tolosa. In the "Libro de Oro", which is the work of the first Franciscans, and which has been very badly edited, some phrases being almost unintelligible, we find the following words: "As we have destroyed and burnt the books and all that pertains to ceremonial or is suspect, and threatened them if they do not reveal them, now when we ask for books, if any have them they tell us they are burnt, and ask why we want them. There are books among them that are not prohibited, such as give the computation of the months, years, and days, and there is always something that is suspect. Besides, there are others which are prohibited, treating of idolatry and dreams." The only thing that can be
proved as certain from this document is that the missionaries burnt books of heathenish and idolatrous ceremonies; the distinction between these and books of annals being clearly drawn; the one prohibited, the other not. As the accusation is principally based on the burning of historical hieroglyphics, we see from this document that there is no foundation for it.

There remains the famous letter of Bishop Zumárraga to the Chapter of Tolosa, written in 1531. As there have been twenty-one editions of this celebrated letter, there are some variations; the quotation is given as it is found in the oldest edition, which says: "Baptizata sunt plausum ducenta quinquaginta millia hominum, quingenta deorum templas sunt destructa, et plausum viesces mille figurae daemonum, quas adorabant, frataque combustae." The accusation as a mark of indignity, and then broken up. This, in all probability, is the meaning of the words in Bishop Zumárraga’s letter.

Briefly, then, the preceding facts show: (a) That before the coming of the first missionaries many hieroglyphic paintings had been destroyed. (b) That the missionaries who came in 1524, and who wrote histories, speak of idols and temples destroyed, but say nothing of writings being burnt, and as early as 1530 they began to distinguish between prohibited and non-prohibited paintings; in 1533, by order of the superior, they collected these writings to compile a history of the Indians. (c) That the charge of having destroyed the historical hieroglyphics of the Indians, practically null in the beginning, has grown in proportion as the writers are farther removed from the time of the conquest. (d) That, even granting that there ever was such a destruction, it could not have been so great, for from 1568 to 1580 the viceroy D. Martin Enríquez ordered that the paintings of the Indians be brought together in order to rewrite their history, and many were brought from Tula, Texcoco, and Mexico, and in the eighteenth century the celebrated writer and collector Boturini found many more.

(4) Public Instruction During the Earliest Colonial Period.—When the first band of twelve Franciscans arrived at Tlaxcala in 1524 they found there Father Tecto, who had come two years before. Seeing that he and his companions had not made much progress in the conversion of the natives, Fray Martín de Valencia asked the reason, and what they had been doing in the time they had been in the colony: “Learning a theology unknown to St. Augustine (namely), the language of these Indians,” replied Father Tecto. Once established, the missionaries devoted themselves to building churches and convents to which a school was always attached. In the large court of the convent catheria was taught early in the morning to the adults and to the children of the macehualitl (workmen) in order that they might then go to their work. The school was reserved for the children of the nobles and persons of prominence. As the Indians did not at first realize the importance of this instruction, the schools were not well attended, and the missionaries had to ask the aid of the civil authorities to compel parents to send their children to be instructed. Many of the nobles, not wishing to entrust their children to the new apostles, but not daring to disobey, sent as substitutes the children of some former dependent, passing them off as their own, but soon seeing the advantages of the education imparted by the friars sent their own children on the being admitted to the schools. Some of these schools were so large that they accommodated from 800 to 1000 children. The older and more advanced pupils taught the labourers, who came in large numbers in their free hours to be instructed.

At first, when the missions were not fully conversant with the language, they taught by means of pictures, and the Indians, accustomed to their own hieroglyphic figures, understood readily. In making copies the Indians inserted Aztec words written in European characters, originating a curious mixed writing of which some examples are still preserved. As soon as the missionaries mastered the language they turned their attention more especially to the children of the nobles, since the children of the working class did not need so thorough an education. According to the custom of the times, they would not be called to rule, and the sooner their course of instruction was completed the sooner they would be free to help their parents. The same reasons did not hold for the girls, and no distinction was made, pupils sitting together, at first in the patios and later in the homes built for them. Bishop Zumárraga founded eight or nine schools for girls in his diocese, and at his urgent solicitation, in 1530, the empress
six women teachers, and in 1534 he himself brought six more. Later on, the viceroy, D. Antonio de Mendoza, founded an asylum for half-caste girls, which at first was hampered by lack of funds, but the king endowed it and declared that those who wished to marry the girls should be provided with employment.

When the missionaries landed, in 1524, they did not find a single Indian who could read; nothing had been done in this direction for them by the army of conquest. Twenty years later, 1544, Bishop Zumárraga wanted to have the catechism of Fray Pedro de Cór- doba translated into the Indian tongue, which was finally done, as he believed so much good would result from it, "for", as he said, "there are so many who know how to read". Contemporary writers bear witness to the rapid progress of the Indians in writing, music, and even in Latin. The one who distinguished himself most in teaching the Indians was the lay brother Pedro de Gante, kinsman of the Emperor Charles V. He gathered together about a thousand children in the conven of San Francisco of Mexico and taught them, besides their religion, music, singing, and Latin. He also started a school for adults and founded a school of fine arts and crafts. With no resources but his indomitable energy, born of his ardent charity, he raised from the foundations and sustained for many years, a magnificent church, a hospital, and a great establishment which was at one and the same time a primary school, a college for higher studies, and an academy of fine arts and crafts—in short, a centre of civilization.

Bishop Zumárraga, who aspired always to higher things for the Indian, managed to open for them the famous college of Santa Cruz, at Tlaltetelco, on 6 January, 1534. This foundation began with sixty students, the number rapidly increasing. Besides religion and good habits, they were taught reading, writing, Latin grammar, rhetoric, philosophy, music, and Medicine. The college of Tlaltetelco sent forth native governors and mayors for the Indian towns, teachers for the Indians, and at times for the young Spaniards and creoles. Some of them were a great help to the missionaries in their philological work. In 1553 there were in Mexico three principal colleges: the one at Tlaltetelco for the Indians, San Juan de Letrán for the mestizos, both under the care of the Franciscans, and another for the Spaniards and creoles who did not wish to mingle with the others. This last was under teachers with bachelors degrees from Spain, until the Augustinians founded their great college of San Pablo, 1575. They were the first to establish a school to be frequented by both creoles and Indians. Shortly afterwards the Jesuits founded the college of San Ildefonso in Mexico with the same idea in view. For all higher studies, however, students had to go to the universities of Spain, as the Mexican schools afforded no facilities for taking university courses. To remedy this the colonial authorities determined to establish a local university.

University of Mexico.—The governor, D. Antonio de Mendoza (1535-50), to whom New Spain owed so much for his interest in public instruction, petitioned the Emperor Charles V for the establishment of a university suitably endowed. The petition, supported by the city, the prelates, and the religious orders, was favourably received, and although D. Antonio de Mendoza had resigned the governorship of New Spain in 1550, to assume that of Peru, the credit of having begun the work is due to him. The university was founded during the term of his successor, D. Luis de Velasco (1550-64). The decree of foundation signed by the prince who later reigned as Philip II, was issued by the emperor at Toro on 21 August, 1551, and the university was opened 3 June, 1553. A yearly endowment of one thousand pounds in gold from the mines was conferred upon it, and all the faculties and privileges of the University of Salamanca. The university was founded, with their respective professors, as follows: Theology, Fray Pedro de la Peña, Dominican; afterwards Bishop of Quito, whose successor in the Faculty was the learned Juan Negrete, professor of the University of Paris; Sacred Scripture, Fray Don Jesus de la Veracruz; Canon Law, Dr. Morones, fiscal of the Audiencia; Civil Law, Dr. Melgarro; Institutes and Law, Licentiate Fray Toribio de Bandera; Anatomy, Dr. Cervantes Salazar; Grammar, Blas de Bustamante. Some years later the chairs of medicine and of the Otomic and Mexican languages were added. At first there was only one chair of medicine, but towards the close of the sixteenth century the division known as prima and secon was introduced, the former including anatomy and physiology, the latter, pathology and therapeutics.

The title of Royal and Pontifical was conferred on the new university and all the doctors then in Mexico, including Archbishop Montúfar, were attached to it. The professorships were divided into temporary and perpetual; the first were for four years, the second were affected only by the death or resignation of the incumbent. When a chair was won by competition the recipient paid the fees or dues, swore to fulfill his duties well, and promised to take no part in plays, theatres, or public demonstrations. According to the instructions left by the Duque de Lerma, the award of professorships was voted on by the senior auditor representing the Audiencia, the dean as representative of the Church, an official of the Inquisition, the dean and the rector of the university, the magister scholarum and the archbishop, who presided and in whose house the voting took place. So much was the influence that in the private instructions which the Marqués de Amarrillas brought from Madrid he was directed to consider the
advisability of adding to the statutes of the university a clause to the effect that the degree of theology should not be conferred on those who did not know the Mexican language, and fixing a special hour for its study by the students of philosophy, either before or while they were studying classics.

In the famous instruction which the second Conde de Revillagigedo left to his successor the Marqués de Braniforte, we find that by a royal decree of 11 June, 1792, all members of the university were obliged to obtain the viceroy's permission to marry. The viceroy, who was the vice-patron of the university, was to appoint the rector in case the election did not give a decisive plurality to any candidate. Towards the end of the eighteenth century a course of botany was introduced. The viceroy, Conde de Revillagigedo, declared that reforms were needed in the methods of study and in the manner of conferring degrees, that little attention was given to the classics, that there was no apparatus for the study of modern experimental physics, and that there were few modern works in the library. We know, however, that D. Manuel Ignacio Beye de Cisneros, who was rector in 1760, built the library and drew up regulations for it, which were confirmed by the king in 1761. It contained more than 10,000 volumes, many of them rare and valuable, especially regarding the history of Mexico, and it was open to the public morning and afternoon, two librarians with the degree of doctor being in charge.

At first the university was governed by provisional statutes drawn up by the viceroy and the Audiencia, modifying those of Salamanca as the circumstances of the country required. The Auditor Farfan amended these in 1550, and in 1583 still further revision was made by Archbishop Moya de Contreras. In 1645, D. Juan de Palafox, who was appointed visitor, compiled new statutes which, when approved by the king, were to supersede all previous enactments. Never-
inces or creating new ones, founding of new convents, sending visitors general or provincials, journeys of the religious, naming of presidents for chapters, any instructions from the superiors not directly connected with the ordinary government of the order, as well as the patents which revoked any concessions previously granted, had to be presented to the Council of the Indies. All Bulls and Briefs from Rome, instructions from generals and other religious superiors, had to go through the Council of the Indies, and without its seal no use could be made of them. The records of provincial councils and synods in the colonies, their constitutions and decrees, and those of the chapters and assemblies of the regulars, could not be published until revised and examined by the Council. The Briefs of the Congregation of the Propaganda appointing missionaries for the Indies carried no weight whatsoever if not accompanied by permission from the king or the Council of the Indies.

In order to form a new mission, province, or seminary for missionaries it was necessary to go through all these proceedings. The province or house soliciting this permission appointed a commissioner who personally or through his superiors made his request to the viceroy or governor, to the Audiencia of the place, and to the bishop, all of whom were obliged to submit their respective reports. The commissioner, supplied with the necessary permits of the viceroy or governor and of his superiors, sailed for Spain, and at the Court the matter was laid before the commissioner general of the Indies. When all this was done, and not before, the petition could be presented to the Supreme Council of the Indies, together with the documents which certified to the necessity for the new foundation. The permission having been obtained, the Council named the religious in which the religious should be drawn, and if the Council failed to do so the commissioner general did it, sometimes leaving it to the choice of the aforesaid religious commissioner. The selection having been made and the new missionaries gathered together, he could now embark with all the necessary authorization of superiors and council, and go to the Indies, whence he was obliged to report to the authorities who had given him permission to go to Spain. If a religious wished to leave the Indies and return to Spain, the permission of the father general, the commissioner general, or of the pope himself (royal decree of 29 July, 1584) did not suffice, it was necessary to obtain the consent of the king or the Council of the Indies. Sometimes the permission of the bishops of the province was sufficient, the viceroy, president, or governor having being first consulted; they were obliged to report to the council the reasons for giving the permission.

When the chapters of the religious orders were held in places where the viceroys or governors did not reside, the latter had to write to the assembled religious admonishing them to the strict observance of their rule and constitution; and if the chapter met where the viceroy or governor lived, he was obliged to be present, and in case he noted disorders, relaxation, monopolies, and partnerships indicative of simony and abuse, and fraternal correction proved insufficient to restore order, the culpable ones were either deprived of the visitation by the visitor, provincial, prior, guardian, or prelate who might be named or elected in the Indies, was obliged before exercising his office to notify the viceroy, president, Audiencia, or governor then in supreme power in the province, showing his letters of nomination and election, in order to obtain the protection and help necessary for the exercise of the duties of his office in the province (royal decree, 1 June, 1654). In the same decree it was ordered that "the provincials of all orders residing in the Indies shall each and every one have always ready a list of the monasteries and houses under their control and the control of their subjects in the province, also all the religious, giving each one's name, age, qualifications, the office or ministry each one exercises; and this shall be given each year to our viceroy, Audiencia, or governor, or to the person exercising the supreme government of the province, adding or subtracting the names of the religious who have been admitted to the communities or who have left. The provincials of the orders, each and every one, shall make a list of the religious who are engaged in the work of teaching catechism to the Indians, administering the sacraments, and acting as parish priests where the principal monasteries are situated, and this shall be given each year to our viceroy, Audiencia, or governor, who will give it to the bishop, so that he may know what persons are engaged in administering the sacraments and doing the work of parish priests . . . . ."

From this and much more that might be added if space permitted it may be seen that the civil power had almost absolute control in the religious life of the colonies, including those of New Spain. Some of these privileges had been usurped by the kings, and others had been granted by the Holy See. To have a proper understanding of the reason of these concessions, which now seem to us excessive, we must bear in mind all that the Spanish kings did for the cause of religion in America. They erected and endowed all the churches in the New World, defrayed the traveling expenses of the religious and bishops until they reached their posts; they had assigned different amounts, by way of alms, to churches of religious orders, in order that these might be supplied with oil, lights, wine, altar breads, and other requisites for Divine worship. The building of new churches and cathedrals, the foundation of missions, depended largely on the royal bounty. When some church, especially in the Indian towns, needed repairing, the citizens could easily, on application, be freed from the tribute which was paid to the king, in order to devote the money to the needs of the church. Although the Bull of Alexander VI conferred the titles of all villages and kingdoms on condition that he should endow the churches and provide an adequate maintenance for their ministers, the kings nevertheless rarely availed themselves
of the grant, but donated to the bishops, dioceses, clergy, churches, and hospitals in the Indies a great part of what was due them from this source.

In so far as the royal patronage in New Spain is concerned, it must be admitted, in deference to the truth, that if in some instances royal decisions were oppressive and little in accordance with the liberty of the Church; the royal supervision in many other respects was beneficial. In illustration of the first may be cited the case of the bishop who, without reflecting that he had not the authorization of the Council of the Indies, and that he ought to advise the viceroy, solemnly promulgated the decree which Clement X issued when he ascended the pontifical throne, granting a general jubilee to all the faithful who should pray to the Divine Majesty that he might be granted the

and monasteries that were built in New Spain, it will be seen that the king, instead of using their royal prerogatives to hinder these foundations, did all in their power to spread and encourage them.

The much vexed question of alternate rule, which caused much dissension in the religious orders, moved Pope Innocent XII to decree that in the provinces of such religious in America as had Europeans and Indians in the communities, the prelacies should be conferred alternately, sometimes on the one and sometimes on the others. When the king heard that the papal order was not being carried out in Mexico, he required the viceroy, D. Antonio Sebastian de Toledo, Marques de Mancera, by official decree of 25 November, 1667, to investigate the matter thoroughly, and to have the orders of the Holy Father carried out. Although at first owing to the scarcity of secular priests, it was permitted religious to hold parishes, later, learning that it was the cause of relaxed discipline among them, of exemption from episcopal visitation, and sometimes of unfairness and abuse of the Indians, they did everything within their power to have these religious replaced by secular priests. As to the intervention of the viceroy in these religious orders, it is known that the part taken by the Conde de Revillagigedo, viceroy from 1746-55, in the chapter of the Carmelites, to settle the question of admitting a visitor, was most beneficial, as well as other regulations among the Franciscans, Augustinians, and Brothers of St. John of God. In the instructions given by Ferdinand VI, 1755, to D. Antonio de Ahumada y Villalón, Marques de las Amarillas, who was leaving for his post as Viceroy of New Spain, the following is found: “See that the bishops, the secular and religious clergy, receive all the support they need from the civil courts, to uproot idolatry; that those having Indians, negroes, or mulattos in their homes as servants send them daily to the Christian classes, and that those working in the fields be given the same opportunity on Sunday and other days of precept, not occupying them in other things until they have learned the catechism; and that if they do not comply they shall be fined. All priests who are to work among the Indians should know their languages, and it is necessary that they should study these languages. The condition of the Indians in all New Spain should be investigated to see if they are oppressed by those whose duty it is to teach them, and in case such conditions are found to exist, they are to be reported to the bishop, and with his help measures must be taken to eradicate the evil.”

The Inquisition in New Spain.—For some writers the Spanish Inquisition in Mexico has always been a particularly alarming subject, the exaggerated accounts of its atrocities and the number of its victims verging on the ridiculous. It has even been said that if the Spaniards abolished the human sacrifices of the ancient Aztec régime, they more than replaced them in the benefices of the Inquisition. Here, however, the truth is that when Viceroy Antonio de la Valenca, when he arrived in Mexico in 1524, bore the title of Commissioner General of the Inquisition in New Spain, but judgment of offences of a grave nature was reserved to the Inquisitor of the Islas y Tierra Firme, who resided in the Island of San Domingo. Fray Martin was to hold this office until some Dominicans on whom the official charge of Inquisitor had been conferred should arrive in Mexico. And in fact, when the first Dominicans reached Mexico in 1526, their superior, Fray Tomas Ortiz, became commissioner of the Inquisition. He returned almost immediately to Spain, and Fray Domingo de Betanzos succeeded him. In 1528 the new superior of the Dominicans, Fray Vicente de Santa Maria, was sent to the Indies. At the time of the second Audiencia, of which the eminent D. Sebastian de Fuen Leal was president, a meeting was held, attended by Bishop Zumärnga, Cortés, and several of the most influential men of the
capital, at which it was decided "that on account of the intercourse with foreigners, and because many privateers that cruised along the coasts might introduce evil customs and habits among the natives and this, by the grace of God had been preserved from the taint of heresy, it was necessary to establish the Holy Office of the Inquisition".

It was no doubt in consequence of this resolution that on 27 June, 1535, Bishop Zumárraga was appointed inquisitor, with ample faculties, including that of turning over the offender to the secular arm and of excommunicating the Holy Office, but he did not establish the tribunal, but it is known that he tried and condemned to be burnt a Texocan noble accused of having sacrificed human beings. After this it was forbidden by the royal decree of Charles V, of 15 October, 1538, to try cases against the Indians before the Holy Office, and that in matters of faith the bishop should be their judge. Since then there is no record of a single Indian having been tried before the tribunal of the Inquisition. In 1554, Archbishop Montós, a Dominican and prior of the Inquisition in Granada, though not bearing the title of inquisitor, proceeded as though thus empowered, no doubt because of the ordinary jurisdiction possessed by the bishop in matters of faith, and passed the autos of 1555 and 1558. Cardinal Diego de Espinosa, Bishop of Sigüenza, and Grand Inquisitor of Spain, appointed as inquisitor for Mexico D. Pedro Moya de Contreras, also two lawyers, Juan Cervantes and Alonso Fernández de Bonilla. Their jurisdiction extended over all of New Spain, Guatemala, and the Philippines. The royal decree of 16 August, 1570, commanded that the City of Mexico was to aid and respect the inquisitors, and on 2 November, 1571, the tribunal was established with all due solemnity. It exercised its authority in Mexico until 8 June, 1813, when the decree of the Spanish Cortes suppressing it was published. On 21 January, 1814, it was re-established, and in 1820 definitively abolished.

In New Spain the Tribunal of the Inquisition was composed of three Apostolic inquisitors and a treasurer, each with a salary of three thousand pesos, paid three times a year in advance by the canons of the cathedrals of their respective districts. There was also a head constable, a trustee, treasurer, three secretaries, several consultors, qualificators, and lay officials. The tribunal had authority to pass general and particular autos de fe. What the viceroys of Mexico thought of this tribunal may be gathered from the many instructions which by order of the king each vicerey had to leave for his successor in the government of the colony. And it may be noted that these instructions, coming from men who were laying down the reins of government, speak with perfect freedom, not hesitating to censure what was considered worthy of censure. From these instructions it is evident that the authority of the tribunal was as absolute as it is generally supposed. The Marqués de Mancera, in the instructions left 22 Oct., 1673, for his successor the Duque de Veragua, says: "The Tribunal of the Holy Office is the best of the jurisdiction and feared and respected with all due reverence in these provinces, knowing full well that, owing to its reverence and vigilance, they find themselves by the grace of God free from the errors and abominations which at different times the common enemy has sought to sow in their midst", adds, "but, as its jurisdiction so absolute, the tribunals do not always keep as it should within its proper limits, nor do the viceroys, governors, or Audiencias take it upon themselves to hold it within bounds, except in cases of the most urgent necessity; nevertheless, when the excesses are notably prejudicial to the respect due the royal representation, to its jurisdiction, or its exchequer, or for any other cause, there is special authority for applying a suitable remedy, and I made use of this faculty at the close of the year 1666", etc. The Duque de Linares says in his instruction to the Marqués de Valero, in 1716, speaking of the inquisitors of his time: "Of the inquisitors I should inform Your Excellency that I am indebted to them not only for a just respect, esteem, and appreciation for my official character, but their mildness and prudence have been such that when the apparent zeal of some of the ministers has attempted to enkindle some sparks, I have been able to extinguish them owing to the consultations and the mutual confidence which have always existed between us.

For the sake of clearness, the persons condemned by the Inquisition may be placed under three heads: relajados (delivered to the secular arm for execution of sentence) in person or effigy, reconciliados (reconciled), and penitentes (penitents). The relajados in person were burnt, either alive or first garroted. On the way to the place of execution they were clothed in the samarra, a sort of seapular of cloth or cotton, yellow or red, upon which dragons, demons, and flames were painted, among which could be seen the picture of the criminal. The head was covered with a species of mitre called coroza, covered with the same devices. The relajados in effigy were those who, having escaped or died, were burned in effigy, sometimes together with their bones and bodies. This was done with those who died or who committed suicide during the process. It sometimes happened that a criminal attempted to commit suicide; if before dying he begged pardon and retracted his errors, he was reconciled in effigy. Such was the case of the French physician, Etienne Morel, whose auto de fe was carried out 9 August, 1795. The reconciliados were those who, recognizing their offences and errors, retracting and asked pardon. They were not condemned to death, but were obliged to submit to various punishments. One was, to wear the San Benito, called fuego revolto or revuelto, a garment similar to that worn by the relajados, with a corresponding coroza, only that in this the flames pointed downwards to show that by their repentance they had escaped the capital punishment. Other forms of punishment were inflicted according to the gravity of the offence—exile, the galleys, whipping, imprisonment, certain
prayers and psalms to be recited on certain days of the year, carrying green candles, confiscation of property, etc.

The ordinary penitents were those whose faults did not merit the death sentence. They wore the plain San Benito, that is, similar in form to the other, but decorated with the cross of St. Andrew, and they wore no coroza. Various punishments were imposed on them, always less than those of the reconciliados, and at times almost grotesque, e.g., the case of the criminal condemned on 7 December, 1664, of whom it is recorded, “The sentence having been read, he was taken out into the court of the convent, placed on a scaffold, and stripped to the waist. Indians then smeared him with honey, feathered him, and left him in the sun for four hours.” From the list made by D. José Punatorio of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, who copied every tablet in the transept of Mexico cathedral, we see that the crimes usually condemned by the Inquisition were heresy and Judaism. Many were condemned for blasphemy, bigamy, perjury, forgery, and witchcraft, as idolators, Illuminati, Freemasons, and apostates; for having heard confessions and said Mass without His Holiness’s leave; for lying, with intent to deceive, received Holy orders before attaining the prescribed canonical age, for rebaptizing, abetting polygamy, and feigning revelations (autos de fe 21 June, 1789 and 8 August, 1795).

A résumé of the autos de fe from the figures of Fr. Richardo, supplemented by others, gives the following result:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reconcilados in Person</th>
<th>Reconcilados in Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto of Fray Martín de Valencia 1555-62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fray Francisco de la Encomienda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fray Alonso de Montúfar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fray Juan de la Encomienda</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The list published by J. García Icazbalceta, including only the autos providing for capital punishment, is somewhat different:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reconcilados in Person</th>
<th>Reconcilados in Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fray Martín de Valencia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fray Jerónimo Vázquez</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquisition Auto of 1574</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ of 1586</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ of 1601</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ of 1635</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ of 1649</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ of 1659</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ of 1678</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ of 1688</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ of 1699</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ of 1715</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ of 1735</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in 277 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This number can be increased, as the autos from 1703 to 1728 (except 1715) are not included, although during this period cases were rarely turned over to the secular arm. And even allowing for this it is evident that the number of victims commonly attributed to the Inquisition in New Spain is greatly exaggerated.

From this it may be seen how erroneous it is to denounce the Inquisition as one of the greatest blots of the Spanish domination in Mexico. The Inquisition existed in Spain and it was nature that it should be established in the new colonies. As the Indians were exempt from its jurisdiction, the full measure of its severity fell upon the Spaniards and heretics, pirates or otherwise, of other nations who infested the coasts of New Spain. In fact, in the autos de fe the greater number of the condemned were Portuguese, for extending its jurisdiction far beyond the confines of the Aztec empire, barely reached fifty victims. The Inquisition pardoned readily, and those who recognized their errors and repented it easily reconciled. When it found or thought it found (for this tribunal like every other human tribunal made its mistakes) a criminal, it was turned over to the secular authorities, whose less lenient justice, which passed and executed the sentence. In fact the Inquisition did no more nor less than the jury of to-day. It is true that it made use of the torture, but this was a practice common to all tribunals of that time. It also made use of the secret process—a method not unlikely to be productive of errors—but it is impossible to set aside the laws on the ground that it mitigated by repenting if one were guilty, or by finally professing the Catholic Faith if one were not. Nor can the Inquisition be blamed for judging heresy a crime punishable by death; it was so held by all the civil courts of the times, and not without reason, because the heretics of those days were the initiators of rebellion in Catholic countries. At the same time people could not be held to be Catholics in England to be a Catholic was a crime punishable by death (see Penal Laws). Judged impartially, the Inquisition in New Spain appears as a tribunal which shares, it is true, the defects of contemporary methods, subject to mistakes like all other human institutions, more merciful than any other court under similar circumstances, above all if the relative number of death sentences and the large number of reconciles be taken into consideration, as well as the glory of having accomplished at the cost of a small number of lives, what the nations of Europe could not achieve even through the medium of long, bloody, fratricidal wars, the unity of religion and the preservation of the faith. As regards the auto de fe of 27 November, 1815, which condemned D. José María Morelos, the principal leader of the war of independence, see Morelos.

(7) The Spanish Government and the Colony.—Mexico having been conquered, Cortés, in virtue of the famous election of Vera Cruz and through force of circumstance, became the viceroy. However, Charles V realized the importance of the conquest without deposing Cortés, he began sending over other officials who, it may be said, were not very wisely chosen. Cortés, though outwardly complying, did not receive them well, doubtless because he foresaw that they would be a disturbing element in the recently conquered territories. When, however, he started on his famous expedition of the Iberians, he showed equality little tact in selecting the men he left to fill his place. In the selection of the first Audiencia (1528-31), composed of Nuño de Guzmán, Juan Ortiz Matienzo, and Diego Degadillo, the emperor was even more tactless. The excesses and injustices of these judges were innumerable, and the entire colony suffered. Nothing changed under the government of the second Audiencia (1531-35), composed of Bishop Sebastián Ramírez de Fuen Leal, D. Vasco de Quiroga, D. Francisco Ceinos, and D. Juan Salmerón. Beginning the work of reconstruction with zeal and perfect integrity, they met at the very outset with an obstacle that greatly hindered legislation destroyed by the conquest had not been replaced by any other, while the Spanish code was entirely inadequate for the new dominions. To meet this situation, Spanish kings began formulating and
sending over a multitude of royal decrees, applicable sometimes to only one province or relating to some particular question, frequently conflicting and contradictory because the sovereigns were working in the dark, deciding questions as they presented themselves, often upon the basis of an exact opinion of the matters involved. So numerous were the decrees that the collection formed a library of documents, notwithstanding which many cases remained unprovided for, and could only be settled by special decisions. These, however, ran the risk of royal disapproval, and the viceroy and governors rarely cared to assume the responsibility of understanding the beneficial effects of such a system; it is only necessary to picture a person, ruled by the changeable mind of a sovereign 2000 leagues away, and requiring years to investigate and report on questions submitted. When reference is made to the famous "Recolección de Indias," many imagine that it was some code of very early date, promulgated in the sixteenth century, whereas it did not go into effect until the end of the seventeenth century, about midway in the period of Spanish domination. Whatever honour redounds to Spain from this code is diminished by the tardiness of its execution.

The Spanish Government is reproached for having isolated Mexico and hindered foreign commerce. The immense extent of the colony of New Spain, the extensive sea routes on all sides, the scanty population, the fatal and insupportable climate in certain sections, the deserts, the impenetrable forests, the gigantic mountain ranges, made communication and defence against foreign aggression extremely difficult. The envy and covetousness of other nations, chafing under the sting of having rejected the offer of the discovery, were a constant source of menace to these over-sea possessions. Strangers could select her weakest point of attack; Spain had to defend all sides. Means of communication, established with difficulty, were constantly being interrupted; foreign nations, without distinguishing between times of war and times of peace, kept up a continuous piratical warfare, sacked the commerce, and seized the cargoes of the ships. While this state of continual aggression and menace delayed and impeded the development of the colony, those responsible for it were the very ones to bring forward this charge against Spain. To allow such people to enter freely, even under the pretext of trade, was very dangerous. A foothold once established, it would not have been difficult for them to overawe the entire country. But it was precisely to avoid this that it was necessary to wage incessant war. This is amply proved by the results attending the concession granted the English to cut timber in Yucatan, which ended in the absorption by the English Government of the entire strip of Mexican territory now known as British Honduras. It was therefore imperative to isolate the colony in order to keep it, without, however, for this reason oppressing it.

One cannot brand as stupid and blind a state policy that without any great armed force maintained for three hundred years, submissive and peaceful, extensive distant territories, the object of universal envy. It is true that the individual may lose liberty of the press, but this was the case also in many European countries, and notwithstanding this, in Spain as well as in Mexico and through all America, the writings of Las Casas, which almost questioned the legitimacy of the conquest of the Indies, circulated freely. The first printing machine was brought to the New World during the lifetime of this man, for the personal advantage of any individual, but through the paternal solicitude of Bishop Zumarraga and the Viceroy D. Antonio de Mendoza. Public instruction, good or bad, according to individual opinion, was on an equality with that of Spain, and to the universities founded in Mexico, which were of the same rank as those of Spain, many noted professors were sent. The
taxes were not onerous, and if at times these were excessive it did not arise from insupportable exactions, but from the methods of administration. Many of the mistakes noted to-day, and so easily censured, were due to the impossibility of one man alone attending to all the details of so complicated a piece of machinery, above all to the great distance of the central government. Scattered through all the ancient documents may be found complaints attributing many of the troubles affecting the Indies to "the cursed distance that prevents their enjoying the presence of their king." The truth, though sought in all earnestness, came to the royal knowledge late, and after many difficulties; it was therefore natural that the remedies for evils should be almost always late.

The motives and intentions of the Spanish kings could not have been better; at times they bordered on the Utopian, but it was humanly impossible that among so many officials all should have been exemplary. As the king was obliged to act through them, it was unavoidable that his wishes should often be either intentionally or unintentionally ignored. The wealth of the country excited envy; and its great distance mitigated fear. The Juicio de Residencia, totally unknown to-day, did not always prove efficacious, yet its establishment shows the earnest desire of restricting the prerogatives of the administration, and at times it proved a strong controlling force that made itself felt. It is, therefore, a vulgar error to believe that the Spanish Government was mercifully towards the Colony of Mexico. Like all nations, Spain sought revenue from her colony (disinterestedness and charity are not governmental virtues), but she did not exhaust its resources. If at times special restrictions were imposed, they were the outcome of circumstances and of the not unnatural desire to retain possession of the colony.

Foremost among the public works undertaken by the vice-regal Government was the draining of the Valley of Mexico. The decree authorising this work is dated 23 October, 1607, and the funds for the work were raised by a tax of 1 per cent. levied on all the
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residencies of the city, seeing that their owners would profit most directly by the improvement. The Indians engaged upon this work were paid 5 reales (63 cents) per month for a daily ration of 1 pound of meat, peppers, wood, and other provisions. A hospital was founded at Huesquetoca for the benefit of disabled workmen, ground being broken on 28 November, 1607, by the Viceroy D. Luis de Valasco, who dug the first sod, after Mass had been said in the village of Nochistongo. Father Juan Sánchez, S. J., and the cosmographer, Enrique Martín (Martínez), were placed in charge of the work. Later Father Sánchez retired, leaving Martín in full charge. This vast work employed the labour of 471,154 men. The Nochistongo tunnel measured over four miles long, with a section measuring 11 feet 6 inches by 13 feet 7 inches. The work was finished on May 30, 1608, and a report made by the Viceroy. It is stated that only 50 of the workmen had died, and of these 10 were accidentally killed. It is true that this great work did not give the expected results, but it nevertheless remains to the credit of the Government that undertook it for the welfare of the people. Finally, it may be noted that in examining the list of the first 200 named Mexican nobles, the desire of the Spanish monarchs that the persons entrusted with this charge should be persons of importance, is very evident, and if there were some who proved unworthy of the duty entrusted to them, oppressing the people and furthering their own private interests, there were many others, like Menéndez, Vázquez de Espinosa, Villavicencio, Rivera, Juárez, Arredondo, Buclare, the second Conde de Revillagigedo, and others who proved themselves upright and prudent governors, and merited the gratitude of the colony.

Independent Mexico.—The revolt of the English colonies in America, the troubles of the French Revolution, the proclamation of Joseph Bonaparte as King Joseph, the uprising in Spain against Napoleon, and old racial antipathies, are the causes to which the independence of Mexico is usually attributed. This was doubtless precipitated by the fact that Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, parish priest of Dolores, discovered that his plot was on the point of being betrayed, and on 16 September, 1810, raised the standard of independence. From the little city of Dolores he marched with an ill-assorted, badly armed company of Indians to the very capital itself, but, not daring to attack it, retraced his steps to Guadalajara. At the bridge of Calderón he was defeated, and pursued as he fled through Acapulco de Bajan; he was captured and executed at Chihuahua, 30 July, 1811. His head was cut off by the young Maria Morelos, parish priest of Caracuaro, and upon his death by the Spaniard Mina. When Mina was captured and put to death, almost all hope of gaining independence seemed lost. D. Vicente Guerrero, entrenched in the mountains, kept up a desultory warfare until negotiations were opened with the royalist general, D. Agustín de Itur- barri. The Viceroy then, on the advice of the insurgent leaders, arrived in the town of Iguála, by which Mexico was to be independent, its government a constitutional monarchy, and the Roman Catholic religion the only one recognized and tolerated. Fer- dinand VII was chosen as sovereign or, in his default, one of his brothers or some member of the reigning house who should be chosen by the Congress. The secular and regular clergy were to be maintained in all their former privileges and pre-eminence.

Gradually both royalists and insurgent began to support this plan, and on 24 August, 1821, by the Treaty of Córdoba, even the Viceroy D. Juan O'Don- ojo, who had just landed at Vera Cruz, signed his consent. On the same day 21 the army of las tres garantías (three guarantees), as it was called, entered the City of Mexico. At the beginning of 1822 it became known that the Spanish Government refused to ratify the treaty, and the partisans of Iturbide, taking advantage of this, proclaimed him emperor. Owing, however, to the difficulties and opposition per week, the ministering year, and withdrew to Leghorn, Italy. In 1824, hoping once more to be of service to his country, and without knowing that he was under sentence of death by the Government, he returned to Mexico. He was arrested on his arrival, condemned, and put to death on 19 July, 1824. Freemasonry, so actively promoted in Mexico by the first mission of the United States, Joel R. Poinsett, began gradually to lessen the loyalty which, in accordance with the plan of Iguála, both the rulers and the government had manifested towards the Church. Little by little laws were enacted against the Church, curtailing its rights, as, for example, in 1833, the exclusion of the clergy from the public schools, notwithstanding the fact that at the time the president, D. Valentín Gómez Farías, claimed for the Republican Government all the privileges of the royal patronage, with the power of filling vacant seats and other ecclesiastical benefices.

General Antonio López de Santa Anna dominated the scene for almost fifty years, but he was a man without principle, and his policy was weak and vacillating. Whatever services he rendered his country were more than outweighed by the many evils of his administration. From 1824 to 1846 the nation was embroiled in an interminable series of revolutions, having to face at the same time some serious national issues. Guate- mala, Yucatán, which had seceded from the empire, was never reunited; the French invaded the country; Yucatan separated from the central government for several years, and the independence of Texas brought on the war with the United States. The North American troops were in possession of the capital, and, to establish peace, it was necessary to cede to the conquerors all the territories south of the Rio Grande, besides California, Arizona, and New Mexico. And then, when peace was most necessary for the healing of the nation's wounds, there came, instead, civil wars and bloodshed. In 1851, Pius IX sent Monsignor Luis Clementi to settle some religious questions. He was officially received by the president, Señor Arista, but not formally granted the law and return to Rome without having accomplished anything. Dissensions continued, and in 1857 the famous Constitution, which is still in force in the republic, was promulgated by the president, Ignacio Comonfort. His successor, Benito Juárez, issued a series of laws against the Catholic religion. At this time an attempt was made to carry a Catholic bishop to Mexico. Plans were made by the secret societies, as well as other anti-Catholic associations of reformers, to induce President Juárez to declare that the Mexican nation separated herself from communion with Rome, and establish a national religion whose first pontiff, named by the Government, should be Sr. Pardo, formerly parish priest of Zotzila in Yucatan, who had frequently obtained a Bull from Gregory XVI consecrating him titular Bishop of Germanopolis and auxiliary to D. Jose María Guerra, Bishop of Yucatan. The sudden death of Sr. Pardo, in May, 1861, ended this abortive attempt.

This was followed by the French intervention, the empire, and the tragedy of Corredor Las Campanas in June, 1867. In 1861, while Maximilian was emperor, the papal nuncio, Monsignor Meglia, visited Mexico, but he did not obtain anything from the emperor, as Maximilian declared that the "Reform Laws", with regard to laicization of church property, would be upheld. Juárez died in 1872, and was succeeded by D. Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada. The latter was overthrown by Porfirio Díaz, who became president. He has filled this office until the present time (1910), with the exception of one term from 1880 to 1884. His concili-
ty policy, the encouragement, protection, and support of industries, the opening of ways of communication, have developed the rich resources of the country, and given Mexico an epoch of much needed peace.

Constitution of 1857 and Laws of Reform. - From 1872, when the law was issued permitting the Government to take possession of the Philippine mission property, and of revenues from pious foundations which were not to be spent within the limits of the Mexican Republic, to the law of 23 November, 1855, Article 42 of which abolished all ecclesiastical jurisdiction in civil matters, a series of laws were enacted by Congress and the legislatures of the states clearly showing the anti-religious spirit of those who framed them. This spirit was at its height from 1857 to 1874. During the presidency of D. Ignacio Comonfort the famous Constitution of 1857, decreeing the separation of Church and State, was promulgated, and in the years following Benito Juárez framed innumerable laws systematizing the provisions of the Constitution and enforcing the separation, and in 1874 President D. Sebastian Lerdo de Tejada raised many of the Reform Laws framed by Juárez to constitutional statutes.

(A) The Church and her Privileges. —

Law of 11 August, 1859, Art. 3.—All laws, circulars, and ordinances of any kind whatsoever, established by public authority, by last will and testament, or by custom, which require officials to attend public religious functions, in a body or separately, are repealed. Law of 4 December, 1860: Art. 8.—Right of asylum in churches is abolished, and force may and should be employed in whatever measure it may be deemed necessary to arrest and remove according to law a declared or suspected criminal or enemy of the ecclesiastical authorities having a right to intervene. Art. 17.—Official recognition formerly given to various ecclesiastical persons and corporations is withdrawn. Art. 18.—The use of church bells is to be regulated by police ordinance. Art. 24.—Public officials are forbidden in their official capacity to assist at any religious ceremony, or entertain in honour of a clergyman, however high in rank he may be. Troops of soldiers are included in the foregoing prohibition.

Law of 13 May, 1873, only article. —No religious rite or demonstration of any kind whatsoever may take place outside of the church building in any part of the Republic. Law of 14 December, 1874, Art. 3. —No official, official corporation, or body of troops may attend in an official capacity religious services of any kind whatsoever, nor shall the Government recognize in any manner whatsoever religious solemnities. All days, therefore, that do not commemorate some exclusively civil event cease to be holidays. Sundays are set apart as days of rest for offices and public institutions. Art. 5. —No religious rite may take place outside the church building, neither shall the ministers of religion or any individual of either sex, of any denomination whatsoever, wear in public a special dress or insignia which would characterize him in any way, under penalty of a fine of ten to two hundred dollars.

(B) Religious Orders. —Constitution of 1857, Art. 5. —The State cannot allow any contract, pact, or agreement to go into effect that has for its object the im-
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The law does not recognize monastic orders, nor can it permit their establishment, whatever be their designation or object. Art. 27. —Religious institutions or corporations, whatever their character, name, period of existence, and object, and such civil institutions as are under the patronage, direction, or administration of these, or of the ministers of any religious denomination, shall have no legal right to acquire title to or administer any property, but such buildings as are destined for the immediate and direct use of said corporations and institutions. Neither shall they have the right to acquire or manage revenues derived from real estate.

Law of 12 July, 1859, Art. 5.—All the male religious orders which exist throughout the republic, whatever their name or the purpose of their existence, are hereby suppressed throughout the whole republic, as also all archiconfraternities, confraternities, congregations, or sisterhoods annexed to the religious communities, cathedrals, parishes, or any other churches.

Art. 6.—The foundation or erection of new convents of regulars, archiconfraternities, confraternities, congregations, or sisterhoods, under whatever form or name is given them, is prohibited, likewise the wearing of the garb of the suppressed orders. Art. 7.—By this law the ecclesiastics of the suppressed orders are reduced to the condition of secular clergy, and shall, like these, be subject as regards the exercise of their ministry to the ordinances of their respective dioceses. Art. 12.—All books, printed or manuscript, paintings, antiquities, and other articles belonging to the suppressed religious communities shall be given to the national archives, libraries, and other public establishments. Art. 13. —All members of the suppressed orders who fifteen days after the publication of this law in their respective localities shall continue to wear the habit or live in community shall forfeit the right to collect their quota as assigned by Article 8, and if after the term of 15 days designated by this Article they should reunite in any place and appear to follow their community life, they shall immediately be expelled from the country. Art. 21.—All novitiates for women are perpetually closed. Those at present in novitiates cannot be professed. Law of 26 Feb., 1863, Art. 1. —All religious communities of women are suppressed throughout the republic. Law of 25 September, 1873, Art 5. —The law does not recognize monastic orders, nor can it permit their establishment, whatever their name or the object for which they are founded.

Law of 4 Dec., 1873, Art. 19. —The State does not recognize monastic orders nor can it permit their establishment, whatever their name or the object for which they are founded. Any orders that may be secretly established shall be considered unlawful assemblies which the authorities may dissolve should the members attempt to live in community, and in all such cases the superiors or heads shall be judged criminals, infringing on individual rights according to Article 97 of the Penal Code of the District, which is declared in force in all the republic.
(C) Church Property.—Law of 12 July, 1859, Art. 1.—All property which under different titles has been administered by the secular and regular clergy, whatever law of proper purpose it may have been enjoyment, and becomes the property of the State. Law of 5 February, 1861, Art. 100.—The government hands over all parochial residences, episcopal palaces, and dwellings of the heads of any denomination, declaring them inalienable and free from taxation as long as they are set apart from any other institution, and the law of 28 September, 1873, Art. 3.—No religious institution may acquire property nor the revenue derived from property. Law of 10 Oct., 1874, Art. 16.—The direct ownership of the churches nationalized according to the law of 12 July, 1859, and left for the maintenance of Catholic worship, as well as those which have since been turned over to any other institution, continues to remain in the nation; but their exclusive use, preservation, and improvement, as long as no decree of consolidation is issued, remains with the religious institutions to which they have been granted. Art. 17.—The buildings mentioned in the preceding article will be exempt from taxation, except when they have actually or nominally passed into the hands of individuals or religious corporations under the title without transmitting it to a religious society; in such cases the property shall be subject to the common law.

(D) Legacies and Gifts.—Law of 14 December, 1874, Art. 8.—Legacies made in favor of ministers of religion, of their relatives to the fourth degree, and in favor of religious corporations, shall be exempt from the taxes which the law imposes for this privilege of exemption.

(E) Civil Marriage and Divorce.—Law of 23 July, 1859, Art. 1.—Marriage is a civil contract that can directly and validly be contracted before the civil authority by the parties, having complied with the formalities of the law, present themselves before the proper authority, and freely express their desire of being united in marriage. Law of 4 December, 1860, Art. 20.—The civil authorities shall not interfere in the religious rites and practices concerning marriage, but the contract from which marriage results in law is slavery to the laws. Any other marriage that is contracted in the republic without observing the formalities prescribed by these laws is null, and therefore ineffectual to produce any of the civil ends which the law grants only to a lawfully contracted marriage. Law of 10 December, 1874, Art. 23.—All decisions regarding marriage or divorce, subject to the law to the marriage laws, must be tried before the civil tribunals which will determine the law without taking into consideration any resolutions on this subject that may have been provided by the ministers of religion.

(F) Cemeteries and Graves.—Law of 31 July, 1859, Art. 1.—The intervention of the clergy, secular or religious, in religious cemeteries, whether within or outside the parishes, to the extent that until the present time has been in force, ceases throughout the republic. Law of 4 December, 1860, Art. 21.—The governors of states, districts, and territories shall exercise the strictest vigilance for the enforcement of the laws in regard to cemeteries and burial grounds, and in no place shall decent burial be refused the dead no matter what may be the decision of the priests or their respective churches.

(G) Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.—Law of 2 February, 1861, Art. 1.—All hospitals and charitable institutions which up to the present time have been under ecclesiastical authority and managed by religious corporations or committees of the Government are secularized and placed under the immediate supervision of the civil authorities. Law of 28 February, 1861, Art. 1.—All hospitals, asylums, houses of correction, and charitable institutions are prohibited in all federal, state, and municipal schools. Morality will be taught in all of the schools when the nature of their constitutions permits it, but without reference to any form of religion. The instruction of this article will be punished by a fine of from 25 to 200 pesos, and dismissal from office if the offense is repeated.

(H) Oaths.—Law of 25 September, 1873, Art. 21.—The simple promise to speak the truth and to fulfill the obligations it entails, shall take the place of the religious oath with its consequences and penalties.

(I) Instruction.—Law of 4 December, 1874, Art. 4.—Religious instruction and the exercises of any form of religion are prohibited in all federal, state, and municipal schools. Morality will be taught in all of the schools when the nature of their constitutions permits it, but without reference to any form of religion. The instruction of this article will be punished by a fine of from 25 to 200 pesos, and dismissal from office if the offense is repeated.

(J) Public Office.—Constitution of 1857, Art. 56.—No member of the ecclesiastical body can be elected a congressman or appointed by the law of 4 December, 1874, Art. 58.—Nominations for senator are subject to the same conditions as those for congressman.

Ecclesiastical Organization.—There is no doubt that the See of Yucatan, with the title of Carolensis, under the patronage of Nuestra Senora de los Remedios, was the first bishopric erected in Mexico; the see of San Cristobal de las Casas, on January, 1518, proves this. The erection of this diocese followed the first reports of the discovery of the peninsula, and by the Bull we see that Yucatan was still thought to be an island. However, as soon as more definite information was received concerning Mexico after the conquest, establishing the fact that Yucatan was not an island, the erection of the diocese were suspended, especially as the Spaniards, diverted by other enterprises, gave little thought to Yucatan, and when it was abandoned by D. Francisco de Montejo, in 1527, they did not return until 1542. It may also be noted that when Clement VII named Fray Julian de Garces first Bishop of Oriente from Tlaxcalan, in 1543, the see of Yucatan was still used, and the Emperor Charles V, using the faculties granted him by the popes of assigning the limits of new dioceses, says in the royal decree which accompanied the Bull: "We declare, assign, and determine as the limits of the Bishopric of Yucatan and Santa Maria de los Remedios the following lands and territories . . .". As Tlaxcalan had a greater population and was nearer the capital, Bishop Garces established the episcopal residence there, from whence it was afterwards moved to Puebla.

Up to 1544 the dioceses in New Spain were:—Puebla, erected in 1526 at Tlaxcalan, translated to Puebla, 1539; Guatemala, 1530; Oaxaca, 1538; Michoacan, erected in 1536 at Tlaixmantlan, translated at the time to Patzcuaro, and from there to the new city of Valladolid, now Morelia; Chiapas, 1546. They were all suffragans of the Archdiocese of Seville in Spain. Yucatan, though erected first, never had any resident bishop until Law of 31 January, 1545, at the solicitation of Charles V, the Holy Father, Paul III, separated these dioceses from the metropolitan See of Seville and erected the Archdiocese of Mexico, with
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the above-mentioned dioceses for suffragans. Before
the end of the sixteenth century the ecclesiastical
Province of Mexico included, besides those already
mentioned, the Diocese of Comayagua in Honduras, erected
1539; Guadalajara, 1548; Verapaz in Guatemala,
erected in 1556, suppressed 1605; Manila in the Philip-
pine Islands, erected 1581.

At the close of the eighteenth century all the dioces,
ses situated in the Mexican territory had been
separated to form new ecclesiastical provinces, and
Chiapas, which from 1743 had belonged to the Arch-
dioce of Guatemala, was not reunited to the ecclesi-
astical Province of Mexico until the middle of the
nineteenth century. Other new dioceses had been
formed: Durango, 1620; Monterey, with the title of
Lima; Guadalajara, the episcopal residence of eight
different cities at various epochs, Arizpe, Alamus, Cu-
lican, and at Hermosillo when the Diocese of Sinaloa
was erected. In the nineteenth century, Mexico
being still the only archdiocese, the Dioceses of S.
Francisco de California, erected 1840, and S. Luis
Potosi, erected 1854, were added. Fius IX, in the
secret consistory of 16 March, 1863, established the Dioceses of Chilapa, Tulancingo, Vera Cruz, Zacatecas,
León, Querétaro, Zamora, and the Vicariate Apostolí
to of Tamaulipas (created a bishopric in 1869), and raised
to archiepiscopal rank the episcopal Sees of Guadalaj-
ara and Michoacán. From 1869 to 1891 the Vicari-
te Apostolique of Lower California (1872), the Dioceses of Taba-
baj, Tepic, Chihuahua, and Colima (1881), were
established. In 1891, Leo XIII, by the Bull "Illud in primis",
erected the new Dioceses of Cuernavaca, Tepic, Tehu-
antepa, Saltillo, and Chihuahua, and raised the Sees of
Oaxaca, Monterey, and Durango to archiepiscop-
al rank. In 1895 the Diocese of Campeche was
erected, and in 1899 that of Aguascalientes. In 1903
the new Diocese of Guadalajara was erected, for
Puebla raised to the rank of an archdiocese, and in
1907 Yucatan was made an archdiocese. At the present
time the ecclesiastical provinces of Mexico are
constituted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCES</th>
<th>Sees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>México, Vera Cruz (epis. residence, Jalapa), Tulan-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>Lingó, Chih...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>Michoacán (epis. residence, Morelia), Zamora, León, Querétaro, Antequera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>Antequera (epis. residence, Oaxaca), Chiapa (epis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>Yucatan (epis. residence, Merida), Campeche, the Territory of Quintana Roo, Tabasco (epis. res., S. Juan Bautista).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Boletín de la oficina internacional de las Repúblicas Ameri-
canas.** *Cuadro general de Geografía (Mexico, 1905); NORIEGA, Atlas miniaturo de la República mexi
cana (Mexico, 1907); CLAVIERRO, Historia antigua de México (Mexico, 1907); GÓMEZ, Historia de la Com-
paña de Jesús en México (Mexico, 1908); RIVIERA, Los Gobernantes de México (Mexico, 1912); ICA
cALBONEDA, Obras (Mexico, 1912); México a través de los siglos (Barcelona, —); SAMÁN, Historia
general de las cosas de Nueva España (Mexico, 1829); DURÁN, Historia de las Indias de Nueva España y Isla de Tierra-Firme (Mexico, 1832); GÓMEZ, Historia de la Nueva España (Mexico, 1909); SOTO ANDRÉS, Historia de las Heredades es-
pañoles (Mexico, 1888); VERA, Compendio de la historia de México (Mexico, 1906); PRÉTENDIDO, Lecciones de historia patria (Mexico, 1923); MÉNDEZ Y FRAZILO, Historia de las Heredades espa-
ñoles (Mexico, 1933); HERRERO, Chihuahua, (1808); PEREZ, Guadalajara, (1808); SOTO, Historia
der las Heredades españoles (Mexico, 1888); VERA, Catecismo geográfico-historico-estadístico de la Iglesia
ejicana (Arequipa, 1851); BURCHIT, El exarchado de México (Mexico, 1870); GÓMEZ, Historia del Archipiélago de Nueva España (Mexico, 1882); CARREÑO, El Obispo de Yucatán (Mexico, 1882).**

**México, Archidiócesis de (Méxicana).—** The boundaries of the Diocese of Mexico were at first not
well defined. When Cuba was discovered three sees
were erected, but when the prelates arrived, their
episcopal sees had been destroyed, and the inhabitants
had fled. In order to avoid such mistakes, the Holy
See allowed the kings of Spain to fix the boundaries
of the new dioceses erected on the American continent,
still considered a part of Asia. From 1500 to 1863
the Diocese of Mexico extended from the Atlantic to
the Pacific, namely from Tampico to Acapulco. At
the present time it is limited to the States of Morelos, Mexico, and part of Hidalgo. The first bishop,
Zumarraga, came to Mexico when Clement VII had just been released from the prison in Castel Sant’ Angelo, where he was kept by Charles V for
several months after the sack of Rome by Bour-
bon’s army. Strange as it may seem, he was, even
obliged to found a college and to accept the consec-
rination, governed the diocese without any papal
appointment, and styled himself "Omnimoda potes-
tate Antistes". He returned to Spain, received his
Bulls, and was consecrated six years after his first
arrival on the American continent. He has been
falsely accused of having destroyed most valuable
monuments: he ought not to be blamed for having
burnt the idols, temples, and hieroglyphics which
prevented the conversion of the aborigines. In his time
the Blessed Virgin, according to Mexican tradition,
appeared to the neophyte Juan Diego, and became
the patroness of America. He introduced the first print-
ing office in the New World, published many books,
encouraged many schools and colleges, gave the German,
a faithful follower of St. Francis of Assisi, to whom
his order belonged. He ruled over the diocese,
raised before he died to the rank of an archdiocese,
from 1529 to 1548.

Five provincial councils have been held in the city
of Mexico. The first and second under the second
archbishop, Alonso de Montúfar, the third was presi-
dered over by the third archbishop, Pedro Moya de
Contreras. The twenty-fourth archbishop, Francisco
Antonio de Lorenzana assembled and presided over
the fourth provincial council in 1770. Prospero
Alarcón, thirty-second archbishop, was the presi-
dent of the fifth and last provincial council in 1894. The
most important of all was the third council, which has
been for centuries the code of ecclesiastical law for
the Mexican Church. Archbishops Moya de Con-
teras, García Guerra, Palafax, Osorio, Ortégas, Haro y
Peralta, and Lisana y Beaumont were also viceroys
and captains-general of New Spain, and were able
to brandish the sword in defense of the church. The
bishop Labastida was regent of the short lived empire
of Maximilian. He was the last prelate to be invested
with any political authority. The most distinguished
of the line was Francisco Antonio de Lorenzana, trans-
ferred to Toledo, and created cardinal by Clement
XIV. He published several important books,
founded many institutions both in New and Old Spain, helped with his own means Pius VI when he was sent to France as a prisoner by Napoleon, and largely contributed to the support of the cardinals assembled in Venice, in the concclave that elected Pius VII. A few years after the conquest, viz., in the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Archdiocese of Mexico already possessed over a university, equal to that of Salamanca, several colleges, and numberless schools. Their number went on increasing, until all religious progress was stopped by the War of Independence and the civil wars that followed. All were destroyed by law and in reality under President Juárez. President Días has treated the question of the restoration of the universities, and his law has been repealed. The present archbishop, Mgr Mora y del Río was born at Pueblencan, 24 Feb., 1854; studied at Zamora and Rome; was ordained, 22 Dec., 1877; consecrated Bishop of Tehuantepec, 19 Jan., 1893; and promoted to the See of Mexico, 2 Dec., 1908 in succession to Mgr Alarco. The population almost entirely Catholic is about 750,000.

Galería de retratos en la Catedral de México: JACOBAUTA, Príncipe Obispo y Arzobispo de México; SOBAL, Episcopado Mexicano; CARDINALLORENZO, paranés; BALDURIG, Granada Mexicana; J. MONTES DE OCA Y OBREGÓN.

MEZGER, FRANCIS, JOSPEH, AND PAUL, three brothers, learned Benedictines of the monastery of St. Peter in Salzburg, and professors at the University of Salzburg.

FRANCIS, the oldest of the three, b. at Ingolstadt, 25 October, 1832; d. at Salzburg, 11 December, 1701. He took vows in 1851; was ordained priest in 1857; taught philosophy at the University of Salzburg in 1869; became regent of the convicuts and secretary of the University in 1861; taught philosophy again from 1865 to 1865; and then moral theology until 1868. From 1869 to 1888 he taught various branches at the Bavarian monastery of Ettal and at his own monastery. From 1888 until his death he was master of novices and director of clerics at his monastery. He wrote the following philosophical treatises: "Philosophia rationalis rationibus explicata" (Salzburg, 1660); "Anima rationibus philosophiae animata et explicata" (ib., 1661); "Philosophia naturalis rationibus rationibus naturalibus elucidata" (ib., 1661); "Manuale philosophicum" (ib., 1665); "Homomicrocosmus" (ib., 1665). The following are some of his translations: "Philosophia sacra" (ib., 1678), from the French of Capuchin Ivo; "Heiligknighter" (2 volumes, Munich, 1690), from the Latin; "Dioptria politice religionis" (Salzburg, 1694), and "Exercitia spiritualia" (ib., 1693), both from the French of the Maurist Le Contat; "Succinctae meditaciones christiane" (4 vols., ib., 1695), from the French of the Maurist Claude Martin; "A vis regia studiis juvenvalia ad eremae spatio" (Frankfort, 1696) from the Italian; and a few others of less importance.

JOSPEH, b. 5 September, 1635, at Eichstätt; d. 26 October, 1638, at the monastery of St. Gall, while on a pilgrimage to Einsiedeln. He took vows at the same time with his brother Francis in 1651; was ordained priest in 1659; taught poetry in the gymnasium of Salzburg in 1660; was master of novices and sub-prior in his monastery in 1661; taught philosophy at the University of Salzburg, 1662-4; apologists and polemics, 1665-7; canon law, 1668-73; he was prior of his monastery and taught hermeneutics and polemics, 1673-8, when he was appointed vice-chancellor of the university. He was an intimate friend of Mabillon, with whom he kept up a correspondence. He who in his "Iter Germanicum" calls him "Universitatis Salzburgensis precipuam ornamentum" (Vetra Analecta, 1, xi). His chief work is "Historia Salzburgensis" covering the period from 562 to 1687, of which work he, however, had written only the first four books (582-1565) when he died, leaving the remainder to be completed by his two brothers. In 1664 he published at Salzburg his four philosophical treatises: (1) "Considerationes de scientiis et de modis scientii in genere"; (2) "Axiomata physicae questionis problematica distincta"; (3) "Quaestionis naturae esse, vivere, sentire, intelligere"; (4) "Unitas et distinctio rerum questionibus philosophici explicata". His two brothers, in their "successiones ecclesiasticas tam ex testamento quam ab intestato" (Salzburg, 1670); "Panaceae juris" (ib., 1673); "Lapis mysticus et corruv parvulum Daniellia" (ib., 1677, 1682); "Institutiones in sacra scriptura" (ib., 1680); "Assertio antiquitatis ecclesiae metropolitane Salisburgensis et monasterii S. Petri, O. Ben."

PAUL, the most celebrated of the three brothers, b. 23 November, 1637, at Eichstätt; d. 12 April, 1702, at Salzburg. He took vows in 1653; was ordained priest in 1660; taught at the gymnasium of Salzburg, 1660-4; was master of novices and director of clerics, 1664-6; taught philosophy, first at the University of Salzburg, 1666-70; then at the monastery of Götweig, 1671-2. Returning to the University of Salzburg, he taught theology, 1673-88; exegesis and polemics, 1689-1700. In 1683 he had succeeded his deceased brother Joseph as vice-chancellor. His chief production is: "Theologia scholasticae ac vitium et doctrina D. Thomae" (4 volumes, Augsburg, 1686-1719), probably one of the most complete and comprehensive theologies that has been produced by a German Benedictine. It is especially noteworthy that the author's treatment of the immaculate conception and of papal infallibility is in exact accordance with the definitions of 1864 and 1870. His other works are: "Somnia philosophorum de possibilibus et impossibilibus" (Salzburg, 1669); "Ecclesiologiae et magnae urbis celestis et elementariss" (ib., 1670); "Mecurierius logicus" (ib., 1671); "De gratia Dei" (ib., 1675); "Allocutiones de mediis pietatis Mariana" (ib., 1677); "Orationes partheni, miscellaneous, sacroprofane, problemata inauguralia seu orationes academica" (ib., 1699-1700); "Sacra historia de gentis hebraicae ortu" (Dillingen, 1700; Augsburg, 1715). Concerning all three see SATTLER, Collect. El=liste zur Gesch. der ehemaligen Benediktiner-Universität Salzburg (Kempten, 1890), 212-218; LINDER, Probesch. der Benediktiner Abt S. Peter in Salzburg (Salzburg, 1806), 63-58, 65-68. For Joseph and Paul see STEINER, Viz scripturae traditiones ac pietatis insignes, quos gentum soli alius (Eichstätt, 1767), 427-428.

MIZZOFANTI, GIUSEPPE, cardinal, the greatest of polyglots, b. 19 September, 1774; d. 15 March, 1849. He was the son of a poor carpenter of Bologna. In the Scuole Pie, besides the classical languages, he learned Spanish, German, Mexican, and some South American dialects from ex-Jesuits who had been expelled from America. To his great love of study he added a prodigious amount of work. At the age of twelve he was able to begin the three years course of philosophy, which he closed with a public disputation. His theological studies were completed with no less distinction, at an age at which he could not yet be ordained; consequently he devoted himself to the study of Oriental languages; and in 1797 he was appointed to the chair of Hebrew at the University of Bologna, and ordained a priest. When the Cisalpine Republic was established, he refused to take the oath of allegiance to it, lost his chair at the university, and was compelled to give private lessons in order to support himself. After the battles of 1799 and of 1800, the hostile state of Bologna, which was sick of almost all the nationalities of Europe, and Messzofanti in giving religious assistance to the unfortunate seized the opportunity of perfecting his knowledge of the languages which he had already studied, as well as of learning new ones. In 1803 he was appointed assistant in the library of the Institute, and later, professor of Hebrew and of Greek at
the university, which relieved him financially. In
1806, he refused an invitation of Napoleon to es-

tablish himself at Paris. In 1808, the chair of Oriental
languages was suppressed, and Mezzofanti received, in
compensation, a pension of 1000 lire; but, in 1815, he
became librarian of the deputies who went to ask
the pope's forgiveness, in the name of the city of
Bologna, for the rebellion of that year, and the
pope, repeating Pius VII's invitation of 1814, re-
qusted Mezzofanti to remain at Rome and place his
learning directly at the service of the Holy See, an
invitation which the modest priest, this time, accepted,
after long resistance; soon he received the title of Do-

mestic Prelate, and a canony at Santa Maria Mag-
giore, which was changed, later, for one at St. Peter's.
At Rome, also, he took advantage of opportunities to
practice the languages that he had acquired, and to
master new ones and in order to learn Chinese he
went to the Chinese College for foreign missions at
Naples. In 1833, he was named Custodian-Chief of
the Vatican Library, and Consultor of the Congrega-
tion of the correction of the Liturgical Books of Ori-
ental Rites, of which he became Prefect. On 12 Febru-
ary, 1838, he was created cardinal under the title of St.
Onofrio al Gianicolo; he was also a member of the con-

congregations of the Propaganda, of Rites, of the Index,
and of the Examination of Bishops. The events of
1848 undermined his already enfeebled health, and a
combination of pneumonia and gastric fever put an
end to his life. He was buried without pomp in a
modest tomb of his titular church, over which a monu-
ment was raised in 1885.

As a moderate, Cardinal Mezzofanti spoke
perfectly thirty-eight languages, among which were:

biblical and rabbinic Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldean, Coptic,
Armenian, ancient and modern, Persian, Turkish, Al-
banian, Maltese, Greek, ancient and modern, Latin,
Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, French, German,
English, Illyrian, Russian, Polish, Bohemian, Magyar,
Czeck, Gothic, Latin, Greek, Basque, Wallachian, and Californian; he spoke thirty
other languages, less perfectly, and fifty dialects
of the languages mentioned above. His knowledge of
these languages was intuitive, rather than analytic,
and consequently he left no scientific works, although
some studies in comparative linguistics are to be
found in his works. A work of his, published in 1833,
to the municipal library, and in part to the library of
the University of Bologna.

MAJAVITI, E'.qu~iasi~ historique sur le cardinal Mezzofanti,
(Paris, 1853); RUSSELL, The Life of Cardinal Mezzofanti
(Lon-
don, 1859).

U. BENIGNI.

MIAMI Indians, an important tribe of Algonquian
stock formerly claiming prior dominion over the
whole of what is now Indians and western Ohio, includ-
ing the territories drained by the Wabash, St. Joseph,
Maumee, and Miami rivers. They were closely con-
nected, both linguistically and politically, with their
western neighbours, the Illinois, the two tribe-groups
speaking dialects of the same language. The Miami,
however, were of more independent and warlike char-
acter. The tribal name, properly pronounced as in
Latin, Me-ah-me (whence Maumee), and in the full
plural form Ou-miami-wek, is of uncertain meaning
and derivation. They were called by the early Eng-
lish writers Twightee, a corruption of their Iroquois
name, which is variously spelled. The Miami, in 1885
the French recognized six bands, or subtribes,
in the tribe, consolidated at a later period into three,

namely: Atchatchakougan, "crane people"; or
Miami proper; Ouiautan, "whirlpool people"; or
Wea; and Pianiguia, "separatores" (?), or Pianki-
shaw. By the United States Government these were
recognized as three distinct tribes. Altogether they
may have numbered over 6000 souls and it is possi-
ble that Nicolet in 1634, and Radisson and Groseilliers in 1658-60 may have met in their Wiscon-
sin journeys in the Miami, but this is not known.
They are first mentioned by the Jesuit Dreuillettes in
1658 as a tribe recently discovered, under the name of
Oumamik, living south-west from Green Bay, Wis.
The estimate of 24,000 souls is an evident exagger-
ation. About 1668 and again in 1670 they were
visited by Perrot. In the latter year the Jesuit Father
Claude Allouez found them, or a part of the tribe,
living with the Mascoutens in a palisaded town, in
which he established the mission of Saint-Jacques,
about the head of Fox river in south-east Wisconsin
(see Mascoutens). He describes them as gentle,
affable, and sedate, while Dablon, his companion, calls
them more civilized than the lake tribes. Apparent-
ly these were only a part of the tribe, the main body be-
ing farther south, although all the bands were repre-

resented. They listened eagerly to the missionary's
instruction and to satisfy them Allouez was obliged to
set up a large cross that he let the village as well as in that occupied by the Mascoutens.

In 1673 Allouez, who had learned the language,
reports good progress, and that they now hung their
offerings upon the cross instead of sacrificing to their
heathen gods, chief among which was the Sun.
There was however a strong opposition party. In June of
this same year the priest went out for Fr. Allouez
stopped at the village and procured Miami guides for
his voyage down the Mississippi. He describes the
Miami as the most civilized, liberal, and shapely of
the three tribes then assembled in the town. They
were their hair in two long braids down their breasts,
were accounted brave and generally successful war-
riors, lived in cabins covered with rush mats, and
were so eager to listen to Fr. Allouez that they left him
little rest even at night. The cross was decorated with
Indian offerings, and one chief who had recently died
at a distance had asked to have his bones brought
for interment beside it, which was done. But despite
this the mission was afterwards abandoned, partly on
account of lack of missionaries and partly on account of the disturbed
conditions growing out of the inroads of the Iroquois,
who, having destroyed the Hurons and others in the
east, had now turned upon the Illinois and others of
the west, and latterly (1682) upon the Miami. The
papal missionary Lambert de l'Hermitte went to the
Miamis and gives a graphic account of the wholesale butcheries and
horrible tortures of prisoners of which he was witness.
The Iroquois, it must be remembered, were well armed
with guns from Dutch and English traders, while the
remote western tribes had only the bow. Shortly
after the building of La Salle's temporary fort on the
St. Joseph river, near the Miami, a band of a Miami
moved down and formed a village near to the same
spot, while some Potawatomis also settled near them.
Allouez followed them and, probably about 1685, estab-
lished the mission of Saint Joseph, where he continued until his death in 1689.
In 1692-3 Fr. Gravier wintered with the Miami, prob-
ably in Illinois. In 1694 we find the Miami in a village
where Chicago now is. In 1721 Fr. Charlevoix visited
the St. Joseph village, where he found nearly all of
both tribes nominally Christian, but, from long
absence of a missionary, "fallen into great disorders".
Soon afterwards this matter was remedied and in
1750 the mission was in flourishing condition. At the
time Fr. Pingeon was in charge of it and he then resided at Wes Creek on the Wabash, near the
present Lafayette, Ind. A third Jesuit mission ex-
ated among the Piankeshaw, who had their principal village lower down the Wabash, adjoining the present town of Vincennes, founded in 1702. After the suppression of the Jesuits in New France in 1762, the missionaries continued their work, as seculars, as well as was possible, until their deaths, Father Pierre Potier, "the last Jesuit in the west," dying at Detroit in 1811.

Through the influence of English traders a large part of the tribe had become hostile to the French and under the head chief "La Demoiselle" had removed about 1748 from the neighbourhood of the French post at the head of the Maumee (now Fort Wayne, Ind.) to a point on the Miami near the present Piqua, Ohio, and established there a town called Piankashaw, which in size and became a centre of English trading influence. After repeated refusal to return, a party of northern Indians, led by a French trader, Langlade, in June, 1752, attacked and burned the town, killing and eating La Demoiselle, and carrying the traders to Canada. By this time the whole tribe was settled along the Wabash and the upper Maumee. They generally sided with the French in the French and Indian and Pontiac's wars, and with the English against the Americans in the later wars. Their great chief, Mishikinakwa, or Little Turtle (1732-1812), led the allied Indian forces which defeated Harmar in 1790 and St. Clair in 1791, but was himself defeated by the Americans in 1794, retiring in the vicinity of Greenville in the next year, by which the Indians surrendered the greater part of Ohio. After the close of the war of 1812, in which again they fought on the English side, the Miami began a series of treaty sales culminating in 1840, by which they sold all their territory excepting a small tract of about ten square miles along the western boundary of the State of Ohio. The final removal to Kansas was made by the main Miami band under military pressure in 1846, the Wea and Piankeshaw having preceded them by a number of years. The main emigration in 1846 numbered about 650. The small reserved tract in Indiana was allotted in severity to its owners in 1872 and their tribal relations were dissolved. In 1854 the united Wea and Piankeshaw were officially consolidated with the Peoria and Kickapoo, the remnant of the ancient Illinois, and in 1867 they removed altogether to their present lands under the Quapaw agency in north-east Oklahoma (Indian Ter.). In 1873 the remnant of the emigrant Miami, having sold all in Kansas, followed their kindred to the same agency.

After the withdrawal of the Jesuits various secular priests ministered as best they could to the Indians within reach of the frontier settlements, notably Fr. Gibault about Detroit and Fort Wayne, and Father Rivet at Vincennes (1795-1804), the latter devoting himself particularly to the Piankeshaw, Wea, and Kickapoo. In 1804 the Friends established an industrial farm on the upper Wabash, where for several years they instructed Miami, Shawnee, and others until forced to withdraw to Ohio by the opposition of the Shawnee prophet, brother of Tecumseh. In 1818 the Baptist minister, Rev. Isaac McCoy, began a work among the Wea and Miami which continued for four years and was then discontinued. In 1833 another Baptist minister, Rev. Jotham Meeker, assisted by Rev. David Lykins, began work among the Wea and Piankeshaw, already in Kansas for some years, and built up a flourishing school with corresponding good effect upon the tribe. The main body of the Indians was thus left at Miami for some years after their removal in 1846 were entirely neglected; without either religious or educational work, they sank to the lowest depths through dissipation, and were rapidly and constantly diminishing by intemperance and drunken murders. In 1841 their agent reported that "more than half the adults who die perish by the hands of their fellow Indians." A notable exception was their chief, Richardville, of mixed blood, who died in the same year, a consistent Catholic, whose "stern honesty and strict punctuality, as well as dignified bearing, commanded universal respect." In the meantime the restored Jesuits had again taken up the western mission work in 1842. In 1856 Frs. Charles F. van den Bergh and Henry Seton began a series of visits to the Kickapoo, Wea, Piankeshaw, Potawatomi, and other removed and native tribes in Kansas which resulted in the establishment of a successful mission among the Potawatomi (St. Mary's) to which the other tribes were contributors. In 1847 a mission was started among the removed Miami, who had made offices of their old forts. When it was discontinued two years later, probably because of the utter unworthiness of the Indians, who are officially described in the same year as "a miserable race of beings, considering nothing but what contributes to the pernicious indulgence of their depraved appetites for whiskey.

The picture in 1849 is in even darker colors—"destroying themselves by liquor and extensively murdering one another," the lowest in condition of all the removed tribes, and reduced in three years by more than one half. In 1855 we bear of the first improvement, through the temperance efforts of the French half-breeds in the tribe. The Quapaw mission of St. Mary's, Okla., charge of a lay priest assisted by a layman. But the Denver Times of October 24, 1886, reports that new evidence now cares for 276 Indians of the associated remnant tribes, including about 40 of Miami kinship. Of an original 4000 or more there are left now only about 400, namely—Indians, 243; Miami in Okla., 128; Wea and Piankeshaw, with Peoria, in Okla., about 40. A new and vigorous effort is now making to re-establish the customs or general ethnology of the Miami. They were organized upon the clan system, with, according to Morgan, ten gentes. One of their dances has been described, the feather dance, in which the performers, carrying feathered wands, imitated the movements of birds. They had a cannibal society—or possibly a clan—upon which devolved the obligation of eating the body of a prisoner upon occasion of certain great victories. Such ceremonial cannibalism was almost universal among the northern and eastern tribes. Their chief deities seem to have been the Sun and Thunder. They buried in the ground, under small log structures upon the surface of the ground, or in large logs split and bowed over for the purpose. Of the language nothing of importance has been published beyond a Wea Primer, by the Baptist mission in 1837, although considerable manuscript exists with the Bureau of American Ethnology. It is still spoken by a large proportion of the survivors.

Michael, see Micah.

MICHAEL, MILITARY ORDERS OF SAINT.—(1) A Bavarian order, founded in 1721 by Elector Joseph Clemens of Colognce, Duke of Bavaria, and confirmed by Maximilian Joseph, King of Bavaria, 11 Sept., 1808. Fias VII, 5 February, 1802, granted to priests dedicated with this order all the privileges of domestic prelates. Under Louis I it was made an order of merit (1837), and under Otto I was reorganized (1887).

(2) An order founded in 1469 by Louis XI, the chief military order of France until the institution of the Knights of the Holy Ghost, after which the two together formed the ordre du rost, the reception of the
cross of the former being made a condition to membership in the latter. After the Revolution the order was revived in Constantinople in A.D. 1261 but was to be found serviced by those who had accomplished notable work in art or science, or who had performed extraordinary services for the state. In 1825 there was a solemn reception into the ordres du roi, which did not, however, survive the Revolution of 1830.

(3) Knights of St. Michael's Wing, founded in the Cistercian monastery of Alcobaca, about 1171, by Alphonso I, King of Portugal, in commemoration of a victory over the Moors, in which, according to tradition, he was assisted by St. Michael in person. The knights were placed under the jurisdiction of the Abbot of Alcobaca and were pledged to recite the same prayers as Cistercian lay brothers. The order was in existence but a short time and was at first suppressed.

Florence Rudol McGahan.

Michael Cerularius (Μιχαήλ Κερωλάριον), Patriarch of Constantinople (1043–58), author of the second and final schism of the Byzantine Church, date of birth uncertain, death in 1058. Although the schism of Photius (d. 891), there remained at Constantinople an anti-Latin party that gloried in the work of that patriarch, honoured him as the great defender of the Orthodox Church, and waited for a chance of renewing his quarrel. The only explanation of Michael Cerularius's conduct is that he belonged from the beginning to that party, and had always meant to break with the pope as soon as he could. Belonging to one of the great families of Constantinople, he held in his youth some place at the Court. He began his public career by plotting with Constantine Monomachus, the future emperor, to depose Emperor Michael I (1042–41). Both conspired to depose him, but their scheme failed, and Monomachus formed the friendship to which Cerularius owed his later advancement. Cerularius was known as a dangerous person, so the Government tried to stop his political career by making him a monk. At first he refused; then suddenly the suicide of his brother caused his conversion, and he voluntarily entered a monastery. In 1042 Monomachus became emperor peaceably by marrying Zoe, a descendant of Basil the Macedonian (Basil I, 867–86) and widow of both Romanus III (1028–34) and Michael IV. He remembered his old friend and fellow-conspirator and gave him an ambiguous place at court, described as that of the emperor's "friend and guardian" (Psellus, "Enkomion", I, 324). As Cerularius was not ordained a priest, any further advancement must be that of an ecclesiastical career. He was therefore next made synkellos (that is, secretary) of the patriarch, Alexius (1025–34). The synkellos was always a bishop, and held a place in the church second only to that of the patriarch himself. In 1034 Alexius died, and Constantine appointed Cerularius as his successor. There was no election; the emperor "went like an arrow to the target" (Psellus, ibid., p. 326). From this moment the story of Cerularius becomes that of the great schism.

The time was singularly unpropitious for a quarrel with the pope. The Normans were invading Sicily, enemies of both the papacy and the Eastern Empire, from whom they were conquering that island. There was every reason why the pope (St. Leo IX, 1048–54) and the emperor should keep friends and unite their forces against the common enemy. Both knew it, and tried throughout to prevent a quarrel. But the papal legates were embittered by the outrageous conduct of the patriarch. Suddenly, after no kind of provocation, in the midst of what John Bucceu describes as "perfect peace" between the two Churches (L. Allatius, "Grecia orthod.", I, 37), Cerularius sent a declaration of war against the pope and the Latins. His agent was Leo, Metropolitan of Achiudia in Bulgaria. In 1053 this latter sent a letter to Bishop John of Corinth in Achaia whose conduct had been reproved by the emperor. John of Corinth sent the letter on to Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, who translated it and showed it to the pope. Cerularius then sent to the other patriarchs a treatise written by Nicetas Pectoratus (Niketas Stethatos in Greek), a monk of Studion, against "asymme bread, fasting on Saturday, and celibacy. Because of these "horrible infirmities", Nicetas describes Latins as "bad workers, bad husbandmen, and liars" (Will, op. cit., 127–36). Cerularius's third move made it plain that he meant war to the knife. Still entirely unprovoked, he closed all the Latin churches at Constantinople, including that of the papal legate. His chancellor Nicephorus burst open the Latin tabernacles, and trampled on the Holy Eucharist because the schism was "besiege that God had worked some new and wonderful things" (Nicetas, "Epistolae", 141; Will, op. cit., 127–36).

The pope then answered the letter of Leo of Achiudia. Knowing well whence it came, he addressed his answer in the first place to Cerularius. It is a dignified defence of the customs attacked and of the rights of the Holy See. He points out that no one thought of attacking the many Byzantine monasteries and "Churches in the West" (Psellus, "Enkomion", I, 324). Cerularius seems to have wavered in his plan because of the importance of the pope's help against the Normans. He writes to Peter III of Antioch, that he had for this reason proposed an alliance with Leo (Will, 174). Leo answered this proposal resenting the stupendous arrogance of Michael's tone, but still held out a hope of peace, as his letter of 1055 shows. Cerularius then wrote a very friendly letter to the emperor, and sent both documents to Constantinople by three legates Cardinal Humbert, Cardinal Frederick (his own cousin and Chancellor of the Roman Church, afterwards Stephen IX, 1057–58), and Archbishop Peter of Amalfi. The emperor, who was exceedingly annoyed about the whole quarrel, received the legates with honour and lodged them in his palace. Cerularius, who had now quite given up the idea of his alliance, was very indignant that the legates did not give him precedence and prostrate before him, and wrote to Peter of Antioch that they were "insolent, boastful, rash, arrogant, and stupid" (Will, 177). In a few weeks a peace was arranged. In May, 1055, Cardinal Humbert wrote defences of the Latin customs, and incidentally converted Nicetas Pectoratus (Will, 93–128, 136–50). Cerularius refused to see the legates or to hold any communication with them: he struck the pope's name from his diplomas, and so declared open schism. The legates then prepared the Bull of excommunication against him, Leo IV, "Orthodox Eastern Church", 186–7. Cerularius, when this attempt failed, sent an account of the whole story to the other patriarchs so full of lies that John of Antioch answered him: "I am covered with shame that your venerable letter should contain such things. Believe me, I do not know how to explain it for your own sake, especially if you have written it to the other most blessed patriarchs" (Will, 190).

After the schism Cerularius became for a time the strongest man at Constantinople. He quarrelled with his former patron, Constantine IX, who appeased him.
by abject apologies. He became a kind of kingmaker. When Theodora succeeded (1055-6), he “tried to rule over the empress” (Psellus, “Enkomion”, 357). Michael VI (1056-7) was not sufficiently submissive, so Cerularius worked up a revolution, deposed him, went himself to cut off his hair, and shut him up in a monastery. In his place he set up Isaac I (1057-87). Isaac never did very well to whom he owed his place and was at first very docile. At this time Cerularius reached the height of his power. He appointed all the officers of state, and was the real sovereign of the empire. So little did he disguise this fact that he began to wear the purple shoes that were always the prerogative of the emperors. “Losing all shame, he defaced his own image, and, joined royalty and priesthood in himself; in his hand he held the cross while imperial laws came from his mouth” (in Bréhier, op. cit., 275). Then Isaac got tired of being the patriarch’s puppet and wanted to reign himself. So once again Cerularius worked up a revolution. This time he meant to have himself crowned emperor. But Isaac was too quick for him; he had him arrested at once and tried for high treason. Michael Psellus was employed to bring the charge against him. He was accused of treason, paganism, and magic; he was “impious, tyrannical, murderous, sacrilegious, unworthy”. He was condemned to banishment at Madytus on the Hellespont. On the way there the shipwrecked of the effects of which he died (1059).

As soon as he was dead his apotheosis began. The emperor professed much regret for what had happened; his body was brought back to Constantinople and buried with great pomp in the church of the Holy Angels, Psellus, who had brought the charges against him, was passed as a paragon in his honour, describing him as the best, wisest, holiest, most misunderstood of men (this “Enkomion” is published by Sathas; see bibliography). It seems that, as soon as he was dead and therefore no longer dangerous, the Government found it more prudent to pretend to share the popular enthusiasm for him. From Psellus’s text accounts (the indictment at the trial and the funeral oration) it is not difficult to form an opinion about Cerularius’s character. He was by far the strongest man in the Eastern Empire during a time of its general degradation, far more capable than the contemptible emperors he set up and deposed. His life was austere. He had unbounded ambition, but he did not disgrace himself by anything dishonorable.

It is said at the time that he never forgave an injury. He was not a scholar, nor in any way so great a man as his predecessor and model, Photius. It seems that his breach with Rome was a part of a general scheme. He wanted to make himself autocrat of at least Eastern Europe. He could easily cow the feeble church, but he could and did do nothing more momentous; he founded the schismatical Byzantine Church.

Michael de Sanctis (DE LOS SANTOS), Saint, b. at Vich in Catalonia, 29 September, 1591; d. at Valladolid, 10 April, 1625. At the age of twelve years he came to Barcelona, and asked to be received into the monastery of the Trinitarians, in which order, after a three years’ novitiate, he took vows in the monastery of St. Lambert at Saragossa, 5 Sept., 1607. When one day a Discalced Trinitarian came to St. Lambert’s to receive Holy orders, Michael felt himself drawn to this more austere congregation. After mature deliberation, and with the permission of his superiors, he entered the novitiate of the Discalced Trinitarians at Madrid, and took vows at Alcalá; he became priest and was twice elected superior of the monastery at Valladolid. He lived a life of prayer and great mortification, was especially devout towards the Holy Eucharist, and is said to have been rapt in ecstasy several times. He was tonsured as a Fransican by Pius VI, 24 May, 1779 and canonised by Pius IX, 8 June, 1862. His feast is celebrated on 5 July. He is generally represented kneeling before an altar where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed.


MICHAEL OTT.

Michael of Cesena (MICHELE FUSCHI), Friar Minor, Minister General of the Franciscan Order, and theologian, b. at Cesena, a small town in Central Italy, near Forli, about 1230. Nothing of his early life is known. Having entered the Franciscan Order, he studied at Paris and took the doctor’s degree in theology. He taught theology at Bologna and wrote several commentaries on Holy Scripture and the “Sentences” of Peter Lombard. At the general chapter of Naples (31 May, 1316) he was elected minister general and went at once to Assisi, where he convoked a chapter to consider the revision of the Constitutions of the order. Returning to Bologna, he issued the document, “Gravi qua prae” (21 Aug., 1316), which, together with several other ordinances regarding the matter of poverty, induced John XXII to publish the Bull, “Quorumadum exiguit” (7 Oct., 1317), whose purpose was to explain the decreets of Nicholas III, “Exit qui seminat” (13 Aug., 1279), and of Clement V, “Exivi de paradiso” (6 May, 1312). As it concerned the principal chapter of the Franciscan Rule, this action caused no little disturbance within the order. The Bull was warmly opposed by Michael and his party, who claimed that it was adopting the errors which had been insisted in his letters, they were following the example and teaching of Christ and His Apostles. Thus the controversy finally shifted to a speculative theological question: whether or not it was consonant with Catholic Faith to hold that Christ and the Apostles had no property individually or in common; and while in the famous dispute at Naples in 1321 the inquisitor, John of Belna, claimed that it was heretical, Bergengario of Perlignan declared it a Catholic dogma in perfect accordance with the decreets of Nicholas III and Clement V. The matter having been brought before John XXII, a further attempt to settle the controversy was made by distinguishing between dominion and simple use, so that both propositions, Christ and the Apostles had no property, i.e., dominion of property, and Christ and the Apostles possessed property, i.e., the use of property, were true. In the Bull “Quia nonnullam” (26 March, 1322) the pope declared that he intended merely to explain the decrees of his predecessors, and excommunicated anyone who adhered to the proposition that Christ and His Apostles had no property, i.e., dominion of property. The question of the Constitution “Quorumadum exiguit”. In June of the same year a general chapter of the order was convoked at Perugia and decided that to assert that Christ and His Apostles possessed no earthly goods was not only not heretical, but sound and Catholic doctrine. At the same time Bonagratis of Bergamo was comn-
sioned to represent the chapter before the papal Curia at Avignon. The controversy continued unabated until, in 1327, Michael was summoned to appear be- fore the emperor. He feigned illness and delayed; but obeyed a subsequent order to do the pope under pain of grave censure to leave Avignon. He was thus unable to attend the chapter held at Bologna in May of the following year (1328); yet despite his absence and the protest of the papal legate, he was re-elected minister general, the chapter deeming his charges against him insufficient to deprive him of office. Several prelates and princes wrote to the pope in Michael’s behalf; but before these letters or the result of the chapter could reach Avignon, Michael, with William of Occam and Bonagratia of Bergamo, who were also retained by the pope at Avignon, fled by night (25 May) to a galley sent them by Louis of Bavaria.

At Pisa, where they were triumphantly received by the party of Louis and were joined by a number of other schismatics, the deposed minister general published a solemn appeal from the pope to a council (12 Dec., 1328), posted it on the door of the cathedral, and the next day read to the assembled multitude a decree of the Emperor Louis deposing John XXII. The pope issued a new edict, but not about this time. It is the faithful against Michael; and the latter answered in his "Ad perpetuum rei memoriam innoenscat quod ego, Fr. Michael" (25 Nov., 1330) and in "Christiane fidei fundamentum", in which he accused the pope of heresy in the three Bulls, "Ad Conditorem Canonum" and "Cum inter nonnullulos", and "Quia quorumdam", "Ques. et Litterarum magisterum", and "Testa Solomonum", which Michael wrote in his own defence, are contained in Occam’s Dialogue.

The general chapter of Paris (11 June, 1329), at which Cardinal Bertrand presided, condemned the conduct and writings of Michael and all who took part with him against John XXII; and elected Gerard of Luxembourg minister general of the order. The next year (1330) Michael and other schismatics followed Louis to Bavaria. The chapter of Perpignan (25 April, 1331) expelled Michael from the order and sentenced him to perpetual imprisonment. During the latter years of his life he was abandoned by nearly all his sympathizers, but it is probable that he died repentant. His remains were translated in 1377, and since then reprinted eight times in various languages; (2) "Astronomia", still in MS., in the Bodleian Library; (3) "Liber Introductorius"...; and in MS., ibid.; (4) "Liber Luminis Luminarum", in a MS., of the Riccardi coll., Florence; and (5) "De Alchemia", in MS., in Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Besides the translations mentioned above, a Latin version of Aristotle’s "Meta" was printed in Venice, 1477, and since then reprinted eight times. The Greek text is sometimes attributed to Michael Scot.

Michael the Archangel (Hebr. הכדש, "Who is like God?"). SAINT, one of the principal angels; his name was the war-cry of the good angels in the battle fought in heaven against Satan and his followers. On a certain occasion, when the archangel Michael, in his chariot, approached the inhabitants of the Universities of Oxford and Paris. At the last mentioned place he was known as "the mathematician," which implies that he studied in the Faculty of Arts. It is probable that he studied theology also. At any rate, he was beyond doubt a cleric. It seems likely that, on leaving Paris, he visited the University of Bologna, then a focus of Jewish learning, and was there at the time of Frederick II. This occurred about 1208. At Palermo, he joined the circle of learned men who surrounded the emperor; by some, indeed, he is said to have been elevated to the rank of imperial tutor, although the MSS., as a rule, entitled him "astrologer to the Lord Emperor Frederick". In 1209 he went to Toledo, made the acquaintance of several of the distinguished Arab scholars and wrote his "Abreviatio Aviscumn", the MS., of which bears the date 1210. He also took up the study of astronomy and alchemy, and translated from the Arabic several works on works on these subjects. That he was interested in the philosophy of the Arabs is evident from the fact that he translated several philosophical works of several of the Arab scholars. After his return to Palermo, about 1220, Michael devoted special attention to the science and practice of medicine. He received several signs of pontifical as well as imperial favour. By Pope Honorius III he was offered several ecclesiastical benefices, among them being the Archipresbyter of Caesal, in Ireland. He was also offered the Archipresbyter of Canterbury, in England. He was also offered the benefice of Canterbury, in England.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.
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Michael Scotus (Scot or Scot), a thirteenth-century mathematician, philosopher, and scholar. He was born in Scotland, about the year 1175. The con- tention that he was an Irishman seems to be disposed of by his being at Bologna, 1223, which places his nativity about 1175. The Archbishop of Caesal, he declined on the ground that he was ignorant of the Irish language. It is not clear whether "Scotus" indicates merely a native of Scotland, or one of the clan Scott, or Scot, which was very numerous in the Scottish lowlands. There is a tradition to the effect that he studied first at the cathedral school of Durham, and afterwards at the Universities of Oxford and Paris. At the last mentioned place he was known as "the mathematician," which implies that he studied in the Faculty of Arts. It is probable that he studied theology also. At any rate, he was beyond doubt a cleric. It seems likely that, on leaving Paris, he visited the University of Bologna, then a focus of Jewish learning, and was there at the time of Frederick II. This occurred about 1208. At Palermo, he joined the circle of learned men who surrounded the emperor; by some, indeed, he is said to have been elevated to the rank of imperial tutor, although the MSS., as a rule, entitled him "astrologer to the Lord Emperor Frederick". In 1209 he went to Toledo, made the acquaintance of several of the Arab scholars and wrote his "Abreviatio Aviscumn", the MS., of which bears the date 1210. He also took up the study of astronomy and alchemy, and translated from the Arabic several works on subjects. That he was interested in the philosophy of the Arabs is evident from the fact that he translated several philosophical works of several of the Arab scholars. After his return to Palermo, about 1220, Michael devoted special attention to the science and practice of medicine. He received several signs of pontifical as well as imperial favour. By Pope Honorius III he was offered several ecclesiastical benefices, among them being the Archipresbyter of Caesal, in Ireland. He was also offered the Archipresbyter of Canterbury, in England. He was also offered the benefice of Canterbury, in England.

WILLIAM TURNER.
tion of Moses (Orig., "De principiis", III, 2, 1). St. Michael concealed the tomb of Moses; Satan, however, by the command of God, appeared to the Jewish people as the sin of hero-worship. St. Michael also guards the body of Eve, according to the "Revelation of Moses" ("Apocryphal Gospels", ed. A. Walker, Edinburgh, p. 647). (d) Apocalypse, xili, 7, "And there was a great battle in heaven, Michael and his angels fought against the dragon. St. John speaks of the great power that was tried of the people, and a fragment also of the battle in heaven at the beginning of time. According to the Fathers there is often question of St. Michael in Scripture where his name is not mentioned. They say he was the cherub who stood at the gate of paradise, "to keep the way of the tree of life" (Gen., iii, 24), the angel through whom God published the Decalogue to Moses. The third of the twelve founders of the Church was in the way against Balaam (Numbers, xxiii, 22 sqq.), the angel who routed the army of Sennacherib (IV Kings, xix, 35), etc. Cf. P. Bonaventura da Sorrento ("Micheel", Naples, 1892).

Following these Scriptural passages, Christian tradition gives to St. Michael four offices: (1) To fight against Satan; (2) To vouch for the souls of the faithful from the power of the devil, especially at the hour of death. (3) To be the champion of God’s people, the Jews in the Old Law, the Christians in the New Testament; therefore he was the patron of the Church, and of the order of knights during the Middle Ages. (4) To call away from sin and saving men, or to accuse judgment (signs for St. Michael represented in luxem sanctum). Offert. Miss. Defunct. "Constituit eum principem super animas suscipiendas", Antiph. off. "Cui, "Hermas", Pastor, I, 3, Simil. VIII, 3). Regarding her rank in the celestial hierarchy opinions vary; St. Basil (Hom. de angelis) and other Greek Fathers, also Salmeron, Bolland, etc.; they believe he is the prince of the other angels; others (cf. P. Bonaventura, op. cit.) believe that he is the prince of the seraphim, the first of the nine angelic choirs. But according to St. Thomas (Summa, I, Q. xxii, a. 3) he is the prince of the last and lowest choir, the angels. The Christian Liturgy seems to follow the Greek Fathers; it calls him "Principes militiae celestis quem honorificant angelorum civium". The hymn of the Mozarabic Breviary places St. Michael even above the Twenty-Four Elders. The Greek Liturgy styles him "Αρχηγός τῶν μαθητῶν", "highest general" (cf. Menæa, 8 Nov. and 6 Sept.).

FEAST.—It would have been natural to St. Michael, the angelic Bishop, to be the champion also of Christians, giving victory in war to his clients. The early Christians, however, regarded some of the martyrs as their military patrons: St. George, St. Theodore, St. Demetrius, St. Sergius, St. Procopius, St. Mercurius, etc.; but to St. Michael they gave the care of their sick. At the place where he was first venerated in Phrygia, his name as an angelic healer obscured his interposition in military affairs. It was from early times the centre of the true cult of the holy angels, particularly of St. Michael. Tradition relates that St. Michael in the earliest ages caused a medicinal spring to spout at Chairetopia near Colossae, where all the sick who bathed there, invoking the Blessed Trinity and St. Michael, were cured. Still more famous are the springs which St. Michael is said to have drawn from the rock at Colossae (Chome, the present Khomas, on the Lycus). The pagans directed a stream against the sanctuary of St. Michael to destroy it, but the archangel split the rock by lightning to give a new bed to the spring. St. Michael is said also to have come from the gorge. The Greeks claim that this apparition took place about the middle of the first century and celebrate a feast in commemoration of it on 6 September (Anacletica, VIII, 285–285). Also at Sipytha in Bithynia and elsewhere in Asia the hot springs were dedicated to St. Michael. At Constantinople likewise, St. Michael was the great heavenly champion and the patron of Armenian, Coptic Churches adopted it also; it is now the principal feast of St. Michael in the Orient. It may have originated in Phrygia, but its station at Constantinople was the Chairetopia of Armenia, and in the "Epistula Michaelis" (No. 8 Nov.). Other feasts of St. Michael at Constantinople were: 27 Oct., in the "Promotu" church; 18 June, in the Church of St. Julian at the Forum; 10 Dec., at Athaea (Maximilian, Liturgia Orientalis, Freiburg, 1908).

The Christians of Egypt placed their life-giving river, the Nile under the protection of St. Michael; they adopted the Greek feast and keep it 12 Nov.; on the twelfth of every month they celebrate a special commemoration of the archangel, but 12 June, when the river commences to rise, they keep as a holiday of obligation the feast of St. Michael "for the rising of the Nile", κύριὰ ἐν τῷ τέμενος Αγιορείτου καὶ Πασχαλίου (N. Nilus, "Kal. muni.", II, 702, Innsbruck).

At Rome, the Leonine Sacramentary (sixth cent.) has the "Natale Basilica Angeli via Salaria", 30 Sept.; of the five Masses for the feast three mention St. Michael. The Gelasian Sacramentary (seventh cent.) gives the first Mass of St. Michael's Archangels and the Gregorian Sacramentary (eighth cent.), "De sacrificio Basilionis St. Angeli Michaelis", 29 Sept. A manuscript also here adds "via Salaria" (Ebner, "Miss. Rom. Iter Italicum", 127). This church of the Via Salaria was six miles to the north of the city: in the ninth century it was called Basilica Archangeli in Septimo (Armillinii, "Chiuse di Roma", p. 856). It disappeared a thousand years ago. At Rome also the protect of heavenly physician was given to St. Michael. According to an (apocryphal?) legend of the tenth century he appeared over the Moes Hadrianis (Castel di S. Angelo), in 950, during the procession which St. Gregory held against the pestilence, putting an end to the plague. The bishop consecrated the Moes Hadrianis in honour of him, a church, which was styled St. Michaelis inter nubes (in summata circi).

Well known is the apparition of St. Michael (a. 494 or 530–40), as related in the Roman Breviary, 8 May, at his renowned sanctuary on Monte Gargano, where his original glory as patron in war was restored to him. To his intercession the Lombards at the time of Sipontum (Manfredonia) attributed their victory over the Greek Neapolitans, 8 May, 663. In commemoration of this victory the church of Sipontum instituted a special feast in honour of the archangel, on 8 May, which has spread over the entire Latin Church and is now called (since the time of Pius V) "Apparitio S. Michaelis", although it originally did not commemorate the apparition, but the victory.

In Normandy St. Michael is the patron of mariners in his famous sanctuary at Mont-Saint-Michel in the Diocese of Coutances. He is said to have appeared there, in 708, to St. Aubert, Bishop of Avranches. In Normandy his feast, "S. Michaelis in periculo maris" or in Monte Turm, "in Monte Turm, apparivit mortem" celebrated on 18 Oct., the anniversary of the dedication of the first church, 16 Oct., 710; the feast is now confined to the Diocese of Coutances. In Germany, after its evangelization, St. Michael replaced for the Christians the pagan god Wotan, to whom many mountains were
sacred, hence the numerous mountain chapels of St. Michael all over Germany.

The hymns of the Roman Office are said to have been composed by St. Rabanus Maurus of Fulda (d. 855). In art St. Michael is represented as an angelic warrior, fully armed with helmet, sword, and shield (often the shield bears the Latin inscription Quo ut Deus, standing over the dragon, whom he sometimes pierces with a lance. He also holds a pair of scales in which he weighs the souls of the departed (cf. Rock, "The Church of Our Fathers," III, 160), or the book of life, to show that he takes part in the judgment. His feast (29 Sept.) in the Middle Ages was celebrated as a holy day of obligation but devotion to St. Michael was considered the most powerful of the saints, and several other feasts it was gradually abolished since the eighteenth century (see Feasts). Michaelmas Day, celebrated in England and other countries, is one of the regular quarter-days for settling rents and accounts; but it is no longer remarkable for the hospitality with which it was formerly celebrated. Stubble-goose being esteemed in perfection about this time, most families had one dressed on Michaelmas Day. In some parishes (Isle of Skye) they had a procession on this day and baked a cake, called St. Michael's bannock. (Hampson, "Medii Evici Calendarium," London, 1841, I, 348 sqq.)
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MICHEAS. See MICHEAS.

MICHAUD, JOSEPH-FRANCOIS, historian, b. at Albens, Savoy, 1767; d. at Passy, 30 Sept., 1839. He belonged to an ancient family of Savoy. Educated at the College of Bourg at Gresse, in 1786 he entered a publishing house at Lyons, but left it after a few years to take up journalistic work at Paris, where, during the Revolution, he defended the royalists and without the risk of the royal. Arrested on 13 Vendémiaire, 1795, he succeeded in escaping and resumed the journalistic war. Under the Consulate he wrote several pamphlets in which appeared criticisms of Napoleon that led to his imprisonment in the Temple for a time. After his release from prison he decided to abandon politics for literature. In 1808 he published the first volume of the "History of the Crusades". In the same year he founded with his brother the "Biographie Universelle." Elected to the French Academy in 1814, he was, under the Restoration, deputy editor of "La Quotidienne," and then lecturer to Charles X. In May, 1830, he undertook a voyage to the East and the Holy Land in order to study phases of Eastern life and thus impart more realistic colour to the accounts of his "History of the Crusades." He was unable to complete the final edition.

MICHAUD's most important work is his "History of the Crusades" (1st ed., 3 vols., Paris, 1812-17; 6th ed., Poujoulat, 6 vols., Paris, 1841). In his choice of the subject and the manner in which he treated it MICHAUD was an innovator; his work was one of the first productions of the historical school which, inspired by the works of Chateaubriand, restored the Middle Ages to a place of honour. To-day the value of this work seems questioned, but "Michaud's" approach appears insufficient and the romantic color is often false. It was none the less the starting point of studies relating to the Crusades, and it was under the influence of this publication that the Academy of Inscriptions in 1841 decided to publish the collection of Historians of the Crusades. MICHAUD had accompanied his work with a bibliography of "De croisades" (Paris, 1829, 4 vols., 129), which contained French translations of the European and Arabic chronicles relating to the Crusades. Besides, he directed the publication of the "Biographie Universelle" (2nd ed., 45 vols., Paris, 1843), and in collaboration with Poujoulat that of the "Collection des Mémoires pour servir a l'histoire de France depuis le 13e siècle jusqu'au 18e" (32 vols., Paris, 1836-44).
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LOUIS BRÉHIER.

MICHEAS (MICHAUS).—In Hebrew the complete form of the name is Mikhâyêhûh or Mikhâyêhûh (contracted into Mikhâhêhûh? II Paral., xviii, 14; Mikhâhûh, elsewhere Mikhah); a resident of the hill-country of Ephraim who founded an independent kingdom. As he restored to his mother the 1100 pieces of silver which he had stolen from her, she devoted 200 therobur with to make an idol which was set up in the house of MICHAUS. In addition, MICHAUS made an ephod and teraphim. He first appointed as priest his son, but afterwards engaged a Levite of Bethlehem, Jona-than, a descendant of Moses by Geramah. The Dan- ites, passing by whilst on a migration, took with them the Levite Jonathan and the objects of the idolatrous worship belonging to MICHAUS, in spite of the latter's protests, and set them up in the sanctuary which they established in the town of Dan, so called after their name. See the commentaries on Book of Judges, by B. F. Moore (1843); Payn Terlaine's Boek van Daniel (Tringen, 1897); Hummelauer (Paris, 1888); Lagrange (Paris, 1903); etc.; cf. A. Van Hoonacker, "Le Sacerdote Lévitique" (London and Louvain, 1889), 22, 227, 230, 234, 244, and 372.

II. MICHAEW, son of Jemla (Hebr., Mikhâyêhûh; II Paral., xvi, 14; Mikhâhûh; ibid., verse 8; Mikhâhêh; etc.), a prophet of the kingdom of Samaria, contemporary with Elisha and Eileuous. It is related in III Kings, xxiii (cf. II Paral., xviii), that Achaeb, King of Israel (c. 873-852 B.C.), allied to Josaphat, King of Judah, having obtained from 400 prophets assurance that his intended expedition against Ramoth-Galaad, a town which he wished to recover from the Sidonians, would succeed, engaged at the earnest request of Josaphat the Prophet MICHAUS, son of Jemla, although the latter, he asserted, had always proved to him a prophet of evil. MICHAUS, in his first answer, foretold the success of the enterprise, but his words were probably spoken in an ironical tone, for Achaeb adjured him in the name of the Lord to speak the truth. MICHAUS then announced the defeat of the two kings. He added that he had seen in a vision a spirit promise Yahweh to deceive Achaeb by his prophets. Whereupon one of these prophets, Sedeqias, son of Chanaan, struck him on the face. Achaeb ordered the imprisonment of MICHAUS till the day when he should return in peace. "If thou return in peace," said MICHAUS, "the Lord hath not spoken by
me." In the ensuing battle Achab was severely wounded by a chance arrow and died the same day. See the commentaries on the Books of Kings by Skinner in "The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges" (C. H. Gordon, 1906); Kettel (Gottingen, 1906); Klostermann (Munich, 1887); cf. W. R. Harper, "Comm. on Amos and Hosea" (Edinburgh, 1905), iv sq.

III. Micheas (Hebr. Mkhah; Jer., xxvi, 18: Mkhâ- yah keih.), the author of the book which holds the sixth place in the collection of the Twelve Minor Prophets, was born at Môræthoth (Mich., i, 1; Jer., xxvi, 18), a locality not far from the town of Geth (Mich., i, 14). Jerusalem was the scene of his minis- try, and it occurred, as we learn from the title of his book, under the Kings Joathan (c. 740-735 n. c.), Achaz (735-727?), and Eschecias (727-708?). We do not, however, appear to possess any of his addresses prior to the reign of Eschecias. He was thus contemporaneous with the Prophet Issias. His book falls into three parts: (1) The first part consists of chapters i-iii. Micheas begins by announcing the impending destruction of Samaria as a punishment for its sins, and Jerusalem also is threatened. In chapter ii the prophet develops his threats against the Kingdom of Judah; his reasons for them are uttered in a reproach with greater distinctness against the chief culprits: the prophets, the priests, the princes, and the judges. Because of their transgressions, Sion shall be ploughed as a field, etc. (iii, 12). This passage was quoted by the defenders of Jeremias against those who wished to punish with death the boldness with which priests and scribes of a later day uttered reproach: Micheas of Morasthi was not punished with death, but, on the contrary, Eschecias and the people did penance and the Lord withdrew his threat against Jerusalem (Jer., xxvi, 18 sq.). There is a general consensus of opinion to attribute to the Prophet Micheas the authorship of this part of the book; serious doubts however have been raised only against ii, 1. Chapters i-iii must have been composed shortly before the destruction of the Kingdom of Samaria by the Assyrians (722 b. c.).

(2) In the second part (iv-v), we have a discourse announcing the future conversion of the nations to the law of Yahweh and describing the Messianic peace, an event which Micheas foretold in connection with his enemies, symbolized by the Assyrians. In v, 1 sq. (Hebr., 2 sq.), the prophet introduces the Messianic king whose place of origin is to be Bethleem-Ephrata; Yahweh will only give up his people "till the time wherein she that travailleth shall bring forth," an allusion to the well-known passage of Is., vii, 14. Similar in spirit but more clearly and closely in line with the ideas of Micheas is vii, 14 sq. Chapters iv-v, either wholly or in part, are of post-exilic origin. But their arguments, principally based on considerations inspired by certain theories on the history of the Messianic doctrine, are not convincing. Neither is it necessary to suppose that in iv, 8, the comparison of the cedars of Sion with the "cove of the flock" and the cedars of Jerusalem with Sion is a reminiscence of Judges and Jerusalem at the time of the composition of the address; this comparison merely refers to the moral situation held towards the rest of the country by the capital, whence Yahweh is presumed to keep watch. The connexion of ideas, it is true, is interrupted in iv, 10, and in v, 4-5 (Vulg. 5-6), both of which may be later additions. A characteristic trait of Micheas's style in chapter iv is found in the puns on the names of localities, and it is noticeable that an entirely similar pun can be seen in vi, 1 (Hebr., iv, 14), particularly when the LXX version is taken into account. The reading supposed by the LXX suggests a very satisfactory interpretation of this difficult passage. "And now, surround thyself with nets," (qodesh, Bethania). The tone and contents clearly show that iv-v must have been composed in other circumstances than i-iii. They probably date from shortly after the fall of Samaria in 722 b. c. in i-iii Micheas had expressed the fear that the conquest of Samaria the Assyrian army would invade Judea; but Yahweh withdrew His purpose (Jer., ii, 19, 40) because the people can expiate their sins (vi, 6-7). The prophet answers that Yahweh claims the observance of the moral law rather than sacrifices (vi, 8). But this law has been shamefully violated by the nation, which has thus brought on itself God's punishment (vi, 9 sqq.). The present writer has suggested ("Les Douze Petit Prophetes", Pans, 1908, 405) that this passage vii, 11-13, seems transposed as to follow vii, 6; in this way the justification of the punishments assumes a connected form in vii, 9-11, 6+11b-13. The rest of chapter vii (7-11a + 14 sqq.) contains a prayer in which the fallen city expresses hope in a coming restoration and confidence in God. "The opinions of critics are much divided on the composition of these chapters. Several consider them a mere collection of detached fragments of more or less recent origin; but the analysis just given shows that there is a satisfactory connexion between them. The chief reason why critics find it difficult to attribute to Micheas the authorship of chapters vii, or at least parts of it, is the difference of a large extent in the prophet's style: Micheas of Morasthi was not punished with death, but, on the contrary, Eschecias and the people did penance and the Lord withdrew his threat against Jerusalem (Jer., xxvi, 18 sq.). There is a general consensus of opinion to attribute to the Prophet Micheas the authorship of this part of the book; serious doubts however have been raised only against ii, 1. Chapters i-iii must have been composed shortly before the destruction of the Kingdom of Samaria by the Assyrians (722 b. c.).

(3) Chapters vi-vii, which form the third part, are cast in a dramatic shape. Yahweh interpellates the people and reproaches them with ingratitude (vi, 3-5). The people respond with explanations that offerings they can expiate their sins (vi, 6-7). The prophet answers that Yahweh claims the observance of the moral law rather than sacrifices (vi, 8). But this law has been shamefully violated by the nation, which has thus brought on itself God's punishment (vi, 9 sqq.). The present writer has suggested ("Les Douze Petit Prophetes", Pans, 1908, 405) that this passage vii, 11b-13, seems transposed as to follow vii, 6; in this way the justification of the punishments assumes a connected form in vii, 9-11, 6+11b-13. The rest of chapter vii (7-11a + 14 sqq.) contains a prayer in which the fallen city expresses hope in a coming restoration and confidence in God. "The opinions of critics are much divided on the composition of these chapters. Several consider them a mere collection of detached fragments of more or less recent origin; but the analysis just given shows that there is a satisfactory connexion between them. The chief reason why critics find it difficult to attribute to Micheas the authorship of chapters vii, or at least parts of it, is the difference of a large extent in the prophet's style: Micheas of Morasthi was not punished with death, but, on the contrary, Eschecias and the people did penance and the Lord withdrew his threat against Jerusalem (Jer., xxvi, 18 sq.). There is a general consensus of opinion to attribute to the Prophet Micheas the authorship of this part of the book; serious doubts however have been raised only against ii, 1. Chapters i-iii must have been composed shortly before the destruction of the Kingdom of Samaria by the Assyrians (722 b. c.).

Micheil, Jean, a French dramatic poet of the fifteenth century, who revised and enlarged the mystery of the Passion composed by Arnoul Gréban. There are three Micheils mentioned in connexion with this work. Some consider Bishop Jean Micheil of Angers as its author, but this opinion can hardly be maintained. None of his biographers speak of his contributions to the mystery of the Passion; moreover, he died in 1447 and therefore could not have revised the work of Gréban, which first appeared about 1450. A catalogue containing the names of the counsellors of the Paris Parliament mentions a "Maistre Jehan Micheil," first physician of King Charles VIII, who was made a counsellor in 1491. We also read in "Le Verger d'Honneur," by Nicholas de La Vigenère, an "un M. Micheil," who died at Chieri (Piedmont) Maistre Jehan Micheil, first physician of the king, most excellent doctor in medicine." The third Jean Micheil, also a doctor, was the physician.
of the young dauphin, son of Charles VIII. His name appears several times in the cartulary of the University of Angers, and in the books of the medical faculty which was founded in 1501. He died in 1506. It is probable that his author was the third Jean Michel, but the fact has not been proved.

Besides his contributions to Gréban's Passion, Jean Michel composed another mystery, a Resurrection, which was played at Angers on the occasion of King René's visit to that city. Jean Michel has not the dryness of his predecessor; on the other hand he lacks his accuracy. He incorporates into his mysteries the most extravagant legends and the fantastic information found in the apocryphal writers. He delights in pictures of low city life in the fifteenth century, and his language is often realistic in the extreme.

PETIT DE JULIENVILLE, Les mystères (Paris, 1880); GRÉBAN, Geschichte der neuen Dramen (Halle, 1893); JUBINAL, Mystères inédits (Paris, 1857).

P. J. MARIQUE.

Michelangelo Buonarroti. See BUONARROTI.

Michelians, a German Protestant sect which derives its name from "Michel", the popular designation of its founder Johann Michael Hahn, b. of peasant parentage, 2 February, 1758, at Altorf near Stuttgart; d. at Sindlingen near Herrenberg in Württemberg, 20 January, 1819. Naturally aumpy and light-hearted disposition, he claimed to have been favored at the age of seventeen with a vision lasting for the space of three hours. From that time on he led a strictly retired life and was a regular attendant at the meetings of the Pietists. His peculiarities drew forth the energetic disapproval of his father, who even resorted to physical violence against him but in vain, as parental opposition served in doing the son from home without changing his manner of life, it was soon abandoned as useless. After a seven weeks' vision, alleged to have occurred in 1780, Hahn began to proclaim his beliefs through speech and writing. Large audiences flocked to his preaching and both the ecclesiastical and the civil authorities instituted proceedings against him. He sought quiet in foreign lands, notably in Switzerland, where he met Lavater. From 1794 until his death, he devoted his time, undisturbed, to religious propaganda, living on the estate of Duchess Frances at Sindlingen. While he entertained for some time the idea of establishing a distinct community, a plan which he had formed in Konstanz near Stuttgart, after his death, neither he nor his followers ever succeeded completely and permanently from the state Church. The Bible, interpreted not in a literal but a mystical, allegorical sense, occupies, in his religious system, the position of supreme guide in matters of faith. The Trinity of Persons in God is replaced by a threefold manifestation of one and the same deity. A double soul of man is admitted, for Adam fell first in seeking a consort for the multiplication of the human species, and again in yielding to her suggestion of disobedience. Hence the necessity of redemption by Jesus Christ, a redemption which is understood mainly in a physical sense, in as much as the Redeemer exudes, in his bloody sweat, the coarse, sensual elements in man to whom he restores a spiritualized body. A second and proximate advent of Christ is taught; also the ultimate universal salvation of all beings, the fallen angels included. Among the sources of his belief Hahn mentions only the Bible and special personal illumination; his ideas, however, are undoubtedly related to the views of his friend Oelgoag. His followers, found chiefly among the rural populations, are scattered over Württemberg, Baden, and the Palatinate. Their approximate number is 15,000 souls divided into 26 districts, each of which holds semi-annual conferences. The works of Hahn, comprising 15 volumes, were published posthumously at Tübingen, 1819 sqq.

WIEDEMÜTER, Michael Hahn (Wilferdingen, 1893); PALMER, Gemeinschaften und Sekten Württembergs (Tübingen, 1877); FUNK in Kirchenlex., VIII, 1501–03; KOLD in New Schaff, Ersch Enzykl., V (New York, 1900), 117.

N. A. WEBER.

Michelis, Edward, theologian, b. in St. Mauritius, 6 Feb., 1813; d. in Luxemburg, 8 June, 1855. After his ordination, in 1830, he was appointed private secretary to the Archbishop of Cologne, Clemens August von Droste-Vischer, whose imprisonment he shared, first in the fortress of Minden (1837), and later at Magdeburg and Erfurt. On his release in 1841 he returned to St. Mauritius, where, the following year, he established the Sisters of Divine Providence, whom he placed in charge of an orphanage he had also founded. In 1844 he was made professor of dogmatic theology in the seminary at Luxemburg, where he remained until his death. Among his published writings are: "Völker der Südasien u. die Geschichte der protestantischen und katholischen Missionen unter denselben" (Munster, 1847); "Lieder aus Westfalen", edited by his brother Friedrich in 1857; "Das heilige Messopfer und der christliche Weltfrieden. Für die Bedeutung" (Erfurt, 1841). He was also the founder of the "Münstersche Sonntagsblatt" and co-founder and editor-in-chief of "Das Luxemburger Wort" (1848).

LAUCHERT in Buchberger, Kirchliche Handlex.; Konversations-Lex.

FLORENCE RUSCHE McGAHAN.

Michelozzo di Bartolommeo, architect and sculptor, b. at Florence c. 1391; d. 1472. He exercised a quiet, but far-reaching, influence during the early Renaissance, and for more than a decade worked with Donatello, to whom several of Michelozzo's works have been erroneously attributed. The Ara Magna monument in the cathedral at Montepulciano and the Brancacci tomb at Naples are the work of Michelozzo alone, whilst he assisted Donatello in the execution of the tomb of John XXIII. He also modelled several pieces in brass for Donatello, with whom he collaborated on a pulpit for the cathedral of Prato. Giberti received important assistance from him on his "Matthew" and the bronze sacratory door of the cathedral of Florence. Later on, he made bronze casts of some of Luca della Robbia's designs. Among other works at Florence, a silver figure of St. John, a larger group of which was afterwards made in clay, is certainly the work of Michelozzo alone, while other pieces are ascribed to him with more or less probability. In San Giorgio Maggiore, at Venice, there is still preserved a wooden crucifix by him. That Michelozzo was influenced by Donatello in his plastic work, cannot be denied; but his own style was not devoid of originality. As an architect, it is sufficient to say of him that he was certainly worthy to be compared with Brunelleschi. Being court architect at Florence after 1435, he built the Medici chapel in the church of Santa Croce and undertook the rebuilding of the convent of San Marco, in which the cloister and the hall of the library are his work. He also built the façade of the church of Sant' Agostino in Montepulciano. In these buildings he manifested a certain preference for antique forms, though there are also traces of the Gothic influence which was then passing away. Probably his greatest work was the palace of the Medici (afterwards in the possession of the Riccardi), which lost much of its fine balance of mass when it was enlarged. Between this edifice and Brunelleschi's Patti Palace there is a great resemblance, though the Pitti may be a work of later date. Still Brunelleschi retains the superiority by virtue of his Palazzo di Parte Guelfa. A peculiarity of the Riccardi (Medici) Palace is the gra-
dation of bossage from the base upwards through two stories, after which come smooth stone blocks. The plan, moreover, was afterwards generally imitated. Not very large, but imposing in effect, it presents, below, a colonnade, above, between bold cornices, a wall decorated with antique reliefs, and then an upper story with semicircular, double-light, windows similar to those of the facade. The composite capital used here was afterwards generally adopted as a decorative element.

To Michelozzo are also due a court in the Palazzo Vecchio, and another in the Palazzo, as well as a palace built for the Medici in Milan, of which only a small part has been preserved. In this, as also in a palace at Ragusa by the same master, the upper floor had windows with the pointed arches of an earlier style. At Milan his Portinari chapel is still to be seen in Sant' Eustorgio. As compared with Donatello and Brunelleschi, Michelozzo is given the higher place by some critics, though others rank him lower.

WOLT, MICHELOZzo DI BADOLLOMEO (Strasburg, 1430); PHILIPPI, FLOREN (Leipzig, 1505); WOERZMANN, KUNDEBAUER, H (Leipzig, 1905).

G. GIEBMANN.

MICHIGAN.—The State of Michigan is bounded on the north by Lake Superior, on the east by Canada, Lake Huron and Lake St. Clair, on the south by Ohio and Indiana, and on the west by Lake Michigan and the State of Wisconsin. It has an area of 58,915 square miles.

Geography.—Michigan consists of two distinct parts separated by the Straits of Mackinac and known respectively as the Lower and Upper Peninsula. The Lower Peninsula, the most important part, consists of agricultural lands including the “Mittag Belt” about thirty miles wide, extending along the shore of Lake Michigan, in which all fruits of the northern states flourish and all the general farming crops of the northern states are grown. Some large tracts, formerly covered with pine, are sandy and of small value, but the greater part of the land is fertile. There are salt works and mineral and agricultural lands.

Seal of Michigan

The state of Michigan has the largest fresh water fisheries in the United States, the catch for the year amounting to $688,375 in the Great Lakes in the last statistical year 1903.

Communications.—Steam vessels and vessels of all kinds navigate the Great Lakes, except during two or three of the winter months. There are 3723 miles of steam railroads and 930 miles of electric roads exclusive of city street railroads.

The state of Michigan has the largest fresh water fisheries in the United States, the catch for the year amounting to $688,375 in the Great Lakes in the last statistical year 1903.
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The state of Michigan has the largest fresh water fisheries in the United States, the catch for the year amounting to $688,375 in the Great Lakes in the last statistical year 1903.
by portage to Lake Nipissing and so by Georgian Bay to their destination. This route was evidently selected through fear of the Iroquois, usually hostile to Canadians, on the shore of Lake Ontario. These pioneers were soon followed and aided by the Jesuit Fathers Allouez, Marquette, and others. Detroit was first settled by Antoine De La Motte Cadillac (1701), and the French Canadians who followed him formed the earliest farming population, settling on the shores of Detroit River. Until the country fell into the hands of the British (1760) there were no settlers of any other nationality, and during the British occupation and afterward, until after the close of the war of 1812, there were but few. Indian troubles and the unsettled state caused by war were so prejudicial to immigration that when Michigan was organized as a territory (1805) its population did not exceed 4,000 persons. But when the public lands were offered for sale (1818) a tide of settlers at once set in from New England, New York, Ohio, and other states, besides emigrants from Ireland, Great Britain, and Germany. Later there was also large emigration from Holland, and later still from Poland, Sweden, Italy, and in short from every European nation, as well as some from Turkey, Syria, Armenia, and Russia. Michigan is invited to the twenty-sixth state of the Union, 26 Jan., 1837. It adopted a constitution on being admitted as a state. In 1850 a second constitution materially changing the former one was framed and adopted, and (1909) a third constitution, better suited to the needs of the state, was prepared, adopted by popular vote, and went into force. The entire region was taken in the name of the King of France at Sault Ste. Marie (1672). In 1701 Antoine De La Motte Cadillac founded Detroit, naming it Fort Pontchartrain. In 1760 Michigan came under British rule. In 1796 the United States took possession, and Michigan became a part of the Northwest Territory. In 1805 it was admitted to the Union, Michigan being the first organized territory in 1805. Father Gabriel Richard of Detroit was elected territorial delegate to Congress (1823), being the only Catholic priest who ever had a seat in that assembly. There arose a dispute with Ohio as to the boundary line near Toledo. Michigan adopted a constitution and took the lead and held the issue to arbitration, but was prevented from doing so by reason of the Ohio dispute, which was settled by the boundary line being determined in favour of Ohio, and by Michigan obtaining instead the Upper Peninsula. It was then allowed to enter the Union (1837). The capital was removed from Detroit to Lansing (1847), then back again to Detroit by an act of 4 May, 1849. By this act there are 24,000 inhabitants. A colony of Mormons took possession of Beaver Island in Lake Michigan, from which they were forcibly expelled by armed fishermen from the mainland in 1856. The Republican party was organized "under the oaks" at Jackson, Michigan. Up to that time the Democrats were in possession into the Union, but ever since the Republicans have had a large majority of the voters. This state sent 93,700 men to the Civil War, of whom 14,855 died in the service. Michigan furnished five regiments, of 1026 officers and men each, for the Spanish War (1898), of which three regiments went to Cuba. Laws and Religion—The constitution provides that "Every person shall be at liberty to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. No person shall be compelled to attend, or against his consent, to contribute to the erection or support of any place of religious worship, or to pay tithes, taxes, or other rates for the support of any minister of the gospel or church, nor shall any money shall be appropriated or drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious sect or society, theological or religious seminary; nor shall property belonging to the state be appropriated for any such purpose. The civil and political rights, privileges and capacities of no person shall be diminished or enlarged on account of his religious believes." Tax laws are such that the payment of a fine of $10 the keeping open of any workshop or place of business; transaction of any business; all work and labour; attendance at dance, public diversion; show or entertainment; taking part in any sport, game, or play, on Sunday; works of necessity and charity are excepted. All persons are also prohibited from attending any public assembly, except for religious services or concerts of sacred music. The sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday is made a misdemeanour, punishable by fine and imprisonment. Disturbing religious meetings on Sunday is made a misdemeanour, punishable by fine and imprisonment. Oaths are administered by the person who swears holding up his right hand, except in cases where he, in the face of particular mode which he considers more binding. The form in general use is "You do solemnly swear that . . . So help you God." Blasphemy and profanity are punished by fine and imprisonment. There are no laws concerning the use of prayer in the Legislature. The custom is that at the first session of each house some minister of the Gospel is invited to read a prayer. Christmas Day and New Year's Day are recognized as holidays, but business and work are not prohibited on those days, which are on a par with Independence Day, etc. Seal of Confession.—"No minister of the Gospel or priest of any denomination whatsoever shall be allowed to disclose any confessions made to him in his professional character of confessor, by oath or otherwise, joined by the rules or practice of such denomination." And all ministers of the Gospel are exempt from serving on juries, and from military duty. Church Property.—Any five adult persons may become incorporated as a religious society by executing and acknowledging Articles of Association in triplicate, and filing them with the Secretary of State, who shall register the names and residences of the original incorporators, and the period for which it is incorporated. One of the triplicates must be filed with the Secretary of State, and one with the County Registrar of Deeds. Such corporation may make its own by-laws, which must be recorded by the Registrar of Deeds, and is entitled to own and hold real and personal property by purchase, gift, or bequest and may sue or be sued. There is no restriction as to number or nomenclature of officers. Religious bodies such as dioceses, synods, conferences, and the like may obtain corporate powers to hold property, sue and be sued, etc., by electing not less than three or more than nine trustees and filing articles of such associations, by which they are to be known with the Secretary of State and County Clerk. Religious corporations organized without capital stock are not limited as to duration of time. All houses of public worship with their furniture and pews and parsonages owned by religious societies are exempt. Also all property owned by charities, hospitals, and personal property by institutions incorporated under laws of the state. Sales of Liquor.—A tax of $500 per year is imposed. Dealers must furnish bonds in not less than $3000. Selling to minors, intoxicated persons, or habitual drunkards is prohibited, also selling on Sundays, holidays, and election days. Dealers and their bondsmen are liable to fines and fines and for injuries caused by intoxication by liquors furnished by them. Saloons must be closed at certain hours. Heavy penalties are provided for violations of the law. Any county may by a majority vote absolutely prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquor within its limits. Will and Testaments may be made by any of full age and sound mind, and attested by two witnesses executed or in presence of two witnesses who must sign at request and in presence of the testator. Bequests to a witness are void. A widow may elect to take her
statutory allowance and dower instead of a bequest. There is no limitation as to charitable bequests.

Public Institutions.—Aside from the state institutions already mentioned, there are four insane asylums, a home for the feeble-minded and epileptic, and a home for indigent aged persons. The Industrial School for Boys at Lansing and the Industrial School for Girls at Adrian are reformatories.

Prisons and Reformatories.—There are two state prisons, at Jackson and at Marquette, a reformatory for male offenders at Ionia, and a house of correction for females at Detroit. The Industrial School for Boys at Lansing and the Industrial School for Girls at Adrian are reformatories.

Cemeteries may be established by municipalities or by private corporations or private citizens. The only limitation as to locality is in cases where it would create a nuisance.

Marriage and Divorce.—Marriage is a civil contract in law; males of the age of eighteen and females of the age of sixteen are competent to contract. First cousins as well as nearer relatives are forbidden to marry. Females under eighteen must have the written consent of one parent or of a guardian. A licence is required which is issued by the county clerk.

According to the new justice of the peace, judges of probate and of municipal courts, and by resident ministers of the Gospel. All marriages must be recorded by the county clerk. No particular form is prescribed, but the parties must take each other as husband and wife. Two witnesses are required besides the magistrate or minister. Divorce from the bonds of matrimony is granted for adultery, impotence, imprisonment for three years or over, desertion for two years, habitual drunkenness. Divorce “from bed and board” is granted for extreme cruelty, and where the husband being of sufficient ability fails to provide a suitable maintenance for his wife; but the court may grant an absolute divorce for either of these causes. A sentence to the state prison for life dissolves the marriage without any judicial divorce.

Ecclesiastical Statistics.—This state comprises the Dioceses of Detroit, Grand Rapids, Sault Sainte Marie, and Marquette. It has 3 bishops, 406 priests, 412 ecclesiastical students, 306 churches, 193 missions, 208 schools, 246 church organizations, 4 orphan asylums, 1 infant asylum, 45,039 young people are Catholic care as pupils, orphans and dependents, 2 industrial schools for girls, 13 hospitals, 1 home for the feeble-minded, 1 home for aged poor, and a Catholic population of 489,451. Michigan was under the control of the See of Quebec until the formation of the Diocese of Detroit (1839), under which it remained until it was included in the Diocese of Bardstown (1808), and later, when the new Diocese of Cincinnati was created, Michigan was made a part of its territory.

The descendants of the original French Canadians are numerically inferior to the descendants of the later Irish immigrants, who form the largest part of the Catholic population. There are Germans, Poles, some Lithuanians, Bohemians, Flemings, Italians, Syrians, and a few Indians. When Bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati visited Michigan in 1832 he confirmed 142 Indians at L’Arbre Croche. These now belong to the Diocese of Grand Rapids, which contains in all eighteen Indian missions with a population of 375 families, and three schools, two of which are taught by religious, the third by a lay teacher. The Diocese of Sault Sainte Marie and Marquette contains about 2000 Catholic Indians in 12 Indian missions, attended by the Jesuit Fathers at Sault Sainte Marie, L’Anse, and elsewhere. There are few Catholic Indians left in the Diocese of Detroit. About the families of the three parishes of Fowatamies, at Basket Lake, in Berrien County are all that remain of the old mission of St. Joseph.

Catholics distinguished in Public Life.—Reverend Gabriel Richard and Timothy E. Tarasney were representatives in Congress. The following were members of the Territorial Legislative Council: Laurent Durocher, Henry Conner, John McDonnell, Charles Moran.

State Senators: Edward H. Leonard and John Corliss, both of whom were members of Congress; James Caplis, Peter Doran, Joseph Nagel, and Michael Moriarty, state senators; Circuit Judge Alfred J. Murphy; members of the state House of Representatives John C. Donnelly, John Donevan, Charles Wheelan; and William T. McCarron, Brigadier General of the Michigan National Guards; also Judge of Recorder’s Court in Detroit, James Phelan, and Probate Judge of Ottawa County, Edward P. Kirby.

FRANCIS A. STACE.

MICHOCAN, ARCHIDOCESE OF (MICHOCANENSIS), in Mexico.—The Diocese of Michoacán was established in 1536 by Pope Paul III at the instance of the Emperor Charles V, its boundaries to coincide with those of the ancient Kingdom of Michoacán. In 1568 it became an archdiocese. Under the Bishops López, Quintero, and Zamora for suffragans, its limits being at the same time greatly reduced. Its population is about one million, and the principal cities are Morelia, Zitácuaro, Maravatio, Pátzcuaro, Purúándiro, and Piedad in the State of Michoacán, and Acámbaro, Salvatierra, Celaya, Salamanca, and Pénjamo in the State of Guanajuato. The first bishop was the eminent Spaniard D. Vasco de Quiroga (1538–65), one of the greatest missionaries to the Mexican aborigines.

Among other bishops of the Spanish period, the following were distinguished for their learning and virtues: Ramírez del Frado, who has been compared to Charles Borromeo; and Ponce de León, who was the compiler of the conciliar (seminario tridentino) for the diocese in 1770; Fray Antonio de San Miguel, builder of the great aqueduct of Morelia and commonly spoken of as the father of his people. Of the bishops who have governed the Diocese of Michoacán only two have been natives of Mexico, Portugal and Munigua. The latter was named archbishop in 1855. Portugal was the first American ecclesiastie to be named a cardinal by the pope, although he died before philosophy, the cardinal’s hat. Munigua was the author of some very excellent books on law and philosophy, and lived up to his motto: “Give wealth, but save principles.” D. Ignacio Areiza and D. Atencio Sánchez, who was bishop of the See of San Luis Potosí, did much for the education of the Indians, in the epoch of peace which the republic has since enjoyed, have achieved some notable results.

The library of the Seminary of Morelia numbers 76,000 volumes; there is also a physical laboratory and valuable astronomical apparatus. In every one of the 64 parishes and the 18 succursal parishes of the archdiocese there is at least one school for boys and another for girls. At Morelia the schools are very numerous, the attendance being over three thousand, boys and girls. Celaya, Salvatierra, and Piedad have four parochial schools each, and several other parishes have two. Several charitable institutions are admirably maintained by the clergy. In times of scarcity, when the price of corn goes up, the example of the great Bishop San Miguel, who, in 1785, with the consent of the cathedral chapter, expended
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280,000 pesos for the relief of the people—an enormous sum for those days. During the two last episcopates the improvement has been notable, the number of priests increasing to 548. The Jesuits, who, we are told, had deserted him, returned. When in Italy he wrote very little, but returned to the fervent practice of the Catholic religion, which he had before neglected. In 1831 the Polish insurrection broke out; Mickiewicz attempted to return to Poland, but was stopped at the Prussian frontier. He then went to Dresden, where he wrote the third part of the "Dziady." It deserves special notice as containing, besides the expression of that revolt against God which some Poles felt after the loss of their independence, a mistaken attempt to explain their country's fate as that of a Christ-like victim slain for the sins of other nations; it offers also a key to Mickiewicz's own spiritual life. In 1832 he went to Paris, and there wrote (in Biblical prose) his "Book of the Pilgrimage," in which he treats the Polish refugees as apostles and sowers of the Word among the nations. Later, in 1834, he published his long poem "Pan Tadeusz," a marvellously lively and faithful portrait of Lithuanian life in the first years of the nineteenth century. Plot, development, characters, and language are of the highest excellence: it is a high-water mark in Polish poetry, one of the world's masterpieces. After this achievement Mickiewicz gave up poetry: his sole aim was henceforth to work out Poland's regeneration by serving God. "An order of Poles," he said, "was needed to bring the nation back to God." From this idea, which he advocated widely, the Order of the Resurrection may be said to have sprung.

In 1835 he married, and was afterwards in constant pecuniary straits. For some time he gave lessons in Latin literature at the Academy of Lausanne (1838–9); he was then named professor in the Collège de France, and his French work, "A Course of Slav Literature," was received with good. But the strain of his poetic creations in two volumes (Vilna, 1822–3). These included:

(a) "Dziady" (The Ancestors), which, besides its artistic lyricism, marks the first appearance of romanticism in Poland. His hero Gustav is rather of the morbid Werther type; (b) many ballads and romances, setting forth Lithuanian folklore with great power and skill; most, though not all, of these are visibly influenced by Goethe, Schiller, and Bürger; (c) "Grażyna," in form like the "Dziady," his best and most mature. Towkawska had won him over to his wild theory of Messianism, already foreshadowed in several of Mickiewicz's poems. He eagerly embraced the idea of a faith that should be to Christianity what the latter was to Judaism. Such a change, though it readily accounts for his melancholy results, Mickiewicz was condemned; Mickiewicz became the apostle of a false doctrine, and lost his chair of literature. He subsequently submitted (1848), but still continued to dream of a great regeneration of peoples, brought about by revolution. When the Crimean War came, he hoped for an invasion of Poland, and even offered his services for that purpose. He died there of cholera. His body was taken to Paris, and thence (1890) to the cathedral of Krakow, where it now reposes. Mickiewicz has much in common with Schiller; he is also like Byron, but above him both in moral tone and in objectivity, in which he recalls Goethe. He was a great superior to all of them as a fervent believer in Christ. Since Mickiewicz, Poland can boast of having one of the world's great literatures, while all of Polish poets he is the most talented, the most intensely patriotic, and the most potent factor in the national life of Poland.

In 1829, after a stay at St. Petersburg, Mickiewicz obtained his great desire—leave to go abroad. On his way to Rome he passed through Weimar, and visited Goethe, who, we are told, told him, "It deserves special notice as containing, besides the expression of that revolt against God which some Poles felt after the loss of their independence, a mistaken attempt to explain their country's fate as that of a Christ-like victim slain for the sins of other nations; it offers also a key to Mickiewicz's own spiritual life. In 1832 he went to Paris, and there wrote (in Biblical prose) his "Book of the Pilgrimage," in which he treats the Polish refugees as apostles and sowers of the Word among the nations. Later, in 1834, he published his long poem "Pan Tadeusz," a marvellously lively and faithful portrait of Lithuanian life in the first years of the nineteenth century. Plot, development, characters, and language are of the highest excellence: it is a high-water mark in Polish poetry, one of the world's masterpieces. After this achievement Mickiewicz gave up poetry: his sole aim was henceforth to work out Poland's regeneration by serving God. "An order of Poles," he said, "was needed to bring the nation back to God." From this idea, which he advocated widely, the Order of the Resurrection may be said to have sprung.

In 1835 he married, and was afterwards in constant pecuniary straits. For some time he gave lessons in Latin literature at the Academy of Lausanne (1838–9); he was then named professor in the Collège de France, and his French work, "A Course of Slav Literature," was received with good. But the strain of his poetic creations in two volumes (Vilna, 1822–3). These included:

(a) "Dziady" (The Ancestors), which, besides its artistic lyricism, marks the first appearance of romanticism in Poland. His hero Gustav is rather of the morbid Werther type; (b) many ballads and romances, setting forth Lithuanian folklore with great power and skill; most, though not all, of these are visibly influenced by Goethe, Schiller, and Bürger; (c) "Grażyna," in form like the "Dziady," his best and most mature. Towkawska had won him over to his wild theory of Messianism, already foreshadowed in several of Mickiewicz's poems. He eagerly embraced the idea of a faith that should be to Christianity what the latter was to Judaism. Such a change, though it readily accounts for his melancholy results, Mickiewicz was condemned; Mickiewicz became the apostle of a false doctrine, and lost his chair of literature. He subsequently submitted (1848), but still continued to dream of a great regeneration of peoples, brought about by revolution. When the Crimean War came, he hoped for an invasion of Poland, and even offered his services for that purpose. He died there of cholera. His body was taken to Paris, and thence (1890) to the cathedral of Krakow, where it now reposes. Mickiewicz has much in common with Schiller; he is also like Byron, but above him both in moral tone and in objectivity, in which he recalls Goethe. He was a great superior to all of them as a fervent believer in Christ. Since Mickiewicz, Poland can boast of having one of the world's great literatures, while all of Polish poets he is the most talented, the most intensely patriotic, and the most potent factor in the national life of Poland.


S. TARNOWSKI.

Miacmacs (Souriquois of the early French), the easternmost of the Algonquin tribes and probably the first visited by a white man, formerly occupied what is now Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Cape Breton, as well as part of New Brunswick, Quebec, and south-western Newfoundland. According to their traditions they held third rank in the original distribution of land among the confederation of the
eastern Algonquins. The first place belonged to the “father” of that nation, namely, the Ottawa tribe, which received as its share the “land of origins”; the second, called Wapanakiag, the “country of the dawn”, fell to the lot of the Abenakis, while the third province, known as Migmagig, was allotted to the Micmacs. Until the arrival of the white men, an annual

Halifax, exasperated them, but on the fall of Canada, Abbé Maillard (1735-62) succeeded in reconciling them to the new order. Several chiefs made their formal submission (1761), and ever since, though more in sympathy with the French, the Micmacs have remained loyal to the British Crown. In 1778 the United States endeavoured to incite them to revolt, but Father Bourg, at the request of the colonial authorities, restrained them from the war-path.

The Micmacs originally dwelt in the ordinary conical wigwams common to most Algonquin tribes; their garments were of dressed leather and ornamented with an abundance of fringe; their government resembled that of the New England aborigines; and their main occupation was fishing. Except in the case of the chiefs, polygamy was not general. There is an old tradition, related by an Abenaki of Oldtown (Nicolar, “Life and Traditions of the Red Men”, 1893), that the Indians came from the West while the white men originated in the East. The Micmacs are remarkable for the fact that they are the only Canadian tribe which ever used hieroglyphics, or ideograms, as a means of acquiring religious and secular knowledge. These were invented in 1677 by Father Leclercq, who took the idea from the rude signs he one day saw some children draw on birch bark with coal, in their attempt to memorize the prayers he had just taught them. They consisted of more or less fanciful characters, a few of which, such as a star for heaven and an orb for the earth, bore some resemblance to the object they represented. A number of manuals were composed which remained in manuscript until 1866, when Father Kau- der, a Redemptorist who for some time ministered to them, had type bearing the ideograms cast in Austria, with which he printed a catechism and prayer book. Though the hieroglyphics are still known by the Micmac, for all general purposes Roman type has been substituted, in which a little newspaper is published monthly in their own language at Restigouche, Que- bec. In the autumn of 1849 the Protestants formed a Micmac Missionary Society, which commenced work the following year and made a few proselytes in the vicinity of Charlottetown. Rev. Silas Rand, a great linguist and prolific writer, was the principal agent. The Indians, almost without exception, have remained steadfast in their fidelity to the Church of their first

Who made you? the Great God indeed made me What for the Great God made you He wanted indeed that I know Him I pray to Him I love Him I serve Him so that to Heaven I will go who were they created men(Indians) they were created indeed all perhaps to Heaven will go such as indeed are baptised are wise those only to Heaven will go who then is wise he that indeed greatly loves the Creator moreover also tries to fulfill as he is commanded and his neighbour he loves him

MICMAC IDEOGRAPHS FROM FATHER KAUNDER'S "CATECHISM"

ceremony long recalled this compact. There is a probability that the Micmacs were visited by Sebastian Cabot (1497) and by Cortereal (1501). They welcomed the French and their religion, preached to them by secular priests and Jesuits, as well as by Recollects and Capuchins. Father Biard (1611) has left us an interesting account of this tribe, which he characterized as mild and peaceful in temperament. He estimated its numbers at three thousand or three thousand five hundred. The Capuchins even opened for it and the white settlers the first high school within the limits of New France, and a report of the Micmac missions sent to Rome (1633) located one of them in Porto Regio. Father Leclercq, a French Recollect who did much for their instruction, called them Cas- pesians, probably because he had first landed (1675) on the Gaspe peninsula, where he successfully laboured for about twelve years. It was not until 1693 that these aborigines became officially known under their true name. Quick to appreciate the religion of the French, the Micmacs were no less faithful to the flag which to them symbolized it. Though not given to the cruel practices of the Iroquois and other eastern tribes, they proved their bravery by their active share in the French and English wars, and their lasting hostility to the colonization schemes of England. The erection of forts on the coast, especially the one at

missionaries. Another point for which the Micmacs may be said to be remarkable is the manner in which their population holds its own in spite of many diffi- culties, such as the bad example given by the whites and the facility with which they can procure intox- icants. In 1891 they had increased to 4108; and in 1894, a careful census taken by one of the Capuchins, living among them since 1894, showed that they numbered 3850 in Canada and 200 in Newfoundland. The Blue Book of the Canadian Government for 1909 sets down their numbers at 3961 within the Dominion alone, practically all of whom are Catholics. All the

Fort of Port Royal
Where the first Micmacs or Maritimes were baptized
24 June, 1610
Indians of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island (respectively 2073 and 274) are Micmacas.

Micrologus either a "synopsis" or a "short explanation", and in the Middle Ages used as an equivalent for "Manual". The best known of several is "Micrologus do celestiae observantiae" or explanation of the liturgy of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and of the ecclesiastical year; first edited at Paris, in 1510, and handed down in a number of manuscripts (P. L., CLI sqq.). This comprehensive work, of importance for both the history and the adequate understanding of the liturgy of the Mass and of the ecclesiastical year, is divided into three parts.

The author treats first of the Mass (chap. i–xxiii) in relation to its historical development; second, of the liturgy of the ember days (chap. xxiv–xxix); and third, of the whole of the ecclesiastical year, with observations on the offices of the feasts and holidays (chap. xxx–lxxi). In chapters xxiv–xxv the writer emphasizes the liturgical See in Latin America, and describes liturgical questions, and mentions Gregory VII in such a manner as to show that he was an adherent of that pope, although Gregory was dead at the time the author wrote; he also refers to Anselm of Lucca in such a way as to infer Anselm's being alive at that time (chap. xvii), hence we may conclude the work to be between 23 May, 1085, and 31 December, 1086, the death of Anselm of Lucca. Ivo of Chartres was generally held to be the author of the "Micrologus", but investigations of Dom Morin and Dom Bäumer point to Berold of Constance, a monk of the abbey of St. Blasien (d. 1100), as the author.

Another well-known treatise, edited under the title "Micrologus de disciplina artis musicae", is by the famous Guido of Arezzo, and is one of the most important writings of that teacher of ecclesiastical music (P. L., CXLI, 379 sqq., ed. Hermersdorf, Trier–1876). Morin, Quelques observations de Jean de Sacqueville (1891), 385–85; Bächler, Der Musikprinzip in J. J. Faust: "Werk Bernolds von Konstanz in Neues Archiv", XVIII (1898), 525; Dvalkhvirdi, "Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik", I (2nd ed. Freiburg, 1898), 80–81.

J. P. Kirsch.

Middendorp, Jakob, theologian and historian; b. about 1537 at Oldenzaal, or, according to others, at Ootmarsum, Overijssel, Holland; d. at Cologne, 13 Jan., 1611. He calls himself Ottersenis on the title-page of his work, "De celebritioribus Academicis". He studied the humanities at the Fraterherren gymnasium of Zwolle, philosophy and jurisprudence at Cologne University, where he became doctor of philosophy and licentiate of theology; he also taught peripatetic philosophy at the Montanum gymnasium there. He remained in Westphalia during the troubles in the Archdiocese of Cologne in the time of Archbishop Gebhard Truchseß von Waldburg, and was professor at various foreign academies; afterwards he returned to Cologne, where he passed the greater part of his life. In 1580 he became dean of St. Maria ad gradas, Cologne, in 1596 dean of St. Andreas, and in 1601 canon of the cathedral chapter. Rector of Cologne University 1580–81 and 1602–04, he was appointed vice-chancellor by the coadjutor, Ferdinand of Bavaria, in 1602. He lies buried in the church of St. Andreas. As an author he can be regarded as "author of the orbis Academis, libri II" (Cologne, 1567, 1572, 1594, and lastly 1602), considerably enlarged, in two volumes, under the title "Academicarum celebritum universal terrarum orbis libri VIII locupletatis". He also published: "Officiorum scholasticorum libri duo, quorum prior tam juventutis quam populi Christiani magistrorum, qui divinas et humanas litteras publicae quam privatae legi docent, minus edisherit, posterior vero praecipius auditorum populique officia complectitur" (Cologne, 1570); "Historiam Arianae versae per LXX interpretetum Scripturæ sacrae ex MS. codicibus Grecicis et Latinos restituit et commentario illustravit" (Cologne, 1578); "Imperatorum, regum et principum clarissimorum virorum quorundam quaestiones theologicae, ut et doctrinae et politicae cum pulcherrimis responsis" (Cologne, 1603); "Historia monastica, qua religioso et solitario vitae origine, progressiones, incrementa et naturam ex Scriptura Sacra, ex pontificio et casaroe jure, ex antiquissimis historis, ex veterum Patrum et librorum scriptis demonstrat" (Cologne, 1603).


Friedrich Lauchert.

Middle Ages. A term commonly used to designate that period of European history between the Fall of the Roman Empire and about the middle of the fifteenth century. The precise dates of the beginning, culmination, and end of the Middle Ages are more or less arbitrarily assumed according to the point of view adopted. The period is usually considered to open with those migrations of the German Tribes which led to the destruction of the Roman Empire in the West in 375, when the Huns fell upon the Gothic tribes north of the Black Sea, and forced the Visigoths over the boundaries of the Roman Empire on the lower Danube. A later date, however, is sometimes assumed, viz., when Odosacer deposed Romulus Augustulus, the last of the Roman Emperors of the West, in 476. Others, again, hold the beginning of the Middle Ages with the opening years of the seventh century and the death (590) of Venantius Fortunatus, the last representative of classic Latin literature. The close of the Middle Ages is also variously fixed; some make it coincide with the rise of Humanism and the Renaissance in Italy; in the fourteenth century; with the Fall of Constantinople, in 1453; with Columbus's discovery of America in 1492; or, again, with the great religious schism of the sixteenth century. Any hard and fast line drawn to designate either the beginning or close of the period in question is arbitrary. The widest limits given, viz., the irritation of the Visigoths over the boundaries of the Roman Empire, for the beginning, and the middle of the sixteenth century, for the close, may be taken as inclusively sufficient, and embrace, beyond dispute, every movement or phase of history that can be claimed as properly belonging to the Middle Ages.

A great part of The Catholic Encyclopedia is devoted to the movements, ecclesiastical, intellectual, social, political, and artistic, which made up European history during this important period. There is little difficulty in determining whether sacred or profane. Under the titles covering the political divisions of Europe, past and present (e.g., Alsace-Lorraine; Anhalt; Austria-Hungarian Monarchy; Baden; Bavaria; Belgium; Bohemia; Bremen; Bulgaria; Castile and Aragon; Croatia; Denmark; England; France; Germany; Greece; Hamburg; Hesse; Hungary; Ireland; Italy; Karinthia; Kraib; Liegn; Lübeck; Luxemburg; Mecklenburg; Monaco; Montenegro; Navarre; Netherlands; Norway; Oldenburg; Papal States; Portugal; Reuss; Rome; Rumania; Russia; Saxen-Altenburg; Saxen-Coburg and Gotha; Saxen-Meiningen; Saxen-Merania; Saxony; Schleswig-Holstein; Schwäbisch-Rudolstadt; Schwarmburg-Sondershausen; Scotland; Servia; Sicily; Spain; Sweden; Switz-
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ERLAND; VENICE; WALDECK; WALES; WURTTEMBERG, are given in detail their respective political and religious developments throughout the Middle Ages. Under articles of a wider scope (e.g., EUROPE; CHRISTENDOM; POPE) is found a more general and synthetic treatment. Particular aspects and movements peculiar to different portions of it are found in such articles as CHIVALRY; CRUSADES; ECCLESIASTICAL ART; FEUDALISM; GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE; INQUISITION; INVESTITURES; CONFLICT OF; LAND-TENURE IN THE CHRISTIAN ERA; MONasticISM; MUSIC; ECCLESIASTICAL; PAINTING; PILGRIMAGES; SCULPTURE; in the articles upon the great religious orders, congregations, and institutions which then came into existence: in the biographies of the popes, rulers, historical personages, scholars, philosophers, poets, and scientists whose lives fall within this period; in the accounts of the universities, cities, and dioceses which were founded and developed throughout Europe from the fall of the Roman Empire to the time of the Reformation, and in innumerable minor articles throughout the work.

Middlesbrough, Diocese of (Middlesburringis).—In medieval history it was known as Myddilburga or Middilburga, with many other variations of form.

There is an old tradition that a church in honour of St. Hilda was dedicated by St. Cuthbert at Middlesbrough about 686, but the earliest positive reference to Middlesbrough in ecclesiastical history goes to show that in the beginning of the twelfth century it was the site of a church dependent on the Abbey of St. Hilda at Whitby. At that time the church of "St. Hilda at Middlesbrough" was given by Robert de Brus of Skelton Castle, founder of Guisborough Priory, to the Black Monks of St. Benedict at Whitby, on condition that there should always be some monks at Middlesbrough serving God and St. Hilda; and there seems to have been a clause binding the monks to distribute twelve pence per week in alms to the poor of Middlesbrough for the soul of the said Robert de Brus. In the plunder of the religious houses the "Cell of Middlesbrough" was granted by Queen Elizabeth to one Thomas Reeve on 4 February, 1563. From that date there is no evidence to show that Mass was ever celebrated there, until in 1848 a private room in North Street was used for this purpose. A little later a modest chapel was erected and a resident priest placed in charge. Two causes concurred in the formation of a large Catholic congregation, namely, the Irish immigration and the rapid development of the ironworks in the Cleveland region. In 1872 Rev. Richard Lacy was entrusted with the charge of the Middlesbrough Mission. In August, 1878, St. Mary's church (rebuilding the original modest chapel) was opened with great solemnity by Cardinal Manning and Bishop Cornthwaite of Beverley. In December of the same year, St. Mary's became the cathedral of the new Diocese of Middlesbrough. The Diocese of Beverley, conterminous with Yorkshire, was, by Apostolic Letter of 17 January, 1878, divided into the Dioceses of Leeds and Middlesbrough, Bishop Cornthwaite (formerly of Beverley, henceforth of Leeds) being ad interim named administrator of the new Diocese of Middlesbrough. It was not until 11 December, 1879, that the papal Brief was received notifying the appointment of the Rev. Richard Lacy, whose consecration took place in his own cathedral on 18 December, 1879, at the hands of Cardinal Manning, assisted by Bishop Cornthwaite of Leeds and Bishop O'Reilly of Liverpool. The chapter of the new diocese, consisting of a provost and ten canons, was erected by a decree of Leo XIII on 13 February, 1881. Our Lady of St. Peter in Beverley is the cathedral patroness of the new diocese and titular of the cathedral; Sts. Wilfrid and John of Beverley are its secondary patrons. Besides these there are many others who have shed the lustre of their sanctity on northern Yorkshire: St. Hilda, Abbess of Whitby (scene of the famous Synod of Whitby in 664); St. John of Bridlington; St. William of York; St. Everilda of York; Blessed Thomas Percy, Earl of Northumberland; the Venerable Nicholas Postgate, and many others.

Notwithstanding the fact that the ecclesiastical division of Yorkshire met with adverse criticism at the hands of several leading members of both clergy and laity, moved by sentiment rather than a profound knowledge of the needs of religion, a few statistics demonstrate both how groundless were the fears then entertained, and how accurately the situation had been gauged by the ecclesiastical authorities. In 1839 the Catholic population of Yorkshire was 13,000; in 1909 it was 167,027. In 1839 there could hardly be 3000 Catholics in what is now the Diocese of Middlesbrough; in 1909 they numbered 86,000. The total number of priests in the Diocese of Middlesbrough was 54; in 1909 they numbered 113 (76 seculars and 37 regulars). In 1879 the churches and chapels were 38; in 1909 they were 67. In 1879 the schoolchildren numbered 3135; in 1909 they numbered 10,060. In 1879 there were 17 elementary schools; in 1906 there were 43. There are 23 elementary schools and 14 middle-class schools conducted by religious; two orphanages, one for boys under the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul at Hull, and the other for girls under the Poor Sisters of Nazareth at Middlesbrough; one reformatory for boys under the Fathers of Charity at Market Weighton; two pupil teachers' centres, one at the Sisters of Nazareth at Hull, and the other at the Faithful Companions of Jesus at Middlesbrough; one training college for teachers, under the Sisters of Mercy, at Hull; two colleges for boys, one under the Marist Fathers, at Middlesbrough, the other under Benedictine monks, in connexion with the well-known Abbey of Ampleforth.

Bishop Lacy was born at Navan, Meath, Ireland, 16 January, 1841, studied at Ushaw College (Durham) and at the English College in Rome, where he was ordained 21 December, 1867.

RICHARD LACY.

MIDDLETOWN, ANTHONY, VENERABLE. See Jones, Edward, Venerable.

MIDDLETOWN, ROBERT VENERABLE. See Hunt, Thurston, Venerable.

MIDIANITES. See MADIANTES.

MIDRASH. — The term commonly designates ancient rabbinical commentaries on the Hebrew Scriptures. It is the plural form of the word מִֽדְרָשׁ, Midrash which is found only twice in the Old Testament (II Par. [Chronicles], xiii, 22; xxiv, 27), where it is rendered by liber (book) in the Vulgate, and by

Whitby Abbey, Yorkshire, England

Richard Lacy.
"commentary" in the Revised Version. In rabbinical
practice, Midrash has the abstract and general
sense of study, exposition of Scripture, while Mid-
 rashim are primarily the free and artificial explanations
of the Sacred Text given by jurists or expositors, and
secondarily the collections of such explanations in
the shape of commentaries on Holy Writ.

ORIGIN AND KINDS OF MIDRASHIM.—After the re-
turn from Babylon, the Law was the centre of the life
of the Jews at home and abroad. Henceforth, the
one concern of the Jewish authorities was to make sure
that the Mosaic precepts be scrupulously observed by
all, and under all circumstances, and it is from this
practical standpoint that the Scribes and after them
the Rabbis studied and expounded the contents of
their sacred writings. A part of these contents, viz.,
the enactments of the Mosaic Law, made of course
directly for the purpose of promoting legal righteous-
ness in Israel; yet, as these laws had been framed in
view of concrete circumstances of the past, they had to
be explained in a more or less artificial way to make
them fit the altered circumstances of Jewish life, or
serve as a Scriptural basis or support of the various
traditional observances which made up the oral law.
All such artificial explanations of the terms of the
Mosaic Law are part of expositions of the Midrashim.
Distinct from this general kind of Midrashim are those
called homiletical, or Hagadic, which embrace the in-
terpretation, illustration, or expansion, in a moralizing
or edifying manner, of the non-legal portions of the
Hebrew Bible. As the object of this latter kind of
Midrashim was not to determine the precise require-
ments of the Law and the traditional asceticism con-
cerning angels, demons, paradise, hell, Messias, Satan,
feasts and fasts, parables, legends, satirical assaults
on the heathen and their rites, etc. —could render their
participation of those portions of the Sacred Text
more instructive or edifying. Both kinds of Mid-
rashim were at first preserved only orally; but their
writings were multiplied and extended, and in our
era, and they now exist in the shape chiefly of
exegetical or homiletical works on the whole or parts
of the Hebrew Bible.

PRINCIPAL MIDRASHIM.—The three earliest and in
several respects most important Midrashim collections are:
(1) the Meikhtta, on a portion of Genesis, containing
embryology the tradition of the School of Rabbi Ishmael (first century); (2) the Siphra, on
Leviticus, embodying the tradition of Rabbi Agiba
with additions from the School of Rabbi Ishmael; (3)
the Siphra, on Numbers and Deuteronomy, going
back mainly to the same two Rabbis. These three works are used in the Gemara,
the Rabbinic commentaries, a large collection of
ten Midrashim on the Pentateuch and Megilloth,
which bear the respective names of: (a) Bereishith
Rabbba, on Genesis (mainly from the sixth century); (b) Shemoth Rabbba, on Exodus (eleventh or twelfth
century); (c) Wayyiqra Rabbba, on Leviticus (middle of seventh century); (d) Bamidbar Rabbba, on
Numbers (twelfth century); (e) Debarim Rabbba, on
Deuteronomy (tenth century); (f) Shir Ashashirim
Rabbba, on Canticle of Canticles (probably before middle of ninth century); (g) Ruth Rabbba, on Ruth
(same date as foregoing); (h) Echa Rabbba, on Lamentations (seventh century); (i) Midrash Qoheleth,
on Ecclesiastes (probably before middle of ninth cen-
tury); (j) the Prophets, on the Prophets (ninth century). Of these Rabbith, the Midrashim on Exodus, Leviticus,
Numbers, and Deuteronomy are chiefly made up of
homilies on the Scripture sections for the Sabbath
or festival, while the others are rather of an exegetical
nature. (5) The Pesiqta, a compilation of homilies on
special Pentateuchal and Prophetic lessons (early
seventh or early eighth century), a Midrashic narrative of the more
important events of the Pentateuch; (7) Tanchuma
or Yelammedenu (ninth century) on the whole Pen-
tateuch; its homilies consist of a Halachic introduction,
followed by several proems, exposition of the opening
verses, and the Messianic conclusion; (8) Midrash
Shemuel, on the first book of Kings (1, II Sam-
uel); (9) Midrash Tehillim, on the Psalms; (10) Mid-
rash Mishle, on Proverbs; (11) Yalqut Shimeoni,
a kind of catena extending over all the Hebrew
Scriptures.

IMPORTANCE OF MIDRASHIM.—At first sight, one
might think that such farrago as the Midrashic litera-
ture could be of interest and value only to a Jew as
Jew, inasmuch as the Midrashim are thoroughly
steeped in the spirit of Judaism, bear distinct witness
to the laws, customs, doctrines, aspirations of the Jew-
ish race, and record the noblest ideas, sayings, and
teachings of the Jewish sages in early times. The
more, however, he examines the contents of these
Midrashim, the more he finds that they are an invaluable
source of information to the Christian apologist,
the Biblical student, and the general scholar as well.
In this body of ancient literature, there is much in the line of ideas, expres-
sions, reasonings, and descriptions, which can be used
to illustrate and confirm the inspired records of Chris-
tianity, and the traditions of the early Church;
notably concerning the passages of the Old Testa-
ment to be regarded as Messianic. The Biblical stu-
dent will at times notice in the oldest parts of the
Midrashim, Scriptural readings anterior to those
embodyed in the Massoretic text. Again, "when it is
borne in mind that the annotators and punctuators of
the Hebrew text, and the translators of the (most
ancient versions, were Jews impregnated with the
theological opinions of the nation, and prosecuted
their Biblical labours in harmony with these opinions
the importance of the Halachic and Hagadic
exegesis to the criticism of the Hebrew text, and to a
right understanding of the Greek, Chaldee, Syriac, and
Arabic versions, can hardly be exaggerated," says
Lastly the philologist, the historian, the philosopher,
the jurist, and the statesman, will easily find in the
Midrashim remarks and discussions which have a direct
bearing on their respective branches of study.
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Midwives come under the canon law of the Church
in their relation towards two of the sacraments,
baptism and marriage. As regards marriage, their
tradition is frequently required in cases de non
consummate matrimonio, whether owing to the
impediment of impotency or because a dispensation is
asked super matrimonio ratio tanti. In such cases the
testimony of three midwives is held sufficient in
practice, since the number seven mentioned in the "Cor-
pus Juris Canonici" (c. 4, de Probat,) is not considered
to be obligatory in law, though some older canonists
insisted on the necessity of having the testimony of
seven midwives. As regards the sacrament of bap-
tism, the office of midwives is of the highest impor-
tance. On them frequently devolves the duty of
conferring this sacrament, under circumstances where
no other person’s ministiration is possible. Hence, the Church has always been most solicitous concerning the character of midwives and their instruction in religion and morals. Indeed, the former are reminded that, as midwives in conferring baptism act in place of the parish priest, he is strictly bound to inform himself whether they have sufficient knowledge to administer the sacrament validly. Some diocesan synods require that midwives, before being approved for duty, take an oath that they will labour to procure the spiritual safety of infant and mother. When a new-born child has been baptized by a midwife, the parish priest must inquire carefully whether she had the proper intention and administered the rite according to the prescriptions of the Church. If there is any reason for doubt, the baptism is to be repeated conditionally (Catech. Rom., II, ii, § 49); but if it be proved that the ceremony was solemnly performed (Catech. Rom., II, III, iii, § 41), it may not be repeated (c. Maiores, 3 de bapt.; Conc. Trid. Sess. VI, can. ix), and only the other ceremonies are to be supplied by the parish priest. Finally, it is likewise necessary that midwives be well informed on the Church’s teaching concerning the performance of abortion.


William H. F. Fanning.

Gregori, Christoph Anton, Cardinal, Prince Archbishop of Vienna, b. 1714, in the Tyrol, d. 14 April, 1803, at Vienna. At nine years of age he entered the school of the Jesuits at Passau, and even then was v. O. of the residence of Prince Cardinal Lamberg at Passau, who later proposed him for admission to the Collegium Germanicum in Rome. At the age of twenty-two he returned to the Tyrol and devoted himself to the study of civil and canon law. Cardinal Lamberg took him as confidant and secretary of the Congregation of the Conclave of 1740, whence Benedict XIV came forth pope, and to him the Cardinal Lamberg repeatedly recommended his favourite Gregori. The latter remained at Rome “in order to quench my thirst for the best science at its very source”. By this he meant philosophy as proved by his words spoken about this time; “Without a knowledge of philosophy wit is merely a light fraction without soul; and reason, founded on false logic, makes man unable to leave any mark of its passage, consuming everything without itself deriving any benefit therefrom.” In 1745 he was appointed auditor of the Rota for the German nation. Owing to the special friendship of Benedict XIV, he was able to conclude several difficult transactions to the entire satisfaction of the Empress Maria Theresa, who in return appointed him in 1751 coadjutor to the aged Archbishop of Mechlin. Thereupon consecrated bishop, he was soon removed to Madrid as ambassador. A treaty which he concluded pleased the empress so much that she appointed him coadjutor of Count Bishop Althan of Waitzen (1756); but as Althan died before his arrival, and the Prince Archbishop Trantson also died in Vienna, the empress named Gregori his successor. In 1761 Maria Theresa made him administrator for life of the See of Waitzen, and at the same time obtained the purple for him from Clement XIII. It is true that Maria Theresa in possession of the sees, the revenues of which he applied to their improvement. In Waitzen he erected the cathedral and episcopal palace and founded the “Collegium pauperum nobilium” and the convent. Indeed he built almost an entire new quarter in that town; it was therefore, to say the least, hard and mortifying when, after twenty-five years of administration the “Concilium locum tenens regnum” was bestowed upon him if the taxing of his benefices in session of two benefices or offices, as in that case it was the emperor’s pleasure (Joseph II) that one of them should be given up. Gregori was forced to resign from Waitzen.

As Archbishop of Vienna time brought him many sorrows. Fious and devoted to the Church as Maria Theresa had been, yet during her reign in Austria the so-called Enlightenment (Aufklärung) developed inevitably. Its followers imagined that they could remedy all the evils of the times and promote in every way the prosperity of mankind. The representative and the literature of the new movement were everywhere in evidence. Its opponents were denounced as stupid, obnoxious and delusive. “The Masonic lodge of the Three Canons” was printed at Vienna in 1742, and at Prague in 1749 that of the “Three Crowned Stars and Honesty”. In a memorial to the empress written in 1769 the archbishop designated as the primary causes of current evils the spirit of the times, atheistic literature, the activists, the publishing of works which undermined the power of the censorship, contemporary literature, the contempt of the clergy, the bad example of the nobility, the conduct of affairs of state by irreligious persons, and neglect of the observance of holy days. Upon each of these disorders he spoke in noble terms of prophetic truth. The situation was all the more critical for the Church since the dignity of the hierarchy was diminishing, her enemies were gaining adherents. Meanwhile Clement XIV suppressed the Society of Jesus, but Gregori endeavoured to save it for Austria. He wrote to the empress, “If the members of the order are dispersed, how can their places be so easily supplied? When a minister is entailed and how many clerics must pass before the honour of a vacant See can be occupied by the departure of these priests can be restored?” Just twenty years later the cardinal wrote to Emperor Francis, “Even the French envoy who was last here, did not hesitate, as I can prove to your Majesty, to say that if the Jesuits had not been suppressed, France would not have experienced that Revolution so terrible in its consequences.” The Church was opposed as far as they were anticlerical, the government monopoly of educational matters, the “enlightened” theology, the “purified” law, the “enlightened” literature, “tolerance” and encroachment on purely religious matters. He also founded the “Inspiration of the Roman,” an establishment for the better preparation of young priests for parochial work. At Rome he was influential enough to obtain for the Austrian monarch the privilege of being named in the Canon of the Mass, Gregori lived to see the election of three popes. Maria Theresa and Kaunitz took a lively interest in his accounts of what transpired in the Conclave (23 Nov., 1775–16 Feb., 1776) which elected Pius VI, who subsequently visited Vienna during the reign of Joseph II. He owed his election to Gregori, leader of the Royalist party. How the empress appreciated Gregori is sufficiently proved in a letter he wrote to him during the Conclave, “I am as ill-humoured as though I had been three months in Conclave, I pray for you; but I am often amused to see your surprise and.”

When Frederick II heard of the death of the empress he wrote, “Maria Theresa is no more. A new order of things will now begin.” Joseph II during his ten years’ reign published 6200 laws, court ordinances, and decrees affecting the Church. Even what is judicial in them generally bears the stamp of habitation. The first means levelled against ecclesiastical jurisdiction, created dissatisfaction as encroachments on the rights of the Church. The number of memorials addressed by Cardinal Gregori to Joseph
IT and the government was astonishingly large. He opposed all the Josephist reform decrees injurious to the Church. The "simplified and improved studies", the new methods of ecclesiastical education (general seminaries), interference with the constitutions of the emperor, the suppression of the academic freedom of the universities, and violations of her rights and interference with the matrimonial legislation of the Church, called for vigorous protests on the cardinal's part; but though he protested unceasingly, it was of no avail. To be sure, matters did not culminate in a rupture with Rome, and by his visit to Vienna in 1781 he somewhat impressed upon the emperor, and the Holy See pronounced no solemn condemnation of Josephinism. On 12 March, 1790, Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany, arrived in Vienna, as successor of his brother Joseph, and as early as 21 March, Migazzi presented him with a memorial concerning the sad condition of the Austrian Church. He mentioned thirteen "grievances," and pointed out for each the means of redress: laxity in monastic discipline, the general seminaries, marriage licenses, and the "Religious Commission," which assumed the position of judge of the bishops and their rights. Finding his wishes only partly fulfilled, Migazzi repeatedly expressed his dissatisfaction.

Emperor Francis II, a Christian whose faith and conduct helped his people with fatherly care. In spite of this he confirmed the Josephist system throughout his reign. For nearly a generation the French wars absorbed his attention, during which time the aforesaid "Religious Commission" paid little heed to the representations of the bishops. The cardinal insisted on its abolition. "I am in all things a subject of the Holy See, and in all matters the shepherd must say fearlessly that it is a scandal to all Catholics to see such fetters laid upon the bishops. The scandal is even greater when such power is vested in worldly, questionabie, even openly dangerous and disreputable men." Age did not diminish his interest even in matters apparently trivial, nor did his speech suffer from it. "The diurnal outlook of the Church in your Majesty's dominions is all the more grievous from the fact that one must stand by in idleness, while he realizes how easily the increasing evils could be remedied, how easily its Majesty's conscience could be calmed, the honour of the Almighty God preserved for the Faithful, the honour of God preserved for the right-thinking of the priesthood set free, and religion and virtue restored to the Catholic people. All this would follow at once, if only your Majesty, setting aside further indecision, would resolve generously and perseveringly to close once for all the sources of so great evils." The emperor in fact made henceforth greater and numerous concessions, each of which was greeted by Migazzi with satisfaction. When the pilgrimage to Mariazell, the most famous shrine in Austria, was once more permitted, the cardinal in person led the first procession. During his long life Migazzi strove with unceasing activity for the welfare of the Church; and he died full of years and of merits. He lies buried in the church of St. Stephen in Vienna.

WOLFSBERGER, Christoph Antonio Cardinal Migazzi, Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. des Josephinismus, with a portrait of Migazzi and a facsimile of his handwriting (2nd ed., Ratisbon, 1887; KOPP,REGISTER ZUR GESCH. DER BÖRSCHEIERN VI (Vienna, 1869), 589-661.

C. WOLFSBERGER.

Mignard, Pierre, French painter, b. at Troyes, 7 November, 1612; d. at Paris, 30 May, 1695. Though destined for the medical profession, Pierre gave early signs of his true vocation. For one year he studied at Bourges, under a teacher of the name of Boucher, then for two years at Fontainebleau, where, thanks to the works of Primatice and Rosso, and the collections formed there by Francis I, there had been for sixty years a sort of national school. The Marshal of Vitry, after Mignard had painted the chapel of his country seat at Coubert, took him to Paris and obtained for him admission to the most celebrated atelier of the time, that of Simon Vouet. But the one place which more than all others attracted painters was Rome, where a throng of foreign artists were at that time living, among them Poussin and Claude Lorrain, who had settled there for life. Mignard was a member of this colony for twenty-two years. Here he found Dufresnoy (1611-65), who had been his comrade at Vouet's and with whom he formed a close friendship, and together they copied Caracci's famous frescoes in the Farnese Palace. But Dufresnoy was before all things a critic, and his best known work is not a painting, but a book, "De arte graphica," a manual written in extremely elegant Latin verse, published after his death with notes by De Piles, and reprinted for a hundred years as a masterpiece. This rare a masterpiece wielded a great educational influence over Mignard, and made him acquainted with Venice and its incomparable school, which our classic art had professed to despise. Mignard was above all an adroit, industrious workman, who knew well how to flatter public taste and thus secure his own advancement. He soon made for himself a position as portrait-painter unique in Roman society; his patrons were princesses, cardinals, and three successive popes—Urban VIII, Innocent X, and Alexander VII.

At the same time he produced many religious works, countless oratory pictures, chiefly those Madonnas which came to be known as "mignardes". That they were intended at the time to be eulogistic, seems to us the best possible criticism of a type of work marked by a certain conscious grace and preciseness. One feels a delicacy about saying positively that these Madonnas are not devotional, since they satisfied the pious instincts of whole generations of devout persons; but it is impossible in our time not to perceive in them a singular meanness, artificiality, and pureility of feeling. But in the midst of all these labours, the artist found time for such large compositions as the frescoes in the church of S. Carlo alle quattro fontane. He thus attained an unquestionable eminence in fresco painting, that pre-eminently Italian medium so little employed by French painters.

For ten years these works were widely exhibited in Rome, where he was compared to Guido and to Pietro of Cortona. During his travels through Upper Italy (1654) he was everywhere received with the greatest distinction, and painted Cardinal Sforza's portrait and those of the Princesses Isabella and Maria of Modena. On his return to Rome (1655) he married Anna Avolar, an architect's daughter, whose beauty was perfect and who posed for his Madonnas. The reputation of "Mignard the Roman," as he was called, to distinguish him from his brother, "Mignard of Avignon", had spread to France, where Louis XIV was beginning his personal reign, inaugurating that system which relied upon the glory of the arts no less than the glory of arms for the exaltation of the monarchy. Mignard was summoned back to France,
and reached Paris (1658), where he met Molière, and formed his famous friendship with that poet.

He found awaiting him in France the same exceptional position that he had enjoyed in Italy. Hardly had he arrived when he executed portraits of Louis XIV and other members of the royal family. His reply to detractors, who questioned his talent for great works, was the decoration of the Hôtel d'Epernon, soon followed by that of the cupola of the Val-de-Grâce. The latter, said to be the largest frescoed surface in the world, comprising two hundred colossal figures, represents Paradise. In pursuance of the formula dear to the Roman decorator, the throng of celestial personages is here displayed around the Blessed Trinity—the Virgin, the Apostles, the Evangelists, virgins, and confessors, founders of orders, holy kings like Constantine, Charlemagne, and St. Louis, and, finally, Anne of Austria, kneeling, offering the model of the church dedicated by her to Jéau Nascenti Virginique Matris. This style of apostolies, already trite in Italy, still possessed the merit of novelty in France. The immense composition, having cost its author only eight months' work, suffers the penalty of its hurried creation. The composition lacks inspiration, the colouring is feeble and neutral rather than bright, yet it was a very celebrated work in its time, because it flattered the megalomania and the chauvinism of the public; France no longer need envy Italy; Rome was no longer at Rome, it was in Paris. In this way Mignard's cupola took on the character of a national victory, as Molière said in his famous poem "La Gloire du Val de Grâce"; thus this very modern type of painting, so honourable at its birth by the most popular and "national" of French writers. Whether from policy or from inclination, Mignard belonged to the social circle of Racine, Boileau, and La Fontaine, at a time when artists in France associated but little with any but their professional brethren. Thanks to these concomitants, Mignard has the benefit of what literature has most to say. Saccorn and La Bruyère acclaimed his greatness, and as he had the knack of turning his literary friendships to his account, he was able to maintain for thirty years his curious squabble with the Academy. This body, after a series of difficulties, had been definitely organized by Colbert under a code of laws that Colbert, a sincere and a real friend of Mignard, would not recognize. The whole of the court faction which opposed Colbert naturally took sides with Mignard, who, without any official position, was clever enough to keep up his reputation as "premier painter", and to add to it that spicy opposition which in France always serves to carry an artist's reputation farther. The list of portraits executed by Mignard in the second period of his life includes all French society of that time. The young queen, the Duc d'Enghien, the Princess Palatine, Chancellor Séguier, the Duc de Beaufort, Bossuet, le Tellier, Turenne, Villars, le Reyne, the Contesse de Grignan, the Duchesse de Châtillon, Molière, the famous Ninon de Lenclos, and the like. He visited Louis XIV ten times, and on the last occasion the king said to him, "Mignard, you find me changed", "True, sire", said the painter; "I see a few more campaigns on Your Majesty's brow". He used for his women models a rather gaudy style, in which the draperies were somewhat overdrawn, and a system of half-mythological emblems and allusions which faithfully reflect the ideals of the court of Louis XIV. Hence these portraits have the same historical value as those of Lely or Kneller at the court of James II, while some of them possess an unquestionable attractiveness. But this was only one part of Mignard's work. He decorated many residences, public buildings, and churches, and the "Apollo" ceiling in the castle of Ballardey (Manche). However, we know by engravings that these works were good, according to the taste of the period, imitated from Caracciolo and from Guido's mythologies, artificial, pleasing, facile, somewhat heavy and weak in style. The best of his religious pictures is the "Visitation" in the Museum of Orleans. At last, Le Brun having died (1691), Mignard, at the age of eighty, succeeded to all his offices, was solemnly received into the Academy, and in one session elected to all its degrees, including that of president. Louvois having consulted him on the project of decorating the cupola of the Invalides, the main painter saw this Museum of Orleans the dignity of crowning his career with an exceptional performance, but Louvois died, the work was delayed, and the artist lost all hope of realising his last dream. He died, it may almost be said, with his brushes in his hand, at the age of eighty-four. His last work is a picture in which he himself appears as "St. Luke painting the Blessed Virgin".

De Monville, Vie de M. Mignard (Amsterdam, 1731); Lepicier, Notice in Mémoires inédits sur les Membres de l'Académie de Peinture, II (Paris, 1854); Bulte, Mémoires sur l'Académie de Peinture (Paris, 1854); Courtaul-de-Bâline, Éloge de Mignard (Troyes, 1781); Blang, Histoire des Peintres, etc., 1ère série (Paris, 1834); Le Brun, Éloge de Mignard (Paris, 1875); Courajod, Le Bateau de F. Mignard au Louvre (Paris, 1884).

Louis Gillet.

Migne, Jacques-Paul, priest, and publisher of theological works, b. at Saint-Flour, 25 October, 1800; d. at Paris, 24 October, 1875. After completing his college courses, he devoted himself to the study of theology in Orleans, and while a student there filled, for a time, the position of professor in the fourth class of the college of Châteaudun. He was ordained priest in 1824, and in the following year was made pastor of Puisieux, in the Diocese of Orleans. He published a pamphlet: "De la liberté", which brought him into conflict with his bishop, Brunault de Beauregard, in consequence of which he resigned his parish, and went to a settlement of almost solitary life at "l'Univers Religieux", later "l'Univers", a journal intended by him to be free from any political tendency, and concerned with Catholic interests alone. He edited this paper until 1836, and contributed to it a very great number of articles. Meanwhile, he had conceived the plan of publishing for the use of the clergy, at a very reasonable price, important, older and modern theological works, at so moderate a price that they might meet with a wide circulation, and thus further an earnest and scientific study in ecclesiastical circles. For this purpose he founded in the suburb Petit-Montrouge a large printing house, with all the necessary departments, the Imprimerie Catholique, where he employed more than three hundred workmen. From 1836 he devoted his energies exclusively to this great and important undertaking, which made him universally known. Within a relatively short time he succeeded in publishing many volumes of the older theological literature, and partly because of the moderate cost, he obtained for them a wide circulation. Migne also edited "Scriptores Ordinarii Completus" (28 vols., 1840–45), with excellent commentaries of older and newer writers on each of the Books of Scripture; "Theologica Cursus Completus" (28 vols., 1840–45), with treatises of many earlier writers supplementing the main articles; "Démonstrations Evangéliques" (20 vols., 1842–53), in which are gathered together the Ecdysiologic writings of over one hundred authors from every epoch of church history; "Collection Intégrale et Universelle des Orateurs Sacrés" in two series (102 vols., 1844–66), containing the works of the best pulpit orators of the preceding centuries; "Summa Aurea de Laudibus Beate Marie Virginis, coll. J. J. Bourasse" (13 vols., 1862–63); "Ecclesiologia" (1868–69). He also carried on an extensive collection of works of reference, alphabetically arranged, and not confined to theological matters.
alone, but including a number of auxiliary sciences, such as philosophy, geography, history, natural history, and the like. The compilation consists of a series of 171 volumes, 1844–66. Several of the dictionaries of the collection are of unequal value, and may be considered as out of date.

The most important and meritorious of his publications is the "Patrologia," in two collections: "Patrology Latinus Cursus Complectus," in two series (217 vols. in all, 1844–55), with four volumes of indexes (vols. 218–221, 1852–64), and "Patrologia Graecae Cursus Complectus," of which one series contains only Latin translations of the originals (81 vols., 1856–61). The second series contains the Greek text with a Latin translation (166 vols., 1857–66). To the Greek Patrology there was no index, but a Greek, D. Soehner, added a list of the authors and indexes (Athens, 1879) and began a complete table of contents (Athens, 1883). The Patrologia Latina contains all the attainable published writings of Latin ecclesiastical authors from the earliest known to Pope Innocent III (d. 1216). The Patrologia Graeca includes the printed works of Greek Christian writers down to 1559. The publisher's intention was to choose for the new issues the best editions of each author, with suitable introductions and critical additions, which plan, unfortunately, was not always realized. The printing, too, was frequently unsatisfactory, and in most of the Migne reprints we find a number of misprints and errata. The great interest in fact is that at a moderate cost and in a handy form a great work of reference was produced, and a whole series of rare and scattered writings were gathered together, and made easily accessible to the learned world. The collections had a large circulation, and are widely used as works of reference. Besides these great collections, Migne printed less important theological authors, in complete editions, e.g., Saint Thomas Aquinas, Saint Teresa, Cardinal Bérulle; the great pulpit orators Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Massillon, Fléchier; the writers Lefranco de Pomigian, de Frezay, Régnier, Thibault, du Voisin, de Maisstre, and others. Up to 1856, Migne was also proprietor of a journal "La Vérité," which gathered articles from papers of every tendency, and republished them as aids to a comprehensive induction on current ideas and facts. In connexion with his Imprimerie Catholique were established workshops for the production of religious objects, such as pictures, statues, and organs. In 1866 a great conflagration broke out in the presses, and the bookshop itself in the midst of the town. The thiebault establishment, destroying almost entirely the work of years, and the valuable stereotype plates of the Patrologia. The loss was over six million francs, but Migne did not lose courage, and began at once to rebuild. But difficulties accumulated. The Archbishop of Paris was adverse to the commercial elements in the work, forbade the continuance of the business, and, finally, suspended the publisher from his priestly functions. The Franco-German war of 1870 inflicted great losses; then from Rome came a decrete condemning the misuse of Mass stipends for the purchase of books, and Migne was especially named in connexion with this abuse. He died without ever having regained his former prosperity, and his business passed into the hands of Garnier Frères.


J. P. KRASCH.

Migration.—The movement of populations from place to place is one of the earliest social phenomena recorded in the Bible. The earliest migration recorded in the Bible was when, after the confusion of tongues, men wandered over the face of the earth (Gen., xi, 8) under conditions only vaguely known to-day. The Book of Exodus more clearly describes the withdrawal of the Hebrew tribes from the land and rule of another race, and in this connection the migration was the separation of Abraham and Lot, when the latter gathered his substance and set his face towards Sodom, while Abraham took his way to the plains, founded a nation, and went into history as the Father of the Mighty. Of the Greeks, too, it may be said that the dominant fact of their leading epoch was the wandering of the race, until its narrow borders widened out into Magna Graecia. Throughout early Latin literature runs the same story of the migrations and conquests of the Latin race, reaching a climax in the colossal structure of the Roman Empire. Modern writers have discussed the fall of that structure and the building of that strange conglomerate of races and European, of Germanic and Romance elements, till a new, and greater, Europe arose from the old.

General movements of population are termed migrations. It is a general term indicating a permanent change of habitat, i.e. a more or less serious intent to take up permanent residence in the new country. The terms invasion and conquest are reserved respectively for the entry into and the departure from any given country. Generally speaking, immigration presents more serious problems than emigration, though certain dangers do arise from an excess of emigration. Many problems grow out of immigration, and to these, legislators and rulers have turned their attention.

Migrations have taken place under a variety of conditions. In general they have been voluntary: peoples have come and gone of their own free will. But forced migrations have not been unknown in history, as when a conquering people has expelled, killed, or sold the conquered into slavery. The rule, however, is that immigration has usually been accompanied by conditions more or less severe. The latest principle, dominant among Western nations, is to disturb the population as little as possible, either in their person or property. The right to exile a people has been abandoned, and the noted case when England transported the Acadians in 1755 marks the date when sentiment turned against it and practice rapidly followed; transferred to a new authority, as the Filipinos were, the people do not migrate. Indeed, in the treaties transferring territory to new hands, the inhabitants are sometimes expressly guaranteed against expulsion, as in the Louisiana Purchase Treaty of 1803. Enforced migration has taken other forms. It has rarely been a direct result of the growth of a nation as seen in Tasmania. It has been practised by Russia in the attempt to settle Siberia. While compulsory migration has not played a great part, assisted migration has been a large factor in either inducing or directing the movement of population. Assistance may be given either by the land which gives or that which receives the emigrant. An illustration of the former is the aid given to emigrants from Prussia to Argentine and to the Kamerun region. In times of colonial expansion this method has been especially effective. Prospective colonists have been given bonuses in the form of tax-exemptions and liberal grants of land; the last mode is best illustrated in the grants in the London charter of 1605–12. Liberation from civil and criminal persecution was also an effective means to induce migration; this was used in England when the jails were emptied, and debtors flocked to Georgia, and when the courts offered the choice of self-imposed exile to accused and condemned persons. Cases are not wanting where countries have attracted immigrants themselves in various ways. A conspicuous example was the United States, where for decades "contract labour" supplied the market and made it possible for absolutely infamous labourers to migrate to America. So extensive had this assistance
become that Congress has for many years legislated
with the view of preventing further aid of this kind.
Migrations also involve many important part-
tics from those of earlier times. Down to a quite
recent date peoples moved as tribes, nations, or races,
moving and settling en masse. Taking forceful pos-
session of extended areas, they maintained their in-
dividuality either under colonial systems or as sepa-
rate groups; they finally established nations. With
these migrating groups were brought in all such conse-
quences, language, religion, industrial methods, and poli-
tical and legal systems. Usually they moved into unin-
habited or sparsely settled areas, where no question of
amalgamation could arise. With certain exceptions,
the Roman Empire being the most noted, migrations
have entailed the settling of a highly cultured people
among those of a lower culture. In such cases, migra-
tion en masse the native habitat was forever abandoned,
and the migrating tribes, thoroughly equipped, entered a new environment and yielded enti-
tirely to new influences. In these particulars different
conditions now obtain: migration is effected by fam-
ilies and individuals. These go from dense and highly
cultivated populations to wide expanses of sparsity
and poverty, by reason of a thousand causes, with
very close, taking few possessions with them; their
language survives during their own generation, and
in the succeeding one is exchanged for the language
of the adopted country, though they usually retain their
religion. They must fit into a new industrial system,
however, unlike their own. As a rule, they renounce
their natural political and economic structures, poli-
tical independence, abandoning the relations attaching
to their former status and assuming new political and
contractual relations. Such migration means to the
emigrants the death of a nation, so far as concerns
them, while to their new country it brings a serious
modification, the extent of which depends upon the
manner in which the new country is organized and
sown, and upon the history of the people which the
new country has received into its fold.
These characteristics of modern migrations have
given rise to a threefold movement. In certain lands,
as Germany, where migration to America means a loss
to German citizenship, attempts have been made to
colonize, and thus save the migrating persons to Ger-
man citizenship and culture. Those nations, more-
over, which they enter look with increasing caution
and suspicion on the numbers and character of the
incoming population. When once admitted, the
problem presents itself of granting them citizenship.
To what extent shall the immigrant assume the rights
and duties of an acquired nationality? The problem
of migration is thus inextricably bound up with a
political question.

CAUSES OF MIGRATION.—The primary cause of the
migration of peoples is the need for larger food sup-
plies. From the time when nomadic peoples were
constantly migrating down to the present westward
movements, one principle has been uniformly fol-
lowed—they have gone from areas of low, to areas
of high food-supply. This has been a constant impel-
lung and expelling power. In the last analysis,
migration results when the forces of increasing popula-
tion and decreasing food supply are not in equilibrium,
and it tends to equilibrate of forces among societies
of men: equilibration of food in relation to population;
equilibration of rights as related to authority; equili-
bration of industrial energy as between labour and capi-
tal. These express in the most general terms the
meaning of migration. First came the tribal migra-
tions, such as the exodus of Lot and Abraham towards
Zoar and their subsequent separation in search of
richer pastures. The nomad tribes on the steppes of
Asia take up the journey to the waterways to find
richer pastures for their herds. The Germans, Slavs, and similar nations came later, and,
pushed on by the same inexorable necessity, they moved south from the Caspian and Baltic regions,
overrunning Rome, and taking possession of Gaul and
Britain. With the industrial changes in England,
when the modern age dawned, lessening supplies of
food were a menace beyond the seas. In more modern
times the hunger-stricken peoples of Europe have
come to the new parts of the world, to America,
North and South; to Australia and South Africa; from
Russia they have pushed into Asia, while Japan lays
hold of outlying islands where congested population
may find room for expansion. Moreover, there are
the various causes which drive them back and forth with vary-
ing degrees of force and effectiveness. These causes
operate temporarily though powerfully. They usually
act reciprocally in the different countries, and, like
the sun and moon affecting the tides, now oppose each
other, now act in conjunction.
At the close of the eighteenth century a change in
the condition of the principal governments resulted in
greater freedom for those who wished to migrate.
During the first half of the nineteenth century the laws
limiting or prohibiting emigration were gradually
modified or repealed. At this time most countries, es-
specially those of the Western world, favoured immi-
gration, and few limitations existed checking the flow
of these people. The agitation was thus directed to social,
political, and economic conditions. The effect of the
flow of immigrants to the United States illustrate with
special clearness the operation of these causes. From
1820 to 1833 the number of immigrants gradually
increased, but as hard times began here, culminating
in the panic of 1837, immigration fell off. More
serious for the United States were the effects of economic conditions from 1846 till 1857. During that period the ac-
tivity showed itself in the United States. Under the
influence of Clay's tariff measures, manufactures had
grown, creating an enlarged demand for labour, which
was not forthcoming from the native population.
The opening of Western lands absorbed much of the
work that had been given over to the European immi-
gration, and also drew on foreign sources for increased supply.
The greatest impulse, however, was given by the dis-
covered gold in California in 1848. Not only was there
a great demand for labour on the Pacific Coast;
the effects of the discovery of gold were more far-
reaching. Prices were high, money plentiful, business,
so sensitive to these influences, was greatly stimulated,
and a heavy demand for labour was created. By an
interesting coincidence European economic conditions
also favoured a heavy migration. With bad crops
and sunless summers throughout Europe, the climax
was reached in the potato famine of 1847 in Ireland.
This destructive calamity occasioned a heavy migra-
tion from Ireland to the Western States. There was,
noting must be found. At the same time certain political causes operated in
Europe. Notable among these causes was the over-
throw of the attempted revolutions in the German
states, especially Prussia; large numbers of the Liberal
Party left Germany. The results of the Crimean War
were less easily measured, though it probably sent a
certain number to our shores. The operation of these
causes may be read clearly in the following statistics:
in 1844, 78,615 persons came to our shores; in 1845,
114,371; in 1846, 154,416; in 1847, 234,968; in 1848,
226,527; in 1854 the high-water mark was reached
when 427,833 immigrants landed here.

Equally forceful were the causes of immigration
which manifested themselves at the close of the Civil
War. Checked by the war, industry advanced by
leaps and bounds at its conclusion, and men and capi-
tal were in abnormal demand. Immigration increased
from 72,183 in 1862, when the national disaster was
at its worst, to 458,403 in 1873. During the mili-
tary years the number fell (in 1873) to 138,469. In the eighties bad economic
conditions again somewhat influenced migration to the
United States, when it fell from 788,992 in 1882
to 334,203 in 1886. The panic of 1907 and the
subsequent hard times are clearly recorded in the attenuated immigration to this country in 1808; when the population was nearly a million and a quarter, in 1808 and 1809 the figures amounted to only three quarters of a million.

Among the motives other than economic which prompt emigration is the desire to escape military service. This has been especially operative in such military countries as Germany. This cause is much more powerful during a war. In 1872-73 there were 10,000 processes for desertion on this account alone and in great part due to emigration. Again migration because of religious persecution has been historically of great importance. In past centuries thousands went from the Continent to England, from Ireland and England to the Continent and to the New World, till they might escape from a war. In recent years these influences have been most powerful in Russia and Turkey, whence persecutions affecting the Jews and the Greek Christians have sent large numbers of refugees, especially of the former class, to the United States. Another cause, difficult to measure, but of great influence, is the solicitation of relatives and freedmen. Once these small instances relatives plan to bring those left behind, secure places for them, aid them in coming, and in general form a centre of attraction in the new land, drawing powerfully on those beyond the sea. Along with this is the fear, periodically recurring with the agitation for restriction, that further immigration may be a menace to the country. Often the intentions are not seen. This was particularly noticeable before the American legislation of 1903.

A phase of this subject which cannot be overlooked and which is of increasing importance in the United States is the commercial. On the one hand is an employing class, eager for cheap foreign labour; on the other there is the Government's ability to control transportation of goods and people. As the main profits of, say, the steamship companies come from the immigrants who travel in the steerage, the reason is clear to the line of action which they follow. Everywhere, in lands where migration originates, is the ubiquitous immigration agent. His business is to induce people to migrate. Exaggerated reports, sometimes amounting to actual misrepresentation, are too often resorted to. On this legislation has had its important bearing. The greatest influence exerted by the employing class is by means of contract labour. At first generally desirable, when labour was scarce, this has since become most unpopular, and through law and popular opinion is now of comparatively little importance.

Immigration to the United States.—The many varied problems of immigration are best illustrated by its history in the United States. Perhaps no more composite nation has existed since the Roman Empire engulfed the various nationalities of Western Europe. At a very early period in the history of the American Colonies, the Negro was introduced—a race so remote, anthropologically, from the first colonists as to be impossible of assimilation. The American Indians, isolated from the first, have ever since been tending to extinction, and hence need not be considered, as a possibility in the problem of national and social composition. As time passed, other races came to still further complicate the problem. Besides these distinct racial elements must be reckoned an infinite number and variety of nationalities marked by lesser differences and capable of assimilation.

The settlers of the original Thirteen Colonies, while fairly homogeneous, yet presented some diversity. There were English, at first the dominant element, Irish, and Scotch, and persons of mixed British origin. There were a goodly number of Germans in Pennsylvania and remnants of the Dutch settlement in New York and New Jersey. A few Swedes had come to Delaware and a sprinkling of Finns. The French were represented by the Hurongis in Canada, the Carolinas. It has been estimated that the population of one million in 1750 had developed from an original migration of 80,000. Additional racial modification resulted from the annexation of new territories of alien population. In 1803, by the treaty with France, Louisiana was added, with some accessions of population. Just before the war in 1860 there were a few Spaniards, although their influence is negligible. The enlargement westward, from 1845, when Texas was admitted, till 1848, when the Mexican Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo brought a new immigration of Spaniards, Mexicans and half-breeds. Following upon the Spanish War of 1898, which resulted in an accession of nearly 8,000,000 of alien, mainly Far-Eastern, races, the extension of American dominion into the Pacific has vastly complicated the problem of nationalisation, at the same time rendering more difficult the control of immigration from these sources.

The beginning of migration to the English Colonies in America was the Jamestown settlement of 1607. In New England the first real migration of any extent was the company that reached Salem, Mass., under John Endicott in 1632. Figures on the subsequent arrivals, while not certainly accurate, are nevertheless very interesting. The discussion of the times, however, was not so marked, though there was some variation. The early German immigrants were mostly Protestants. Maryland was settled by Catholics. Into the South drifted a large number of Huguenots. In New England there was a strong Separatist element. The formation of the State of Pennsylvania by Quakers gave it a high proportion of open immigration.

The beginning of immigration into the United States (i.e. of post-Revolution immigration) dates from 1789. Before that time it is more proper to speak of colonists than of immigrants. Statistics as to the aliens coming to, or returning from, the United States are inaccurate and incomplete from 1789 till 1820. Not only are the absolute figures unsatisfactory, but no distinction was made between newcomers and returning Americans; nor was any attention paid to the returning immigrant. Roughly speaking, about 250,000 immigrants landed here from 1789 to 1820. From these figures recorded any analysis is imperfect. The dominant elements were English, Scotch, and Irish. These are the figures as immigrants, from 1820 to 1910, a grand total of more than 28,000,000. The numbers by decades were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821-1830</td>
<td>143,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831-1840</td>
<td>599,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1850</td>
<td>1,713,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1860</td>
<td>2,590,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1870</td>
<td>2,314,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1880</td>
<td>1,907,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1890</td>
<td>5,246,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1900</td>
<td>3,682,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1910</td>
<td>8,938,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures given for the last decade are, of course, partly conjectural. The statistics recently issued for the year ending 30 June, 1910, give a total of 1,041,570 immigrants to the United States for that year: 786,038 males, 305,532 females. These included 192,673 Italians; 128,348 Poles; 84,260 Jews; 71,380 Germans; 53,486 English. These are the largest numbers of immigrants known for any year so far. Except the years 1907 (1,285,349) and 1906 (1,100,735) it will be seen, too, that the last decade shows a very large number of immigrants as contrasted with any previous decade. These figures are only absolute. It is in
relative statistics that meaning lies. From the standpoint of social significance, the relation between the influx of population and the native population is the important concern. This is true, considered from the country giving or the country receiving the immigrants. The following figures show the percentages of the native and of the alien population for a series of decades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Alien</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1890 there were 17,314 foreign born to each 100,000 native; in 1900 the proportion was 15,386 to 100,000. The largest proportion of foreign-born is in North Dakota, which in 1890 had 42.7 per cent; in 1900, 35.4 per cent foreign-born. In 1900 there were seven states with more than 25 per cent foreign-born. North Carolina had in 1900 the lowest percentage of foreigners, two-tenths of one per cent, the average in the Southern states being below 5 per cent. From these figures it is clear that the effect of immigration is not materially changing.

So also regards emigration. Not the absolute numbers leaving, but the migration relative to the total, and again to the annual excess of births over deaths, is significant. A very large migration from a country with a very high birth-rate probably has no effect, or only a slight effect. When a million a year leave a country like China, it merely means that famine, disease, infanticide, etc., are less important factors in keeping down population; the greater the migration, the less burden the sending population must bear. In many Western countries this is not the case when heavy emigration takes place. The nation may be materially weakened either for war or peace. The following figures illustrate this condition: out of every 1000 inhabitants of Italy 6.87 migrated in 1888; from Great Britain and Ireland, 7.46; from Scotland 8.88; from Ireland 15.06; from Sweden 9.86; from Germany only 2.10. Most remarkable has been the effect upon Ireland, where so great has been the emigration since the potato famine that the population is now less than the half what it then was, this being about the decrease which would be produced by an emigration of 15 in 1000 during a generation.

Emigration statistics are no exception to the rule, and much meaning may be drawn from them by proper analysis. Immigrants are not merely so many units, so many homogeneous things to be blocked off in columns of hundreds, thousands, and millions, and then abandoned. Immigrants are human beings, statistics must be dealt with in the light of that fact, and the careful account must be taken of all the conditions to which their lives are subject. These cover age, sex, training, traditions, and property. Of these the most obvious and significant are age and sex. As to age, immigration to the United States has always been heavily upon adult life, the mass of immigrants coming to the United States during their productive period. Of German immigrants up to 1884, upwards of 60 per cent were between the ages of fifteen and forty-five. Of all immigrants to the United States in 1887, 70.51 per cent were between fifteen and forty. In 1909, out of 751,786 immigrants admitted, 624,576 were between 14 and 44 years of age; 88,393 were under 14, and 15,517 were 45 or older. These figures indicate the normal conditions of immigrants coming to the United States, serving to emphasize the large amount of ready labor brought in, and the large addition to the labor force of the country at a very slight cost. Caution is needed, however, in calculating the value of this influx of foreign labor. Some have taken the average cost of raising a laborer to the productive stage; others have estimated what value of goods this foreign labor would produce. The better way is to reckon the profit attributable to immigrant labor in excess of their expense to the new country; this would give the actual value accruing from the immigration.

As regards sex among immigrants, males have always far exceeded females. This is illustrated by the statistics of 1900: out of the total arrivals of 751,786 during that year, 519,969 were males and 231,817 (somewhat less than one-third) were females; again, in 1910, out of 1,041,570 immigrants, 736,038 were males. This tends to destroy the equilibrium between the sexes in the countries concerned. It leads in many instances to a large withdrawal of money from the United States to the home country. The interest of the immigrant in his native land, and leads many to return to families from which they have only temporarily separated. It increases that shifting population, especially in the large cities, and greatly augments the numbers of the "birds of passage." On the whole, the results are unfortunate. The condition is far more marked with certain nationalities. The characteristic feature of Chinese immigration to the United States has been the absence of women. The tendency among Italians to leave their families at home is strong. Of 163,248 immigrants from the South of Italy in 1909, there were 135,080 males and 30,168 females. From Northern Italy the proportion was somewhat more equalized: 18,844 males and 6,306 females. From Austria-Hungary, Ireland came 15,785 males and 15,400 females. In the case of the Japanese more women than men migrated to the United States.

Statistics of departing emigrants have not been kept with accuracy and completeness; hence it is difficult, if not impossible, to know just how many foreigners annually reside in the United States. In 1907 it is estimated that there entered the country 782,870 immigrant aliens. The same year saw 395,072 depart. These figures for that year show a net gain of 387,797, a rather small number. Of course, this number of departures was exceptional—resulting from the panic of 1907.

Out of a total of 751,786 landing in 1909, as many as 225,802 departed, leaving a net increase of 525,984.

The study of illiteracy in connexion with immigration reveals the foreigners to us, enlarges our knowledge of the countries from which they come, and helps to explain the conditions of literacy or illiteracy in the United States. Moreover, as it is strongly urged that illiteracy should be excluded in the admissions as to foreign education will help to set the limits to this form of regulation. The statistics on this phase of the subject are kept fairly constant by the shifting of the sources of migration from the north to the south of Europe. As education of the masses has not advanced as rapidly in the countries now supplying the immigrant and countries further north, so the percentage of illiteracy does not fall with the general advance of education. In 1909, out of a total immigration of 751,786, the totally illiterate numbered 191,049. This number takes in only those over 14 years of age; but, as the great majority of those coming are over 14, and those under that age are, probably, more generally educated, they may be neglected. The percentage of illiteracy of all over 14 years in 1909 was 29; in 1907 it was 30; in 1906 it was 28. There is, then, no general diminution in illiteracy among immigrants to the United States. The degree of illiteracy among those from Southern Europe is considerably above the average; among those from Northern Europe a good deal below.

Migration as Affecting Other Countries.—The last quarter of the nineteenth century saw a large migration to South America. The Argentine Republic has presented interesting phases of the subject. For half a century immigration has been an object of public attention and statistical record. There are
about 200,000 immigrants annually, and about 80,000 emigrants. In 1907 there were 209,103 immigrants and 90,190 emigrants. Of the immigrants there were 90,282 Italians, 86,606 Spaniards, and sprinklings of other nationalities. In 1909 there entered Argentina 125,497 Spaniards and 93,479 Italians, with small numbers of Portuguese and Scandinavians. The balance of immigrants against emigrants has been 2,550,197. There have migrated to Brazil since the records were kept, 2,723,964. In 1908 Brazil received 94,695 immigrants. In 1909 there migrated from the German Empire 24,921, of whom 19,930 came to the United States. Italy in 1908 lost 486,674 emigrants and received back 3,000, leaving a net loss of about 386,528 in 1907, of whom 352,983 went to the United States. In 1902, 55,366 Russians emigrated to the United States; in 1903, 68,105; in 1904, 80,892; in 1905, 72,475; in 1906, 112,764.

LEGAL CONTROL OF MIGRATION.—The legal control of migration began when it ceased to be collective and began to be individual. Laws have been passed preventing people from leaving their native land, and also, by the country of destination, forbidding or regulating entrance thereto. Extensive regulation has been found necessary applying to transportation companies and their agents, the means of transportation, treatment *en route* and at terminal points. The joint action of the national and dependent governments, particularly the right of a nation to control the variations of its own population. The greatest necessity is that arising from war: on this ground nations almost universally regulate very closely the movements of population, forbidding emigration, that they may not lose their soldiery, and guarding immigration as a military precaution. The means of transportation are thus justly regarded as the ground of health and morals, and on the general ground that a national family has a right to say who shall join it. Historically speaking, the right of the individual to emigrate is of rather recent date. The old theory was that a man may not leave his native land without the consent of the ruler. This situation arose from a variety of causes. After the dissolution of the feudal system, the population carried some of the advantages and some of the incumbrances of that system over into the monarchical state. One of its leading principles was the fixedness of the mass of the people to the soil. Again, in England, after the ravages of the Great Plague in 1351, laws were enacted requiring that the right of emigration be confined to the landless. As time passed, and the industrial revolution brought its changes, this legislation still farther limited freedom of movement. Furthermore, when the patriarchal idea of the State gave way to the military, the personal bond of national unity yielded to the impersonal, but the obligation of the subject as a member of this new national family did not weaken, the presumption being that no one could abrogate this allegiance. The opposition to emigration was based upon military necessity, upon the desire to maintain a strong industrial population at home, upon the jealousy existing among the nations, and upon the desire to keep the nation intact. Generally this attitude toward migration was abandoned. The Treaty of Westphalia extended the right to migrate for religious reasons. The great migrations westward, as discovery and the settlement of new lands became a dominant interest, did much to break the crust of conservatism and allow life to operate in ways that were free. The development of means of transportation made trans-continental migration possible, leading immigrants into new and unoccupied areas. The growth of a colonial system under which the mother country reaped large profits broke down the narrow policies and removed the old prejudices, and migration to the colonies was encouraged—in some instances enforced. Along with these changed conditions came the radical philosophy of the eighteenth century, the teaching of natural rights and an insistence upon the individual's privilege to go to, and remain in, that part of the world which best suited his fancy. Thus was a condition reached when limitations could be removed. In England, in 1824, the law limiting emigration was repealed. In Continental Europe the same has been true in the United States, Russia, in European Turkey, and in certain Oriental lands the old policy is still partially prevalent, though in these countries more liberal measures are being adopted. But, generally, there is no longer question of prohibiting emigration, but rather of encouraging it, and always of making regulations for the control of emigration. The governments have undertaken this control partly on their own account, partly in co-operation with the United States. The fortunate sentiment constantly grows stronger that joint action is necessary to successful regulation.

France is the country where emigration plays the smallest part. With a birth-rate in some years above, in others slightly below, the death-rate, she has no surplus population. It has been truly said that Germany has population to spare, but no territory; England has an excess of both people and territory; but France has no surplus people and little vacant land. The annual emigration from France is 6,000. The French government has undertaken to control the emigration. The regulations in France deal almost exclusively with the means of transportation, the condition of ships, waiting-room inspection, the health and morals of the emigrant, etc. There are no general legal barriers to free migration. The same thing may be said of Belgium and Holland. The emigration law of Italy of 1901 is most thorough enactment among the laws of the European states: it places matters concerning emigration under the Foreign Office; all persons leaving Italy must register with the Government; persons under 14 years may not leave alone; parents and guardians must leave their children or wards in competent hands. Strict care is taken that persons shall not take passage who will be liable to return under foreign immigration tests. A fund has been created with which to care for those who are forced to return. These countries, constantly losing population, have so far had few problems connected with immigration. Immigration into them is practically unrestricted. In Germany, on the contrary, very minute and effectual regulations are intended and carried into effect. Germany possesses their general practice of close public regulation, certain special conditions urge such a course. Germany is, of all lands, most completely organized for military purposes; a vigorous attempt is constantly made, therefore, to prevent desertion from the military forces, whether with the colours or in the Reserves. Hence their laws relating to the emigration of eligibles are very strict, and treaty rights for such persons who go to foreign countries are very uncertain and imperfect. Again, up to a recent date Germany has been of all lands the point of departure, not only of her own, but of the emigrants of other European states. Germany has been compelled to guard, not only her own emigrants, but, what has perhaps been a more pressing necessity and more difficult task, the inspection of the alien emigrant. The many trans-German emigrants are subjected to two, and also some cases, as the first line of inspection, before they finally embark. Of such persons the Russians are the most rigorously dealt with: they must have Russian passports and tickets through to their destination and their baggage must be examined and disinfected.

In the United States immigration problems have developed, demanding, and finally receiving, minute
and comprehensive regulation. As the subject has such important international bearings, the treaties covering the subject demand attention. The most notable among these deals with the immigration of Chinese, was the famous Burlingame Treaty of 1868, between the United States and China. In this treaty the contracting parties freely and fully recognize the inalienable right of people everywhere to migrate. They also recognize that migration should be voluntary, and they agree to allow such migration to their respective countries. In 1882 a second treaty between the United States and China reversed the previous policy, and allowed each country at its option to prohibit further immigration, a provision upon which the United States acted in 1882. The last treaty (upon which subsequent legislation touching Chinese immigration has been based) was signed in 1894. A treaty signed to the Burlingame Treaty was concluded between the United States and Japan in 1894. This agreement gives to the subjects of either contracting power the right to enter, and reside in, the country of the other power. A treaty granting privileges of immigration to Italians was signed by the United States and Italy in 1871. This treaty marks the beginning of the immigration from the Italian states to the United States. Through treaties a certain amount of control has been exercised over immigration. But the problem of controlling immigration into the United States has been complicated by the dual system of government, state and national. Until the adoption of the Constitution of 1787 the matter rested primarily with the state governments. In this instrument no direct grant of power is made to the Federal Congress for the exclusive control of immigration. It was only after considerable litigation, and several decisions by the Supreme Court, that Congress was, in 1876, given exclusive jurisdiction. Among the earlier attempts to regulate the matter were laws passed by the states, particularly New York and Massachusetts. In 1824 New York passed a law covering many details of registration, reports, head tax, etc. This act went on appeal to the Supreme Court, which voided the law as conflicting with the authority of Congress to control international relationships. Other acts touching certain phases of immigration were all declared null by the court, and the exclusive jurisdiction lies to-day in the Federal Congress.

The activity of the Federal Congress dates from 1819, and was called forth, not by any desire to limit the quantity or quality of the immigration, but by the necessity of checking the brutal agencies engaged in taking advantage of some of the states, particularly California, in matters concerning the interior of the country. The first statute covering this was passed by Congress in 1819. It limited the number of persons any one ship could bring; at first only two persons per ton, and later only one person per two tons, of the ship's displacement. Subsequent acts made provision for more sanitary ships, better food, and more space to each immigrant. During the last quarter of the century there was serious opposition to immigration, and to the immigrant as such. Beginning in 1844, at the rise of the Know-Nothing Party, a new attitude was taken by many. This party grew strong, especially in the South, and from 1844 to 1856 it carried many states. It elected members to Congress and to local assemblies, and governors of states. One of its tenets was opposition to immigration, and as a party strong in the Southern states it did much to determine that antipathy of the South to immigration which was maintained for many years. The close of the Civil War marks a new attitude towards the immigrant. It was a period of rapidly expanding industries and there was an increased, indeed an alarming, demand for labour. An act passed by Congress, in 1864, which greatly encouraged the importation of labour, really authorizing contract labour. This Act was operative till 1868. Under its influence and other favourable conditions there was a vast increase in immigration by 1866. From 72,183 in 1862, the numbers sprang up to 332,577 in 1866. In the early seventies sentiment began to revert to foreign immigration to a certain degree, partly due to the organization of the labour movement. It was more largely due to a vast increase of Oriental migration. Acts were passed prohibiting the equipping of ships to carry on the trade in coolies. A system of coolie labour had developed amounting practically to slavery. In 1875 any person contracting for coolie labour was liable to indictment for felony. From 1877 on, an opposition, centered on the Pacific Coast, developed against the further immigration of Chinese labour, and this first took shape in the treaty of 1880 mentioned above. On 6 May, 1882, an Act was passed by Congress for excluding the admission of Chinese labour for ten years. This Act, with certain changes, has been continued to the present day. No Chinese labourer may now enter the United States. No Chinese may become a citizen unless he be born here, in which case citizenship is secured to him by the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution. These restrictions, both as to entry and naturalization, have been from time to time extended till they apply to the whole of China. The following table shows the growth of Chinese immigration to the United States in sixteen typical years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>4,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>7,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>3,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>6,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>5,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>15,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>16,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>5,502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1882 11,890
1885 39,579
1888 22
1890 1,716
1895 975
1900 1,247
1906 1,544
1910 1,770

It will thus be seen that the Chinese Immigration Law has been fairly successful as a measure of exclusion.

The first statute covering the general question of immigration was enacted by Congress on 3 August, 1882. The purpose of this and subsequent legislation has been twofold. It was necessary to provide for a more effective administration of matters of immigration. This involved the increased power of the federal hands and the creation of a fund for this purpose. The Act of 1891 gave the control of immigration to the Federal Government exclusively, doing away with concurrent administration. The Act of 1882 had begun the formation of a fund by imposing a head-tax of $0.50 on each alien immigrant entering a port of the United States; this tax was afterwards (1903) raised to $2 per head, and it now produces enough to carry on the department and leave a slight surplus.

The law of 1891 created the office of superintendent of immigration, later changed to commissioner-general of immigration. The Act of 1903 added much to the needed control. It created a number of excluded classes, which may be grouped under two general heads: those physically, those mentally, and those morally diseased. Under the general head of physically unsound are many excluded classes, the most stringent rules covering those having loathsome and contagious diseases, especially trachoma and tuberculosis. Idiots and lunatics are excluded. Among those regarded by the Act as morally defective or "the anti-social class", are Anarchists and those accused of plotting against government, all criminals and fugitives from justice, all women immigrating for immoral purposes, all prostitutes and procurers of girls or women for purposes of prostitution. There is provision for excluding paupers and those who are likely to become a public charge. All those are excluded who have come under contract to labour, or who have their expenses paid by another, except that immi-
grants’ relatives may send money to aid them. Certain of these cases are made criminal: importation of women for lewd purposes, preparing passages under contract to labour, promising employment to aliens through advertising, bringing diseased aliens in by other than regular routes—all these are criminal offences against the United States.

The Act of 20 February, 1907, is the latest statute of the United States dealing comprehensively with immigration. It constitutes the proceeds of the head-tax a permanent immigrant fund (changed by the Act of 20 February, 1907, so that these funds go to the general fund. This law of 1907 still further extends the limits of the excluded classes. It makes the prohibition of contract labour stricter, as well as the exclusion of lewd women and girls, and of the procurers of such. It forbids the advertising by anyone for purposes of securing labour to come to this country; limiting such advertisement to furnishing necessary data of sailing, rates, etc. This Act also requires that a list and full descriptions of the aliens coming with each ship shall be furnished. Provision is also made for deporting such persons as may be illegally landed, the time for legal deportation being extended from one year to three years. The Circuit and District Courts are given full power in this matter, and all matters under the immigration laws. The Act further enacts a provision for the calling of an international conference to discuss matters relating to immigration. Some details are relegated to be dealt with by the Department of Commerce and Labor.

**Effects of Legislation in the United States.**—Results of legislation show its results in these: the number of immigrants debarked and returned immediately on attempting to land; the number subsequently apprehended and deported; the number of those stopped at the port of departure. Figures are obtainable on the first and second of these classes; they are only conjectured as to the last. It is, however, unfair to measure the effects of legislation by these tests alone; the deterrent influences are more powerful. During the past seventeen years about one per cent of all those coming to the ports of the United States have been either debarked from or deported after entering. The following table shows approximately the percentage of immigrants debarked or deported for all reasons in certain typical years during that period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Excluded</th>
<th>Debarred</th>
<th>Dead</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>579,663</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>-483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>258,338</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>-1,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1,026,499</td>
<td>11,879</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>12,734</td>
<td>-2,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1,100,738</td>
<td>12,432</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>13,108</td>
<td>-1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1,293,349</td>
<td>11,962</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>12,856</td>
<td>-1,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>792,870</td>
<td>10,902</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>12,971</td>
<td>-1,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>751,786</td>
<td>10,411</td>
<td>2124</td>
<td>12,535</td>
<td>-1,456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 10,411 excluded in 1909, 4401 were likely to become public charges; 2084 had tuberculosis; 1172 were contract labourers, while 402 were sent back as immoral. Although a larger number of Chinese have been excluded regular students of that nation, they have also been deported. There are, of course, many obvious difficulties in the way of enforcement. Many of the reasons for debarring are difficult to establish—such as many forms of disease, various types of immorality, and weak physical condition with no real organic ailment. Again, the contract labour law is hard to enforce because of these many effective means of evasion. Among these the most serious has been the increased immigration through Canada, which results either in smuggling pure and simple—or by means of a year’s residence in Canada—in the evasion of certain regulations—e. g. the head-tax. However, the laws as at present administered, especially with the cooperation of foreign governments, are at least pointing in the right direction and supplying the country with a better selected body of immigrants.

**Distribution of Immigrants in the United States. —A. As to Origin.**—There have been several changes in the origin of migration to the New World. In the Southern Europe—Italy, Spain, and Portugal—it began when the Americans were new. In the northern states, it was a hardy venture. It then shifted northward till the peoples of northern countries began to send many colonists out to America. After the formation of the Republic, its immigrant population came chiefly from northern Europe and so continued well into the nineteenth century. One of the most striking features of migration to America has been the latest change in the sources of the stream, which now flows more strongly from the South and East. This change has been very marked. From 1841 to 1850 45-57 per cent of the immigration to the United States was from Ireland; from 1871 to 1880 only 15-1 per cent. From Germany between 1861 and 1885 there came 25-6 per cent; from 1861 to 1870, 36-65 per cent; from 1871 to 1880, 25-74 per cent, while in 1900 Germany furnished only 8-5 per cent, and Ireland 4-3 per cent of the immigration. From 1820 to 1902 Germany sent 21-98 per cent of all the immigrants, and Italy had sent 26-60 per cent; in 1903 Italy sent 26-91 per cent. In 1907 Italy sent 28-22 of the total, while Germany, Scandinavia, and the United Kingdom combined furnished only 20-1 per cent; in 1910 Italy sent 223,431 immigrants; Germany, 71,380; England, 53,418; there were also 123,348 Poles and 52,037 Scandinavians. In 1880 Italy and Austria-Hungary sent 11,756 immigrants; in 1907 these two countries sent 624,184, about one-third more than the total immigration in 1877. From 1872 to 1900 there came to the United States 356,062 Italian immigrants; from 1890 to 1900, 655,888. These figures illustrate what might be much further amplified; the change in source of the immigration to the United States in the last few decades. Further analysis would show many minor divergences. From Italy come two different types: northern Italy—furnishes one; southern Italy and Sicily another. These vary widely in mental characteristics, in industrial habits, and in wealth. They furnish needed elements to our population, lending colour and vivacity to the American nationality. Equally clear are the types of Jews now coming in such numbers. In earlier times there were the Russian and Portuguese Jews. Later, the migration of Jews had its origin in Germany. Here as it was the rule. The great majority of Jews who now migrate to the United States are of Russian origin. There has also been a change in the Irish immigrant. At first the Irish migration was largely from the North, contained a large admixture of Scotch blood, was Protestant in religion, and agricultural in pursuit. The centre of migration from agrarian to industrial. During this transition a large number of persons were left without occupation, as the older order broke up, and many of these migrated. The stream of migration from Ireland was necessarily checked as that population became more and more seriously depleted, falling to about one-half its number between 1860 and 1870. During this period there was an increase of population in the southern and southeastern countries, and owing to various causes a high birth-rate has been accompanied by a low death-rate. A surplus of population resulted, and migration from those countries was the consequence. Low industrial organisation there, high industrial demand here, and labour naturally flowed into the area of high demand.
A feature less fundamental is the development of the means of transportation to and from southern ports. In interesting contrast to the earlier domination of the Italian cities by their maritime power in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries into Dutch and English, and, later, into German, hands. This led to a marked neglect of southern ports, and not till a generation ago did the merchantmen begin to reorganize the lines to tap southern countries and call at southern ports. The Italian lines sailing from southern ports doubled in tonnage, and the construction of ships in those ports, for Italian and Austrian trans-Atlantic traffic, became a flourishing industry. Gradually the southern harbours became active in a trade the most important item of which was the transportation of immigrants to the United States.

Typical of this change was the growth of the cities of Genoa, Naples, and Trieste. The growth also of the German lines must also be considered. These, together with the extension of railway lines leading to the harbours, have done much to develop the migration from southern and southeastern countries. From 1850 to 1890, Germany sent to the United States 1,432,977 persons; during the 17 years following 1890, she sent 2,372,576. In 1899 Germany sent 58,534, while Italy sent 190,498. Germany formerly supplied one-third of the immigration to the United States; now, less than one-tenth is from that source. Between 1860 and 1870, the British Isles, Germany, Scandinavia, and Canada together supplied 90 per cent of the total immigration to the United States; in 1880 and 1890 the percentage was 41 per cent. In 1869 Austria-Hungary, Italy, Poland, and Russia together supplied only 1 per cent; in 1902, the same group of countries supplied 70 per cent.

B. As to Destination.—The distribution of the immigrant population in the United States may be considered as showing the following trends.

(1) Geographically.—The most obvious distinction is between North and South. From the beginning of the Republic until 1866 there was practically no immigration into the southern States. While slavery existed, the South had no immigrant problem, the only foreigners entering that section being those brought in by the slave trade. The North, being considered as the home of the immigrant, the North Atlantic States stood first in percentage of foreign-born. In 1903, according to Dr. Hall, 22.6 per cent of the population in the North Atlantic States were aliens; 13.8 per cent in the North Central; 20.7 per cent in the Western; only 4.6 per cent in the South Central and South Atlantic. In 1880, 50 per cent of the aliens in the country resided in the North Atlantic States; of these, New York was the choice of 220,865; Pennsylvania of 112,402; Massachusetts of 61,187; New Jersey of 41,907. New York received 75,988 Italians—somewhat less than one-half their total number; Pennsylvania took 33,000 Italians. The marked change in the percentage since 1850 are in the North Atlantic States, which received 59 per cent of the immigration then and now receive about 50 per cent; and in the Western States, which in 1850 had 1.2 per cent, 8.2 per cent in 1900, and in 1906 6.5 per cent of all the new arrivals. In 1900, one-eighth of the whole population was foreign-born; in 1905, aliens formed one-tenth of the rural and one-fourth of the urban population.

(2) As to Occupation.—The rapid development of industrialism in the United States has a marked selective effect on a population that is unsettled. That it should act with increasing power on a drifting immigrant population is to be expected; as the century advanced the effect shown in a great increase of urban immigration. A corresponding lessened interest in agriculture is due partly to the growth of manufactures, partly to the changed nature of population. On the other hand, the important mining industries still draw very heavily on the immigrant for their labour.

The tendency, therefore, is for an ever-increasing percentage of the people to settle in the large cities. According to Professor Smith, in 1880 the cities took 45 per cent of the Irish immigrants; 38 per cent of the German, 30 per cent of the English and Scotch, and 60 per cent of the Italian. In 1900 the cities took 75 per cent of the population, and 80 per cent of the foreign-born; 80 per cent of the foreign-born lived outside the cities. In the South Atlantic States 9.2 per cent of the urban population and 1.1 per cent of the rural were foreign-born; in the North Central, 25.4 per cent of the urban and 12.9 per cent of the rural; in the Western, the percentages were 27.2 and 18.5 per cent. There are 86 cities in which at least 20 per cent of the population is foreign-born, and 27 cities in which they form more than one-third of the total population.

The attitude of the United States at the present time (1910) towards foreign immigration is one of caution. Actual and projected legislation aims, not at exclusion, but at selection. It is recognized that the assimilation and integration of the alien is the ultimate limit. Legislation must, by the application of rational principles, eliminate those incapable of assimilation to the general culture of the country.

Great care is, of course, necessary in determining and applying these principles of selection: an educational test, for instance, while it would exclude much ignorance, would also exclude many industrious and of high character and solid worth. It is probable that a more vigorous system of inspection of immigrants at points of entry will be put in force, while a stricter control will be exercised over the steamship companies. At the same time, the co-operation of foreign governments is needed, if the exclusive measures designed for the protection of the United States are to be effective. The American immigration are to be made thoroughly effective.

Official Sources.—Decennial Census of the United States, 1790-1900; Annual Reports of the Bureau of Immigration; Treaties in Force of the United States; Trade and Commercial Relations of the United States; Special Consular Report, XXX.

Unofficial.—Commons, Race and Immigrants in America (New York, 1903); CHINCHON, Chinese Immigration (New York, 1899); BRANDENBURG, Imported Americans (New York, 1904); HALL, Immigration and Its Effects on the United States (New York, 1898); HACK, The Japanese in the United States (New York, 1902); KAPP, Immigration into the United States (New York, 1870); Seward, Chinese Immigration (New York, 1881); SMITH, Immigration and Emigration (New York, 1892); STEINER, On the Trail of the Immigrant (New York, 1906); Warne, The Slav Invasion (Philadelphia, 1884); WHEELEET, The Problem of Immigration (London, 1906).
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MILAN, ARCHIEPISCOPATE OF (MEDIOLANENSIS), in Lombardy, northern Italy. The city is situated on the Orona River, which, with three canals, the Naviglio Grande (1257-75), the Naviglio Martesana (1457), and the Naviglio di Pavia (1567-9), is the highway of the commerce of this great industrial centre, called the moral capital of Italy. The soil is very fertile and there is extensive cattle-raising and manufacturing throughout the province. The name of Milan is probably derived from the Celtic melian, which means "in the middle of the plain". The city was founded in 39 b.c. by the Romans, on the site of the city of Mediolanum and became the chief centre of the Cisalpine Gauls. After the defeat of the Gauls near Clastidium, Mediolanum was taken by the consul Lucius Scipio (221) and be-
same a Roman municipium. In 45 B.C. it obtained Roman citizenship, and under the emperors it had famous schools and was a flourishing city, the Emperor Adrian having made it the seat of the praefectus Ligure and Constantine, of the vicarius Italiae. After A.D. 296 it was several times the capital of the emperors of the West (Maximian Herulius, Valentinian I, his sons Gratian and Theodosius I), and later, of Ricimer and of Odoacer. The edict of toleration of Constantine and Licinius (313) was agreed on and published at Milan. In 452 the town was besieged by Attila, and in 538 destroyed by Uraia, a nephew of Vitiges, King of the Goths, with a loss, according to Procopius, of 300,000 men. Perchance for this reason the Lombard kings did not thereafter come from Milan, though in 896-97 they did so during the brief division of the kingdom between the sons of Gundobad (661). After Charlemagne, Milan was the seat of counts, whose authority however, was overshadowed by the prestige of the archbishops, foremost among whom was Ansaperto da Bisoseo (869-91), who fortified the town and adorned it with beautiful buildings. In 896-97 it endured a severe siege by the Hungarians, and a century later Otto II transferred the title of count to the archbishops. The most distinguished of these was Ariberto (1018-45), who induced Conrad II to take the crown of Italy. With the assistance of the people he made war on Pavia and Lodi (1027), on which account he obtained the presidency of the ducal feudal lords, whom he exiled, but who, leagued together, defeated the archbishop at Campo Malo (1035), and returning to the city, called Conrad to their assistance; the latter, however, besieged Milan in vain (1037). Though the struggle continued, a noble, Lanzano, and no longer Ariberto, headed the popular party. Finally, not having been able to subdue the city, this intermingling of the classes brought the commune into existence. At the same time tradesmen, the industries (especially wool), and commerce flourished. As the power of the burghers grew, that of the archbishops waned, and with it the imperial authority which the prelate represented, so that Milan in 1110, refused to pay tribute to Henry V, who had come into Italy. In 1116 the public authority passed entirely into the hands of consuls elected by the people. Milan made war on cities faithful to the empire: Pavia, Cremona, Lodi (destroyed 1111), and Como (destroyed 1127). Frederick Barbarossa wished to remedy these evils, and in 1129 obliged Milan to swear allegiance to him and to receive a imperial podestà. This power was soon driven from the city, but in 1162 after a long siege, Milan was again reduced to obedience, and in part destroyed. The battle of Legnano (1176) secured their rights to the Lombard cities, and to Milan its consular government; but on many occasions the authority of a foreign podestà was substituted for the native consuls. The long period of peace was favourable to agriculture (greatly furthered by the Cistercians), also to the wool and silk industries, in the former of which, throughout Milanese territory, 60,000 men were employed, while the silk industry supported 40,000 persons. The struggle against the empire was renewed under Frederick II, who regained the rights won at the peace of Constance. A second league was formed, which Frederick defeated at Courtenova, though he did not succeed in his ulterior purpose. Thereafter Milan entered into further wars with Ghibelline cities, especially with Pavia. The nobility remained favourable to Frederick and to his successors, and assisted internal strife in Milan, and the creation of a new office, that of capitano del popolo, which was first held it was Pagano della Torre, elected in 1240 by the Credenza di San Ambrogio, the executive branch of the city government, composed of twelve members representative of the three orders of citizens. The legislative power was exercised by the General Council, the number of whose members was variable. The capitano del popolo was hated by the nobles, and when Pagano della Torre was succeeded (1247) by his nephew Martino, under the title of ansiato della Credenza, the nobility sought the assistance of Esselino da Romano; but Martino overcame the resistance of the nobles, and also defeated Esselino, introduced reforms into the public administration, and distributed the public offices with equity. A new civil war was prevented by the "peace of St. Ambrose" (1258), at which the equality of nobles and people was agreed on. As conflicts continued, Martino called to his assistance Oberto Pelaviccino, a well-known soldier with whose help Martino had finally vanquished Esselino da Romano. In 1263 Filippo, brother of Martino, was real papal legate at Milan, and the city was granted the title, and as other cities—Como, Lodi, Novara, Vercuri, also La Valtellina, were subject to Milan, he may be called the founder of the duchy. His nephew Napoleone, under the title of ansiato del popolo, exercised supreme power (1265-77), and in his later years was imperial vicar for Italy, notwithstanding the fact that he was a Guelph. The archbishop Otone Visconti, who since 1262 had been prevented from taking possession of his see, organized the nobles exiled from Milan, and after several battles, succeeded in capturing Napoleone and his relatives, whom he locked up in cages at Como. The archbishop then caused himself to be proclaimed perpetual lord, thus putting an end to the Republic of Milan and founding the power of the Visconti, which at the conquest of the entire peninsula, though its real domain was limited by the Alps, the river Sesia, and the Po, while the east extended as far as Brescia, conquered in 1337. From 1302 to 1311, Ferrara Torre were again in power, Guido of that family having Dutch and Flemish support. When the latter returned, he was made imperial vicar by Henry VII, and devoted himself to driving the leaders of the Guelph party from the Lombard cities. On this account John XXII declared war, and sent Cardinal Bertrand du Puyet against Matteo. Galeazzo, Matteo's son, continued the war against the legate and the Guelphs, and adhered to the party of Louis of Bavaria. His son Azzo (1329-59) contributed to the ruin of the Scaligers, obtained Brescia, and was succeeded by his sons Luchino (1339-49), famous for the refinement of his cruelty, and Giovanni II (1349-54), Archbishop of Milan, who obtained possession of Genoa and Bologna, though unable to hold either of these towns, or the cities of Ferrara and Mantua. At the death of Giovanni, Milan was divided between three brothers, his nephews: Matteo II, who died in 1355; Galeazzo II (1354-78), and Bernabò (1354-85) all patrons of literature and of the arts, but odious through their cruelty, misgovernment, and exorbitant taxes. Accordingly, a strong league was formed against them in 1367. The state of the Visconti was thus united again and in 1385, Giovanni Galeazzo received the title of duke. In 1387 he had conquered Verona and Vicenza. During his reign the duchy of Milan was at the height of its power, and contained the following cities: Pavia, Bergamo, Brescia, Cremona, Como, Novara, Vercuri, Alessandria, Valenza, Tortona, Piacenza, Genoa, Reggio, popes of Rome, Belluno, Fies, Siena, and Perugia. Giovanni Galeazzo so wavered in his devotion to good and evil; the Carthusian monastery of Pavia is a witness of his religious transformations and of his taste for the arts. The power of the duchy of Milan reached its height, but,
Giovanni Maria having been assassinated in 1412, Filippo Maria remained sole duke, and with the assistance of Carmagnola, retook a great portion of the lost territory. The offensive proceeding of Filippo Maria caused the fall of the Este and Fe, and compelled the community to form a league against him, which led to a long war; in the course of it, several famous battles were fought, among them that of, Macloedo (1427), by which the Duke of Milan lost Bergamo and Brescia, and the naval battle of Portofino (1431) disastrous to the Genoese allies of Milan. The peace concluded in 1435 was favourable to Venice. The war broke out again, and continued until the death of Filippo Maria, in 1447, when the Ambrosian Republic was proclaimed (1447-50).

For military reasons, Francesco Sforza was made capitanio del popolo, and succeeded in taking possession of the fortress and in having himself recognised duke (1450). This event led to a new war with Venice and the King of Naples, closed by the peace of Lodi in 1454. Francesco was succeeded in 1466 by his son Galeazzo Maria, who, hated by his subjects, was stabbed to death in 1476. His son Giovanni Galeazzo had as regent, first his own mother, and then (1480) his ambitious uncle Ludovico il Moro, who succeeded his nephew, at the latter's death in 1494. Louis XI, with a view to gain over the Kingdom of Naples for the advantage of the French, attempted to renew the compact with Venice for the division of the duchy. Ludovico il Moro attempted to resist them, but was constrained to seek refuge in Germany, and Milan came under the power of the French. In 1500, Duke Ludovico returned to his dominions for a time, but other French troops were sent against him, and he died a prisoner in France. The expulsion of the French from Italy ensued upon the death of Gaston de Foix, the victor of Ravenna (1512), and Milan was given to Maximilian Sforza, a son of Ludovico il Moro, although the Spaniards were its real masters. After the battle of Marignano, Maximilian surrendered Milan at the end of a brief siege, and remained a prisoner in France. The expulsion of the French from Italy by the League of Cambrai (1517) was followed by the deposition of the French king Francis II, a brother of Maximilian, who was succeeded by Charles V, who returned to Milan and re-established himself in the Spanish throne. The peace of Utrecht (1713) gave Milan to Austria, which power had occupied the duchy since 1706. In 1708, the war of Succession between Austria’s dominion over Milan was interrupted for a time (1745), and France even offered the duchy to Savoy. Maria Theresa and Joseph II much were done for the prosperity of the Milanese, and civil and ecclesiastical reforms were also introduced. In 1766 Milan became the capital of the Cispadian Republic, soon transformed into the Cispalian Republic, and (1805) into the Kingdom of Italy; the Cispadian Republic was supported entirely by French arms, which checked by Austria (1799), returned victorious, after Bamberg. In 1814 the Austrian domination was re-established, and lasted until 1859. Encouraged by the revolution of Vienna in 1848, Milan revolted, in an effort to throw off the foreign yoke; and the Austrian government (18 to 22 March of that year) remained famous; a provisional committee was formed and the Austrians were compelled to retreat; but the consequent war, Piedmont having taken up the cause of Italy, was disastrous to the insurgents; and Milan (with Lombardy) again became subject to Austria. The war of 1859, however, decided the final annexion of Lombardy to the King of Sardinia.

Milan is an archiepiscopal see. According to an eleventh-century legend the Gospel was brought there by St. Barnabas, and the first Bishop of Milan, St. Anasthalm, was a disciple of that apostle. But a diocese cannot have been established there before 200, and possibly not till much later, for the list of the bishops of Milan names only five predecessors of Merocles, who was at the Council of Rome (313). During the persecutions several Christians suffered martyrdom at Milan; among them Sainta Gervasia and Protastia (first persecution of Diocletian), St. Victor (304), Sta. Priscilla (304), St. Faustina (304), and St. Fe. Among its bishops should be named St. Eustorgius, St. Protasius, and St. Dionysius, who firmly opposed the Arian emperor Constantius, and was exiled to Caesarea (355), while the Arian Auxentius was put on the episcopal throne of Milan. But the people remained faithful to the Catholic religion. At the death of St. Austro, the great St. Ambrose was elected bishop (375-97), vanquished pagan and Arianism, and was the guide of those good princes Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius. He was succeeded by St. Simplicianus (397), and Venerius (400); Lusaratus (438-49) appears to have amplified the Ambrosian rite of Milan; Laurentius (490-512) presided over the Roman curia in the cause of Pope Symmachus; St. Datius (550-54), lived almost always in exile at Constantinople, on account of the Gothic War; Vitalis (652) adhered to the schism caused by the “Three Chapters”, but Auxanus (656) re-established the union of the diocese with Rome. Honoratus (568) sought refuge in Genoa, with a great number of his clergy, during the siege of Milan by the Lombard Alboin. He died at Genoa, and was deposed and exiled to France, and succeeded him Laurentius II, while Frontino (elected at Milan) was not recognized. When Laurentius died, King Agilulfus wished to secure the election of an Arian bishop, in which, however, he was thwarted by the vigilance of St. Gregory the Great, and both at Genoa and at Milan, Constantius was elected to the vacant see; under his successor, the clerical spirit of Genoa and Milan became Catholic, and the conversion of the Lombards to the Faith was begun, while the episcopal palace was again taken up at Milan. The first prelate of this diocese who bore the title of archbishop was St. Petrus (784), but it is certain that. St. Ambrose had already exercised metropolitan jurisdic tion over the diocese of Milan. The title of Patriarch was conferred on the Frankish king Clovis by St. Ambrose in Milan, and the Frankish king Childebert gave to Bishop Laurentius II the title of Patriarch. St. Petrus established an asylum for foundlings, one of the first institutions of its kind in Europe. Mention has been made above of Ansepto da Biassono.

In 880 Landolfo, a sone of the imperial vicar, Boniso, became the archbishop of Milan; his father, however, being driven from the city on account of his abuse of power, but was taken back by the emperor Otto II, and repaired the evil that he had done. He was succeeded by Arnolfo II (998) and Ariberto d’Intimiano (1018), mentioned above. The latter was succeeded by Guido (1045), also a simoniac. At this time the morals of the clergy were deplorable: simony and concubinage were common, and out of these conditions developed the famous patoria, a popular movement for social and ecclesiastical reform, headed by the priest Anselmo da Biaggio, later Bishop of Lucca, and by the cleric Ariald, both of whom used force to compel the clergy to observe continence, and to drive its members from the churches where they never entered, and to replace the communion. In 1059 Nicholas II sent to Milan St. Peter Damian and the same Anselmo, at which the people murmured, demanding that the church of Milan be not subject to that of Rome. Archbishop Guido, however, promised amendment, and accepted the conditions imposed upon him, but soon relapsed and Ariald, with whom the noble warrior Erlembaldo was associated, being aware of the real state of things, the consequence of which he was brutally assassinated 2d June, 1066. Erlembaldo then gave a military organisation to the patoria, and Guido, who was excommunicated, was compelled to leave the city. While the election of his successor was being discussed, Guido sold the archiepiscopal dignity to his secretary. Until 1085 there were several pretended to the see;
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and in one of the many tumults caused by this condition of affairs Erlembaldo was killed (1074). Under Anselm III order was re-established.

Unfortunately, the patauria had created an anti-clerical sentiment in the people, and had prepared them to accept the doctrines of Manicheism. In fact, the Cathari of Italy were more frequently called Patari, and in Milan, one of their chief centres, they maintained a kind of university. Archbishop Oberto was exiled by Barbarossa in 1162; and though his successor, St. Galduino, was elected at Rome by the emigrated Milanese, he was able to take possession of his see in 1167; he reorganized the hospital del Brogo. Archbishop Ubarto Crivelli became Pope Urban III in 1185. At an archiepiscopal election, in 1283, not less than five candidates, Raimondo della Torre, and the nobles a member of the family of Seltala; therefore Urban IV appointed Ottone Visconti, who was prevented by the Milanese from taking possession of his see until 1277, when he entered Milan, both as archbishop and as lord. Roberto Visconti, who succeeded John in 1354, was old enough to have made no doubt about the property of the Church, which they regarded as the personal property of their uncle. Among other archbishops of Milan were Pietro Filargo (1402), who became Alexander V; Fra Gabriele Sforza (1454), an Augustinian, brother of Duke Francesco and founder of the Ospedale Maggiore; and the cardinals Stefano Naldini (1459), of the Saluzzo family; Filippo d'Este (1497), also the latter's nephew in Bolognola (1520). During the incumbency of this prelate, always absent from his diocese, great abuses grew up which Giovanni Angelo Arcimboldo (1550) and St. Charles Borromeo (q. v.) sought to remedy (3561).

Here is enough to mention the latter's seal for the reformation of morals, his enthusiasm in preserving the Franciscan Rite and extending it in Milan, and the archdiocese (Monza alone retaining the Roman rite), and his foundation of the Oblates for diocesan missions. His work was continued by Gaspare Visconti (1584) and by a nephew of St. Charles, Federigo (1594–1631), who was a cardinal, as were all of his successors, to Filippo Visconti (1784–1801), whose nominal title to the see rested on the possession of the Holy See, nearly brought on a schism. He was followed by Cardinal Capra, well-known as Apostolic legate to the court of Napoleon. After the death of this prelate in 1811 the See of Milan remained vacant for six years; the next archbishop, Cardinal Carlo Giacinto Gaisruck, was appointed in 1818, and governed the see with great prudence. Its character as a "monastic" see was not yet lost, and he wrote the "monastic prelate." He was especially opposed to the re-establishment of the religious orders. Archbishop Paolo Angelo Ballerini (1859–67) was never able to take possession of his see, because the Italian Government denied him the exequatur; and his auxiliary bishop Dominioni was also persecuted.

The Milanese in 343 and 347, against Photinus; 355, in the cause of St. Athanasius, at which the Emperor Constans menaced the bishops; 390, against Jovinian; 451, against the Robber Council of Ephesus; 680, against the Monothelites; 1060, 1098, 1117, 1287, for ecclesiastical reforms. The diocesan synods of St. Charles Borromeo and those of 1636 and of 1869 were also reform synods. Diocesan synods were held in 1600 and 1850 respectively. The suffragan bishops of Milan were wont to meet each year at Rò; their sees are Bergamo, Brescia, Como, Crema, Cremona, Lodi, Mantua, and Pavia. The archdiocese has 788 parishes, with 1,828,000 inhabitants, 27 religious houses of men, and of women nearly 80 in the city. The archdiocese is a centre of religious educational establishments for boys and 176 for girls, 2 Catholic daily papers, and many important periodicals. In the Middle Ages there was a monastery at Milan, St. Cosmas, for Armenian monks of the Rule of St. Basil; they depended, however, on a similar monastery in Genoa, and had no relation with Armenia. This order, which used the so-called Aquinian rite, was suppressed in 1650.

RELIGIOUS EDIFICES.—The wonderful Italian Gothic cathedral is built of white marble, has five naves, and is 486 feet in length; it is surmounted by 98 slender turrets, on the principal one of which is a bronze statue of the Magdeburg saint, 2000 of which are on the exterior. The cathedral is situated on the site of the ancient basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore (fourth or fifth century), and was begun in 1386 by Giovanni Galeazzo Visconti. The tomb of St. Charles is under the cupola. The treasury of the cathedral contains, among other valuable objects, the precious statuette of Santa Charles and of St. Ambrose, made of silver and set with precious stones, a gift of the city. The high altar is a gift of Pius IV. The church of St. Ambrose, built by its patron saint in 386, and often restored, especially in the twelfth century, contains the tomb of the Emperor Louis II; in the chapel of St. Saturn is a mosaic that dates, probably, from the fifth century, while the central altar with its woodcarvings representing the life of David, is held, on seemingly good grounds, to be of the time of St. Ambrose; the church possesses also a golden altar-front (palliotto) of Angilbert (835). The monastery annexed to this church had a fine library, and belonged at first to the Benedictines, later to the Canons, finally to the military order of the church of St. Eustorgius contains the mausoleums of Stefano Visconti, Martino della Torre, and others. The church of St. Stefano Maggiore is of the fifth century; that of San Vittore al corso is the Basilica Portiana, dating from before the time of St. Ambrose; it contains the body of the martyr St. Victor, and also valuable paintings; San Nazaro Maggiore (382?) has some interesting frescoes; S. Gemma Galgani (1281–1345) is the founder of the Trivulzio family. In the church of St. Aquilinus there is a beautiful mosaic and the sarcophagus of a lady of the family of the Emperor Theodosius. Santa Maria delle Grazie is a church in the style of the Renaissance (1465), with a cupola by Bramante; it has valuable frescoes, beautiful carvings, and inlaid work in the choir; in the ancient monastery, which formerly belonged to the Dominicans, is the famous Last Supper of Leonardo da Vinci. On the site of the principal hall of the baths of Maximian, the premises of which remain, is built the church of San Lorenzo, containing ancient mosaics. The church of San Marco (1294) has a beautiful high altar, and valuable paintings; that of San Maurizio, far better than either, but also by the hands of Theodelinda, is covered with frescoes by Luini between 1503 and 1509. San Satiro, a church that dates from 1503 and 1509. San Satiro, a church that dates from 1503 and 1509.

SECTARIES.—Among these are the Palazzo di Corte (1228), restored several times; whose garden contains the Royal Villa (1790); the Broletto Nuovo, from 1228 to 1788 the palace of the commune; the Palazzo della Ragione (1223); the Broletto (1413–24), at present containing public offices; the Collegio Elvetico, founded by St. Charles Borromeo, and now the seat of the Court of Assizes; the Vittorio Emanuele gallery and the Castello Sforzesco. There are several schools, which have several due to the Bank of Lombardy, is an important Romanesque structure, the Lombard Seminary for foreign missions; the Academy of Sciences and Letters; the Technical Institute; the Superior Institute of Commerce; 3 royal and 6 private gymnasia; many other schools, 17 of which are under religious direction; the Verdi Conservatory of Music; the Lombard Institute for Sciences and Letters; the Royal Library, with many important works of art; the Jesuit college, rich in paintings of the old Lombard school, and possessing a valuable numismatic collection. In the Castello Sforzesco is a museum of ancient and medieval art, while many of the private
palaces, such as those of the Borromeos and of the Trivulzio, contain valuable collections of paintings. The National Library in the Brera (1770) and the Ambrosian Library are famous. The latter was founded by Cardinal Federigo Borromeo (1600) and contains 200,000 manuscripts, of which 830 are illuminated with miniatures. The State and the municipal archives are important; so, also, in their sphere, are the astronomical and the meteorological observatories. Milan has 14 theatres, of which the Scala is world-famous. There are 17 historical and 6 polycolyces, also asylums for the insane, the blind, the deaf, etc. Besides, there are nearly 500 industrial establishments, with 150,000 workmen; the textile, typographic, and pharmaceutical industries are especially well represented.

Cappelletti, Le Chiesa d’Italia, XI (Venice, 1856); Eustachio di Milano, Una cabala romantica (Milan, 1856); Eusebio, Storia di giorni trascorsi in Milano (4 vols., Milan, 1820); Castro, 2 (vols., 1855); Bonfido, Gianetti, 4 (vols., 1883–1934); Asti, Milano all’aperto (London, 1907); Sartorio, Archipe- coporum Mediolanensis series (Milan, 1755); the periodical Milano Benefico (1905 sqq.).

U. BENIGNI.

Milde, VINZENZ EUGEN, Prince-Archbishop of Vienna, b. at Brunn, in Moravia, in 1777; d. at Vienna in 1855. The adulatory monument erected to him in the Cathedral of St. Stephen in Vienna portrays a catechist bending over two children, inscribed 'Charity', to the left, a priest in the act of elevating the Blessed Sacrament, attended by a young priest and a clerk, inscribed 'and Prayer'. Under these two inscriptions, and extending across the whole length of the monument are the words 'link together the inhabitants of this world and those of the next'. The monument thus bears witness to Milde’s distinction as a catechist and as the founder of a seminary for priests and teachers. Towards the close of his preparatory studies, Milde left called to the ecclesiastical state which his stepfather was very much opposed to his entering. His mother favored his purpose, however, and poor and without acquaintances, he entered the ‘Alumnat’ or little seminary at Vienna in 1794. Here he formed an intimate friendship with Vinzenz Darnaut, the future professor of church history, and with Jakob Frint, later Bishop of St. Pölten. The three distinguished men were again united by a court chaplain and the firm friendship for the remainder of their lives. Meanwhile, Milde became catechist in the Normal High School and successor of the famous Augustin Gruber, and occupied also the chair of pedagogics at the university. Later, as court chaplain at Schönbrunn, Milde spoke so comforting to the Emperor Francis I, inurable after a battle lost to Napoleon, that the emperor replied: ‘I shall never forget this hour, dear Milde’. Not content with words, the emperor named Milde Bishop of Leitmeritz in 1823, and in 1831 Prince-Archbishop of Vienna. Milde being the first archbishop named from the ranks of the people to this see, which had hitherto been always filled by a nobleman, his nomination was thoroughly characteristic: ‘The bond of the sacred ministry is broken, but the bond of the heart will never be severed. Those whom I have loved, I shall love to the end, and, though separated from you, I shall remain united with you in charity and prayer. Pray our heavenly father not that I may live long, but that I may live for the salvation of the faithful and for my own salvation’. Milde thus greeted the people of Vienna: ‘Not only do I wish to be united with you in the bonds of the sacred ministry, but I wish to be united with you in the bonds of charity. Not for myself, but for you do I wish to live.’ He kept the promise which he made to his flock, and was to them a faithful and loving father.

Nevertheless, the year of the Revolution (1848) brought him his bitterest enmities and his most severe illnesses. He was between two fires. On 13 March the storm broke, and four days later he warned his clergy, in a circular letter, not to overstep the bounds of their calling: ‘Priests are not intended to advise regarding the earthly affairs of men, nor to regulate them, but to administer the Church, to expound the exterior matters pertaining to the salvation of souls.’ But the revolution soon menaced the archbishop. Mock serenades were held repeatedly outside his palace and its windows were broken. On the other hand, a portion of the clergy clamoured that he should be declared incapable of managing the affairs of the diocese and expressed the hope of being led to victory by a stronger personality. A deputation of the clergy represented this to Milde, who compiled as far as possible by retiring to his castle of Kranichberg. When the draft of the fundamental laws of the Austrian constitution was discussed by the assembly of the States of the Empire at Kremser, the archbishop drew up an address to the assembly: ‘The undersigned bishops declare solemnly that they, as true citizens, promote the welfare and hold sacred the rights of the state, but it is the duty of their office and of their conscience to look after the freedom and the rights of the Catholic Church, to oppose encroachment and restriction on the part of the state, and to beg for the support which would make the true prosperity of the state and the successful activity of the Church.’ At the great assembly of bishops in Vienna (1849), Milde was chosen one of a committee of five to continue the negotiations with the state. When finally in 1850 the imperial decisions were promulgated, which attempt does a blow, to the existing Josephist system, Milde published a pastoral for the purpose of stilling the tumult: ‘The uneasiness is indeed in great part the result of misunderstanding, but often also the result of malicious misrepresentation, since, through some newspapers and through speeches made by certain men inimical to the Church, the words of the August decree were distorted and erroneous representations spread abroad.’ The words of Milde in ‘My last will’ are strikingly beautiful. ‘Hope softens the separation. Those who did me evil I do not think wicked, but gladly persuade myself that I by my sensitiveness have in many cases been more deeply wounded than the occasion warranted. During the last ten years, however, many bitter misunderstandings and shameful calumnies. I have kept silence through it all, not through apathy, but partly that the malice might not be excited further, and partly in imitation of my Redeemer.’

Milde’s ‘Lehrbuch der allgemeinen Erziehungs- kunde’ is famous, and even yet much used (Vol I: Von der Kultur der physischen und der intellektuellen Anlagen; Vol II: Von der Kultur des Gefühls- und des Begehungsvermögens, Vienna, 1811–13, 3rd ed., 1843). A compendium of the Erziehungskunde was published in 1821. J. Ginsel edited Milde’s ‘Reli- quien’ (2nd ed., Vienna, 1859), which contained his addresses and which he dedicated to the emperor.

C. WOLFGRUNER.

Miles, GEORGE HENRY, dramatist and man of letters, b. in Baltimore, Maryland, 31 July, 1824; d. near Emmitsburg, 23 July, 1871. He graduated from St. Mary’s College, in 1836, and then took up the study of law, commencing to prac- tice later in his native city. But the profession of
law was ill-suited to his temper of thought and to his literary talents, which had early evinced themselves in a facility in turn-making and versification. His first appearance in print was with an historical tale, "The Truce of God," which appeared serially in the "United States Catholic Magazine," followed shortly by "The Governess," and in 1849, by "Lorletto," which won a $50 prize offered by the "Catholic Mirror." The following year, when but twenty-six years of age, his "History of Missions" won the $1000 prize offered by Edwin Forrest. The law was now definitely abandoned for the drama. In 1859 he scored his first success with the tragedy of "De Soto," produced at the Broadway Theatre, New York City, and during the same season his comedy, "Mary's Birthday," was performed. In 1849 "Senior Vice," a work of distinction, was given a long presentation at New York, Boston, and Baltimore on the same night. During the season 1860-61 the "Seven Sisters," based on the theme of Secession, was produced at Laura Keen's Theatre, New York City. Other dramatic ventures were not so successful, and his most pretentious effort, "Cromwell, a Tragedy," remains unfinished. In 1851 he was dispatched to Spain by President Fillmore as official bureau. He was again in Europe in 1864 and, on his return, published in the "Catholic World" a series of charming sketches, "Glimpses of Tuscany," and, in 1866, "Christine: a Troubadour's Song," and a volume of verse, "Christen Poems." In 1859 he had been appointed professor of English literature at Mount St. Mary's, in which year he married Adaline Tier of New York, and moved from Baltimore to Thornbrook, a cottage near Emmitsburg, where he lived until his death.

In addition to works of creative fancy, Miles delivered in 1847 a "Discourse in Commemoration of the Landing of the Pilgrims of Maryland," and, shortly before his death, contemplated a series of critical estimates on Shakespeare's characters. Only one, that upon "Hamlet," was published (in the "Southern Review"), which won no mean measure of appreciation from contemporary scholars in England.

---

Miletus, a titular see of Asia Minor, suffragan of Aphrodisias, in Caria. Situated on the western coast of Caria near the Latmic Gulf at the mouth of the Meander and the terminus of several of the great roads of Asia Minor, Miletus was for a long period one of the most prosperous of the cities of Asia Minor. It was first inhabited by the Leleges and called Legegia or Pitussa, it was rebuilt under the name of Miletus by the Cretans (Strabo, XIV, i, 3). It is mentioned by Homer (Iliad, II, 868). About the tenth century n. c. the Ionians occupied it, and made it a maritime and commercial power of the first rank. From it numerous colonies were founded along the Hellepont, the Propontis, and the Black Sea, among others Cysicus and Sinope. Miletus also had its period of literary glory with the philosophers Thales, Anaximander, and Anaximenes, the historians Hecateus and Cadmus, the rhetorician Semonides, and the writer of tales, Ariosto. After the sixth century n. c., it passed successively under the domination of the Persians, Alexander, the Seleucids, and the Romans, and finally lost its splendour to such an extent as to become for the Greeks and Romans the symbol of vanished prosperity. It is, nevertheless, often mentioned by Strabo (XII, viii, 16; XIV, i, 3, 6) and by Pliny (Hist. nat., IV; vi; XXXVI etc.). St. Paul landed there from Samos, and made farewell to the ancients at the Port of Ephesus. On another occasion, doubtless after his first captivity, he left here his companion Trophimus, who was ill (II Tim., iv, 20). In the Acts of St. Thyrus and his companions, martyred at Miletus under Declus, mention is made of a Bishop Cresarius who gave them burial (Acts SS., III, January, 422). Eusebius, Bishop of Miletus, stationed at the Council of Nicea (325). For the list of the other known bishops see Le Quien (I, 917-20) and Gams (448). Mention may be here made of St. Nicephorus in the tenth century (Anal. Bolland., XIV, 129-66). At first a suffragan of Aphrodisias, Miletus afterwards became an autocephalous archdiocese and even a metropolis. Among those who brought fame to the city during Byzantine times must be mentioned the architect Isidore, who, with Anthemius of Tralles, built St. Sophia at Constantinople. The ancient city is now buried under the alluvium of the Meander, which has also filled up the Latmic Gulf. Near its site, about four and a half miles from the sea, is the village which sits on the medieval town named Palatscha. Recent excavations have brought to light other ruins, the remains of a temple of Apollo Didymus. Greek Christian inscriptions have also been found there, among others one mentioning the

---

Miletus, a Diocese of (Miletensis), in Calabria, in the province of Reggio, southern Italy. According to tradition, this city was not far from the site of the ancient Medmata, by fugitives from Miletus in Asia Minor, destroyed by Darius. It suffered much from earthquakes, especially from those of 1905 and 1906, and, although in a less degree, from that of 28 December, 1908, which destroyed Reggio and Messina. Miletus was made an episcopal see by Gregory VII in 1073. The earthquake of 1783 destroyed the cathedral, built by Count Roger, who also built the monastery of the Most Holy Trinity and St. Michael for Greek Basilian monks. Callistus II united this diocese with those of Tauriana and Vibona, the latter destroyed by the Saracens. The first bishop was Arnolf; after him were Godfrey (1084), under whom the city was under the Roman Emperor Corrado Caracciolo (1402); Cardinal Astorgio Agnensi (1411); Antonio Sorbili (1435), who founded the seminary in 1440; Felice Centini (1611), afterwards a cardinal; Gregorio Ponziani (1640), charged with a mission to England by Urban VIII. The present incumbent (since 1898), Mgr. Morabito, has been a chargeable sufferer from the recent quakes. The diocese has 124 parishes, containing 220,000 souls; 2 convents of men, and 12 houses of nuns, 2 schools for boys, and 7 for girls.

---

Cappelletti, Le chiese d'Italia, XXI (Venice, 1870).

U. Benigni.
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martyr Onesippus, and another, probably of the fourth century, containing an invitation to the seven archangels, guardians of the city (Corp. inscr. gr., 2892, 8847).


S. Salaville.

Miletus (originally MULLER), VITUS, Catholic theologian, b. at Gmbd, Swabia, 1549; d. at Mains, 11 Sept., 1615. He studied at the German College, Rome, from 1567 to 1575; on 28 Oct., 1573, as dean of the students of the philosophic faculty, he gave a short address before Pope Gregory XIII, when he visited the newly organized academy. He was ordained in St. John Lateran on Easter Saturday, 1575, and returned to Germany in the summer of that year; on his journey he was the doctor of theology at Bologna (11 June, 1575). He was summoned to Mains by the Elector Daniel Brandenburg, where he was active in the reform of the clergy. From there he was sent by the elector to Erfurt, to assist the suffragan bishop Nicolaus Elard in his efforts for the restoration of Catholicism. In 1575 he renounced the doctrine of the Eucharist, preached at Erfurt in Lent, 1575, involved him in sharp controversy with the Protestant preachers. He was sent to Rome in 1582 to bring the pallium for the new archbishop, Wolfgang von Dalberg. The latter brought him back again to Mains, and employed him on important affairs, notably on the visitation of monasteries. At Erfurt he benefited from the conference with the Jesuits, and the confirmation and the pallium for the succeeding archbishops, Adam von Bicken, and Schweikart von Cronenburg. Under all these archbishops, the last of whom appointed him his spiritual counsellor, he was tirelessly engaged in defending the Catholic Faith, both by preaching and writing, until his death. He was profoundly influenced by the ideas of Erasmus, of St. Victor’s and St. Peter’s, all in Mains; and canon of St. Severus’ at Erfurt. After 1575 he also had a canony in the cathedral chapter at Breslau. He did not visit Breslau until 1599, and then only for a short time, while taking part in the election of a bishop; he then went to Rome to bring the confirmation of the election, and SIGNA OF THE BLESSINGS ARE:

- De festo Corporis Christi in honorem Jesu Christi"

(Mains, 1580): “Augenschein des Jesuiten Spiegels, so neuwlich su Erfurt ud in trau gekürgen” (Cologne, 1582); “De sacramentis, mille secenti errores, vaniloquias et cavillaciones eorum, qui hoc tempore ab Ecclesia secessus catholici, cum brevi explanatione, perierer in eorum errores, quos duobus predicans Saxonic Thielmannus Heusibusii et Joannes Olearius Pontificiis hic est Christianae Catholicae vanissime haecentus attribuit” (Mains, 1594).

Michael Ott.

Military Orders, The.—Including under this term every kind of brotherhood of knights, secular as well as religious, historians of the military orders have enumerated as many as a hundred, even after eliminating the apocryphal and stillborn. This great number is explained by the vogue with which in the Middle Ages welcomed an institution so thoroughly corresponding to the two occupations of that period, war and religion. Royalty afterwards utilised this new idea to strengthen its own position or to reward faithful nobles, creating secular orders of knighthood until there was no country without its royal or princely order. Even private individuals entered into the business; adventurers attempted to exploit the vanity of the noblesse by sham insignia of knighthood with which they decked themselves, and which they distributed among their dupes lavishly—though not gratuitously. Hence came a whole category of orders justly considered apocryphal. In the seventeenth century Marino Caraccioli (1624), a Neapolitan nobleman, succeeded in
passing himself off as Grand Master of the Order of Knights of St. George, which he pretended to trace to Constantine the Great. In 1632, Baltazar Giron, who called himself an Arab, was made chief of the European branch of the order, and the Star of Our Lady of the Nile was bestowed on his brother. In 1646, at the court of Louis XIV, a negro, brought from the Gold Coast, was received as a prince, even receiving the crown of being baptized by Bossuet (1668), and instituted the order of the Star of Our Lady before returning to his alleged dominions.

A regular order of knighthood means a brotherhood or confraternity which combines with the insignia of knighthood the privileges of monks. This supposes recognition on the part of both Church and State; to belong to the regular clergy, they needed the pope's confirmation; they could not wear the sword of knighthood without the authorization of the prince. Orders of knighthood lacking this official recognition should be expunged from history, even though they figure in the pages of all the old historians of the military orders. As a matter of fact, more than one rule of this kind, scarcely passing beyond the initial stages, has existed, and such are the orders which may be designated stillborn. No trace is to be found in the "bullarium romanum" of the order called the "Order of St. Michael, attributed to King Alfonso I of Portugal (1176), nor of the Order of the Ship, which St. Louis was supposed to have founded on the eve of the crusade to Tunis where he died (1270), nor of that of the Angers, as of St. Nicholas, attributed to Charles III, King of Naples, 1382. Philippe de Mesieres, chancellor of the King of Cyprus, drew up the statutes of an Order of the Passion of Christ (1360), the text of which has recently been published, but which were never enforced. After the conquest of Lemnos from the Turks, Pope Pius II founded an order of Our Lady of the Lilies, intending to transfer the islands to the possession of orders of older orders which no longer fulfilled their purpose (1459), but the loss of the island prevented its institution. The same fate befell the German Order of the Christian Militia, projected (1615) under Paul V; of the French order of The Magdalen for the suppression of duelling (1614); of the Order of Our Lady of the Tower, intended to transfer the Tower of London to the Order of St. John of Jerusalem (1631), and of the Order of St. George of Cyprus (1658), which was dissolved by the Duke of Mantua and approved by Urban VIII (1623), have remained a dead letter. The age of the crusades had passed. The orders of any historical existence may be reduced to three categories: I. The Greater Regular Orders; II. The Lesser Regular Orders; III. The Secular Orders.

The military orders. The great military orders had their origin in the crusades, from which they retain the common badge of every order of knighthood, the cross worn on the breast. Of all these, the Knights Templars (q. v.), has served as a model for all the others. After barely a century of existence, they were suppressed by Clement V; but after the fall of Acre and the foundation, by the same pope, of the Order of Christ (q. v.) in Portugal, and the Order of Montesa (q. v.) in Spain. In the twelfth century Portugal had borrowed their rule from the Templars and founded the Portuguese Order of Avis (q. v.). Almost at the same time there arose in Castile the Order of Calatrava (q. v.) and in Leon the Order of Alcántara (q. v.), contemporaries with the purely military orders, others were founded, at once military and hospitalier, the most famous of which were the Hospitalers of St. John of Jerusalem and the Teutonic Knights, modelled on the former, both still in existence. In the same category should be included the Order of Santiago (q. v.) which spread throughout the Iberian Peninsula, and Portugal. Lastly, to give the purely hospitalier orders rank and command, however, claiming the rank of knights though they had never been in battle, such as the Orders of St. Lazarus of Jerusalem (q. v.) and of the Holy Spirit of Montpellier (q. v.). With these may be connected the Order of Our Lady of Ransom (Nuestra Señora de Merced, also called Mercedarians), founded (1218) in Aragon by St. Peter Nolasco for the redemption of captives. Including religious knights as well as religious clerics, it was originally considered a military order, but dissensions arose and each rank chose its own grand master. John XXII (1317) reserved the grand-mastership to clerics, with the result of a general exodus of knights into the newly founded military Order of Montesa.

II. THE LESSER REGULAR ORDERS.—There is mention in the twelfth century, in Castile, of an Order of Montjoie, confirmed by Alexander III (1180), but difficult to distinguish from the Order of Calatrava, with which it was soon amalgamated. In 1191, after the siege of Acre, Richard I of England founded there in fulfillment of a vow, the Order of St. Thomas of Canterbury, an order of hospitaliers for the service of English pilgrims. It seems to have been made dependent on the Hospitaliers of St. John, whom it followed to Cyprus after the evacuation of Palestine. Its existence is attested by the Bullarium of Alexander IV and John XXII; beyond this it has left but little trace except a church of remarkable architecture, St. Nicholas, at Nicosia in Cyprus. Better known is the history of the Schwäbische Orden (Ensfers, or Sword-bearers of Livonia), founded by Albert, first Bishop of Riga (1197), to propagate the Faith in the Baltic Provinces and to protect the new Christianity there against the pagan nations still numerous in that part of Europe. Against these pagans a crusade had been preached; but, the temporary crusaders having made haste to withdraw, it became necessary, as in Palestine, to supply their place with a permanent order. This order adopted the statutes, the white mantle and the red cross of the Templars, with a red sword as their distinctive badge, whence their name of Ensfers. The order was approved in 1202 by a Bull of Innocent III. Thrown open to all sorts of persons without distinction of birth, overrun by aimless adventurers whose expenses were calculated rather to exasperate the pagans than to convert them, it endured but a short time, having only two grand maes.
Knights, exclusive of princes of the blood and foreign princes, with St. George as its patron and with its chapel in Windsor Castle for the holding of chapters. This, the Order of the Garter, takes its name from the characteristic badge, worn on the left knee. The choice of this badge has given rise to various anecdotes of doubtful authenticity. Nothing is now known of the original badge of the Bath, the creation of which dates from the coronation of Henry IV (1399). A third order, Scottish by origin, is that of the Order of the Thistle, dating from the reign of James V of Scotland (1534). These orders still exist, though they have been protestantized. In France, the royal orders of the Star, dating from John the Good (1632), of St. Michael, founded by Louis XI (1469), of the Holy Ghost, founded by Henry III (1570), of Our Lady of Carmel, amalgamated by Henry IV with that of St. Lazarus (q.v.), were absolutely suppressed by the Revolution. Austria and Spain now dispute the inheritance from the House of Burgundy of the right to confer the Order of the Golden Fleece, founded by Duke Philip the Good, approved by Eugene IV in 1433, and extended by Leo X in 1516.

In Piedmont, the Order of the Annunziata, under its later form, dates only from Charles III, Duke of Savoy, in 1518, but its first dedication to the Blessed Virgin goes back to Amadeus VIII, first Duke of Savoy, antipope under the name of Felix V (1144). There had, previously to this dedication, existed in Savoy an Order of the Collar, which held its chapters in the Charterhouse (founded in 1392) of Pierre-Châtel in Bugey. Here also the Knights of the Annunziata kept their feast of the Annunciation, so that they have considered themselves as successors of the Order of the Collar. After the cession of Bugey to France, they transferred their chapters to the newly founded Camaldolese monastery on the Mountain of Turin (1627). In the Duchy of Mantua, Duke Vincent Gonzaga, on the marriage of his son Francis II, instituted, with the approbation of Paul V, the Knights of the Precious Blood, a relic of which is venerated in that capital. Lastly there are a number of pontifical secular orders, the oldest of which is the Order of Christ, contemporary with the institution of the same name in Portugal in 1319. In approving the latter institution, John XXII reserved the right of creating a certain number of knights by patent, and it is now used to reward services rendered by any person, whatever his rank or profession, provided he is of good moral character and his name is to be said of the Orders of St. Peter, instituted by Leo X in 1520, of St. Paul, founded by Paul III in 1534, of Our Lady of Loretto, charged by Sixtus V in 1558, to watch over and preserve that sanctuary. These distinctions were mostly granted to functionaries of the pontifical chancellor. There has been some question as to the Order of the Holy Sepulchre (q.v.), formerly dependent on the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and quite recently reorganized by the reigning pope (Pius X). The Knights of St. Catherine of Sinai (q.v.) are not an order, either secular or regular. The respective particular histories of the great military orders have been traced in the various Volumes devoted to them; it is necessary here only to explain their general organization, religious, military, and economic.

(1) Religious State.—The knights of the great orders were regarded in the Church as analogous to monks, whose three vows they professed and whose immunities they shared. They were answerable to the Pope alone; they had their own chapels in Rome and their cemeteries, all exempted from the jurisdiction of the secular clergy. Their landed property was free from tithes. They were not subject to the interdicts which the bishops in those days employed so freely. They did not all follow the same monastic rule. The Templars and orders derived from their

Knights Templars

in 1589, were not so much a military order as an association of gentlemen who undertook to maintain the public peace in those turbulent times. An order of St. George of Alfaia, in Aragon, approved in 1363 by Urban V, was merged in the Order of Montesa in 1399. The Knights of St. George, in Austria, founded by the Emperor Frederick III, and approved by Paul II in 1468, failing to perpetuate their existence, owing to the lack of territorial possessions, gave place to a purely secular confraternity. The Order of St. Stephen Pope was founded in Tuscany by the Grand Duke Cosmo I and approved in 1581 by Pius IV, being placed under the Benedictine Rule. It had its principal house at Pisa, and was obliged to equip a certain number of galleys to fight the Turks in the Mediterranean after the manner of, and in concert with, the "caravans" of the Knights of Malta.

III. The Secular Orders.— Dating from the fourteenth century, fraternities of lay knights were formed modelled on the great regular orders; as in the latter, we find in these secular orders a patron, a vow to serve the Church and the sovereign, statutes, a grand master (usually the reigning prince), and the practice of certain devotions. Most of them also asked for the approbation of the Holy See, which, on the other hand, granted them favours, indulgences, the privilege of private oratories, dispensation from certain fasts, etc. The chief of these orders, classified by countries, are as follows:— In England, Edward III, in memory of the legendary Knights of the Round Table, established in 1349 a brotherhood of twenty-five
followed the Cistercian Reform. The Hospitallers followed the Rule of St. Augustine. Nevertheless, in consequence of the relaxation which manifested itself among them after the period of the crusades, the Holy See introduced mitigations in favour of the non-clerical brethren. For this it was difficult to maintain the rule of celibacy in all its rigour; they were permitted, in certain orders, to marry once, and that only with a maiden. Even where second marriages were tolerated, they had to vow conjugal fidelity, so that if they violated this obligation of the natural law they sinned doubly, against the law and against their vow. Besides the three vows, the rule bound the brethren to the exercises of the monastic life such as the recitation of the commander and subordinate, these orders surpassed, in that cohesiveness which is the ideal of every military organization, the most famous bodies of picked soldiery known to history, from the Macedonian phalanx to the Ottoman Janissaries.

3) Economic Organization.—The importance acquired by the military orders during the course of the Middle Ages may be measured by the extent of their territorial possessions instituted throughout Europe. In the thirteenth century nine thousand manors formed the portion of the Templars; thirteen thousand that of the Hospitallers. These temporalities were an integral part of the ecclesiastical domain, and as such had a sacred character which placed them beyond liability to profane uses or to secular imposts. They differed from the temporalities of other monastic institutions only in the centralized system of their administration. While within each of the other religious institutes every abbey was autonomous, all the houses of a military order were bound to contribute their revenues, after deducting expenses, to a central treasury. As a result of this enormous circulation of capital controlled by the orders, their wealth could be applied to financial operations which made them veritable credit and deposit banks. Their perfect good faith earned for them the implicit confidence of the Church and of temporal rulers. The papacy employed them to collect contributions for the crusades; princes did not hesitate to entrust to them their personal property. In this respect, again, the military orders were most similar to the sovereign states.

MILLENNIUM.—Origine des chevaliers et ordres militaires (Antwerp, 1609); FAYN, Histoire des ordres de chevalerie (2 vols., Paris, 1852); RIEHLENSFELD, Geschichte und Verfassung aller Ritterorden (Weimar, 1841); CAPPELLETTI, Storia degli ordini cavallereschi (Leghorn, 1904); CLARKE, Concise History of Knighthood, II (London, 1884); DIXON, The Broad Story of Honour (London, 1876); LAWRENCE-ARCHER, The Orders of Chivalry (London, 1887); see also bibliographies attached to special articles on the several great orders.

CH. MOELLER.

Millennium and Millenarianism.—The fundamental idea of millenarianism, as understood by Christian writers, may be set forth as follows: At the end of time Christ will return in all His splendour and glory; He will judge the world and give the just to eternal life, and the wicked to eternal damnation. The duration of this glorious reign of Christ and His saints on earth, is frequently given as one thousand years. Hence it is commonly known as the "millennium", while the belief in the future realization of the kingdom is called "millenarianism" (chiliasm, from the Greek χίλια, one thousand).

This term of one thousand years, however, is by no means an essential element of the millennium as conceived by its adherents. The extent, details of the realization, conditions, the place, of the millennium were variously described. Essential are the following points: The early return of Christ in all His power and glory, the establishment of an earthly kingdom with the just, the resurrection of the deceased saints and their participation in the glorious reign, the destruction of the powers hostile to God, and, at the end of the kingdom, the universal resurrection with the final judgment, after which the just will enter heaven, while the wicked will be consigned to the eternal fire of hell.

The roots of the belief in a glorious kingdom, partly natural, partly supernatural, are found in the hopes of the Jews for a temporal Messiah and in the Jewish apocalyptic. Under the galling pressure of their polit-
Theological circumstances, the expectation of a Messiah who would free the people of God had, in the Jewish mind, assumed a character that was to a great extent earthly; the Jews longed above all for a saviour who would free them from their oppressors and restore the former splendour of Israel. These expectations generally included the belief that Jehovah would conquer all powers hostile to Himself and to His chosen people, and that He would set up a final, glorious kingdom of Israel. The apocalyptic books, principally the book of Henoch and the fourth book of Esdras, indicate various details of the arrival of the Messiah, the defeat of the nations hostile to Israel, and the union of all the Israelites in the Messianic kingdom followed by the rejection of the Gentiles, and the world and the Heavens on the last day.

The natural and the supernatural are mingled in this conception of a Messianic kingdom as the closing act of the world's history. The Jewish hopes of a Messiah, and the descriptions of apocalyptic writers were blended; it was between the close of the present world-order and the commencement of the new that this sublime kingdom of the chosen people was to find its place. That many details of these conceptions should remain indistinct and confused was but natural, but the Messianic kingdom is always pictured as something miraculous, though the colours are at times earthly and sensuous. The evangelical accounts clearly prove how fervently the Jews at the time of Christ longed, partly by hope, partly by need, for a Saviour to proclaim the spiritual kingdom of God for the deliverance of man from his sins and for his sanctification, a kingdom which actually began with His birth. There is no trace of chiliasm to be found in the Gospels or in the Epistles of St. Paul; everything moves in the spiritual and religious sphere; even the description of the end of the world and of the last judgment bear this stamp. The victory over the symbolical beast (the enemy of God and of the saints) and over Antichrist, as well as the triumph of Christ and His saints, are described in the Apocalypse of St. John (Apoc., 20-21), in pictures that resemble those of the Jewish apocalyptic writers, especially of Daniel and Henoch. Satan is chained in the abyss for a thousand years, the martyrs and the just rise from the dead and share in the priesthood and kingship of Christ. Though it is difficult to focus sharply the pictures used in the Apocalypse and the things expressed by them, yet there can be no doubt that the whole description refers to the spiritual conflict between the Good and the Bad within the Church on the one hand and the malignant powers of hell and the world on the other. Nevertheless, a large number of Christians of the post-Apostolic era, particularly in Asia Minor, yielded so far to Jewish apocalyptic as to put a literal meaning into these descriptions of St. John's Apocalypse; the result was that millenarianism spread and gained staunch advocates not only among the heretics but among the Catholic Christians as well.

One of the heretics, the Gnostic Cerinthus, who flourished towards the end of the first century, proclaimed a splendid kingdom of Christ on earth which He would establish with the risen saints upon His second advent, and pictured the pleasures of the one thousand years in gross, sensual colours (Caus in Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.", III, 28; Dionysius Alex. in Eusebius, ibid., VII, 25). Later among Catholics, Bishop Papias of Hierapolis, a disciple of St. John, appeared as an advocate of millenarianism. He claimed to have received his doctrine from contemporaries of the Apostles, and Irenæus narrates that other "Presbyters", whom he called "synagogues", learned from him the belief in millenarianism as part of the Lord's doctrine. According to Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., III, 39) Papias in his book asserted that the resurrection of the dead would be followed by one thousand years of a visible, glorious earthly kingdom of Christ, and according to Irenæus (Adv. Haereses, V, 33), he taught that the saints too would enjoy a superabundance of earthly pleasures. There will be days in which vines will grow, each with 10,000 branches, and on each branch 10,000 twigs, and on each twig 10,000 shoots, and on each shoot 10,000 clusters, and on each cluster 10,000 grapes, and each grape will produce 216 gallons of wine, etc.

Millenarian ideas are found by most commentators in the Epistle of St. Barnabas, in the passage treating of the Jewish sabbath; for the resting of God on the seventh day after the creation is explained in the following manner. After the Son of God has come and put an end to the era of the wicked and judged them, and after the sun, the moon, and the stars have been changed, then He rested on the seventh day. The author had premised, if it is said that God created all things in six days, this means that God will complete all things in six millenniums, for one day represents one thousand years. It is certain that the writer advocates the tenet of a re-formation of the world through the second advent of Christ, but it is not clear from the indications whether the author of the letter was a millenarian in the strict sense of the word. St. Irenæus of Lyons, a native of Asia Minor, influenced by the companions of St. Polycarp, adopted millenarian ideas, discussing and defending them in his work against the Gnostics (Adv. Haereses, V, 32). He developed this doctrine more fully in his "Against the Gnostics", in which he preached that all the Christians in a happy future life, and discerned in the glorious kingdom of Christ on earth principally the prelude to the final, spiritual kingdom of God, the realm of eternal bliss. St. Justin of Rome, the martyr, opposes to the Jews in his Dialogue with Tryphon (ch. 80-81) the tenet of a millennium and asserts that he and the Christians whose belief is correct in every point know that there will be a resurrection of the body and that the newly built and enlarged Jerusalem will last for the space of a thousand years, but he adds that there are many who, though adhering to the pure and pious teachings of Christ, do not believe in it. A witness for the continued belief in millenarianism in the province of Asia is St. Melito. Bishop of Sardes in the second century. He develops the same train of thought as did St. Irenæus.

The Montanistic movement had its origin in Asia Minor. The expectation of an early advent of the celestial Jerusalem upon earth, which it was thought, would appear in Phrygia, and appeared in the minds of the Montanists with the idea of the millennium. Tertullian, the protagonist of Montanism, expounds the doctrine (in his work now lost, "De Sp Fidelium" and in "Adv. Marcionem", IV) that at the end of time the great kingdom of promise, the new Jerusalem, would be established and last for the space of one thousand years. All these millenarian authors appeal to various passages in the prophetic books of the Old Testament, to a few passages in the Letters of St. Paul, and to the Apocalypse of St. John. Though millenarianism had found numerous adherents among the Christians and had been upheld by several ecclesiastical theologians, neither in the post-Apostolic period nor in the course of the centuries, does it appear as a universal doctrine of the Church or as a part of the Apostolic tradition. The primitive Apostolic symbol mentions indeed the resurrection of the body and the return of Christ to judge the living and the dead, but it says not a word of the millennium. It was the second century that produced not only defenders of the millennium but proponents of chiliasm and gnostic ideas. Gnosticism rejected millenarianism. In Asia Minor, the principal seat of millenarian teachings, the so-called Alois up against millenarianism as well as against Montanism, but they went too far in their opposition, rejecting not only the Apocalypse of St. John, alleging Cerinthus as its author, but his Gospel also. The opposition to millenarianism
became more general towards the end of the second century, going hand in hand with the struggle against Montanism. The Roman presbyter Caius (end of the second and beginning of the third century) attacked the millenarians. On the other hand, Hippolytus of Rome defended them and attempted a proof, basing his arguments on the allegorical explanation of six days of creation as six thousand years, which he had been taught by tradition. The most powerful adversary of millenarianism was Origen of Alexandria. In view of the Neo-Platonism on which his doctrines were founded and of his spiritual-allegorical method of explaining the Holy Scriptures, he could not side with the millenarians. He committed them expressly, and openly, to the greatest confusion which his writings exerted on ecclesiastical theology especially in Oriental countries, millenarianism gradually disappeared from the ideas of Oriental Christians.

Only a few later advocates are known to us, principally theological adversaries of Origen. About the middle of the third century Nepos, bishop in Egypt, who entered the lists against the allegorism of Origen, also propounded millenarian ideas and gained some adherents in the vicinity of Arsinoe. A schism threatened; but the prudent and moderate policy of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, preserved unity; the chiliasts abandoned their views (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.", VII, 14). Egypt seems to have harbored them longer than the other lands. The Methodius, Bishop of Olympus, one of the principal opponents of Origen at the beginning of the fourth century, upheld chiliastic in his Symposion (IX, 1, 5, in Migne, "Patr. Grœc.", XVIII, 178 sqq.). In the second half of the fourth century, these doctrines found their last defender in Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea and founder of Apollinarianism (A.D. 265). His writings on this subject have been lost; but St. Basil of Cesarea (Epist. CCLXIII, 4, in Migne, "Patr. Grœc.", XXXI, 980), Epiphanius (Haeres. LXX, 36, in Migne loc. cit., XLII, 696) and Jerome (In Isai. XVIII, in Migne, "Patr. Lat." XXIV, 627) testify to his having been a chiliast. Jerome also adds that many Christians of that time shared the same beliefs; but after that millenarianism found no outspoke champion among the theologians of the Greek Church.

In the West, the millenarian expectations of a glorious kingdom of Christ and His just, found adherents for a long time. The poet Commodian (Instructiones, 41, 42, 44, in Migne, "Patr. Lat." V, 283 sqq.) and Firmicus Maternus, (Instit. Hist. Mart., "Patr. Lat." VI, 739 sqq.) proclaimed the millennial kingdom and described its splendour, partly drawing on the earlier chiliasts and the Sybilline prophecies, partly borrowing their colours from the "golden age" of the pagan poets; but the idea of the six thousand years for the duration of the world is ever conspicuous. Victorinus of Pettau also was a millenarian though in the extant copy of his commentary on the Apocalypse no allusions to it can be detected. St. Jerome, himself a decided opponent of the millenial ideas, brands Sulpicius Severus as adhering to them, but in the writings of this author in their present form nothing can be found to support this charge. St. Ambrose indeed teaches a two fold resurrection: a new apotheosis of the blessed and a universal resurrection and a final judgment immediately following, he could no longer cling to the principal tenet of early chiliism. St. Augustine finally held to the conviction that there will be no millennium. The struggle between Christ and His saints on the one hand and the wicked world and Satan on the other, is waged in the Church on earth; so the great Doctor

describes it in his work De Civitate Dei. In the same book he gives us an allegorical explanation of Chap. 20 of the Apocalypse. The first resurrection, of which this chapter treats, he tells us, refers to the spiritual rebirth in baptism; the sabbath of one thousand years after the six thousand years of history, is the whole of eternal life; or, in other words, the number seven, reduced to figures and years, is not to be taken literally, but as a symbol or a number.

And the last space of one thousand years must be understood as referring to the end of the world; at all events, the kingdom of Christ, of which the Apocalypse speaks, can only be applied to the Church (De Civitate Dei, XX, 5–7, in Migne, "Patr. Lat.", XLI, 607 sqq.).

The chiliastic understanding of the Apocalypse, imparted by succeeding Western theologians, and millenarianism in its earlier shape no longer received support. Cerinthus and the Ebionites are mentioned in later writings against the heretics as defenders of the millennium, it is true, but as cut-off from the Church. Moreover, the attitude of the Church towards the secular power had undergone a change with closer connexion between her and the Roman empire. There is no doubt that this turn of events did much towards weaning the Christians from the old millenarianism, which during the time of persecution had been the expression of their hopes that Christ would soon reappear and overthrow the foes of His elect. Chiliastic views disappeared, but the millenarianism was still marked, above all, in spite of their wide diffusion even among sincere Christians, and in spite of their defence by prominent Fathers of the early Church, millenarianism was never held in the universal Church as an article of faith based on Apostolic traditions.

The Middle Ages were never tainted with millenarianism; it was foreign both to the theorey of that period and to the religious ideas of the people. The fantastic views of the apocalyptic writers (Joachim of Floris, the Franciscan-Spirituals, the Apostolic), referred only to a particular form of spiritual renovation of the Church, but did not include a second advent of Christ. The "emperor myths", which prophesied the establishment of a happy, universal kingdom by the great emperor of the future, contain indeed descriptions that remind one of the ancient Sybilline and millenarian writings, but an essential trait is again missing, the return of Christ and the connexion of the blissful reign with the resurrection of the just. Hence the millennium proper is unknown to this epoch. The Protocols of the 19th century, who expected the millennium in one form or another: in Germany, the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren (Comenius); in France, Pierre Jurien (L'Accomplissement des Prophéties, 1680); in England at the time of Cromwell, the Independents and Jane Lead. A new phase in the development of millenarian views among the Protestant sects commonly known as "Pietists", the chief champions of the millennium in Germany was I. A. Bengel and his disciple Crusius, who were afterwards joined by Rothe, Volck, Thiersch, Lange and others. Protestants from Wurttemberg emigrated to Palestine (Temple Communities) in order to be closer to Christ at His second advent. Certain fantastical sects of England and North America,
as the Irvingites, Mormons, Adventists, adopted both apocalyptic and millenarian views, expecting the return of Christ and the establishment of His kingdom at an early date. Some Catholic theologians of the nineteenth century championed a moderate, modified millenarianism, especially in connexion with their emphasis on pietistic and apocalyptic elements of the New Testament (of the World, 1856), Schneider (Die chilalistische Doktrin, 1859), Rohling (Erkärung der Apokalypse des hl. Johannes, 1895; Auf nach Sion, 1901), Rougeyron Chabauty (Avenir de l'Eglise catholique selon le Plan Divin, 1890).

G. GIEßMANN.

Miller, William J. See Transvaal, Vicerariats APOSTOLIC OF.

Millet, Jean-François, French painter; b. at Gruchy, near Cherbourg, 4 October, 1814; d. at Barbizon, 20 January, 1875. This great painter of peasants was a son of peasants: he himself began life as a tiller of the soil, and he never lost touch with it. But though a family of rusticity, the Millets were far removed from rusticity of manners: they were serious folks, profoundly pious, a strange stock of Catholic Puritans whose stern sentiments of religion, handed down from generation to generation, gave them something like an aristocratic character; they were incapable of mean ideas. The grandmother of that house was a daughter of Pascal, Bossuet, Nicole, and Charron. Young Jean-François was reared by the parish priest in the cult of Vergil and the Bible; the "Georgics" and the Psalms, which he read in Latin, were his favourites. Later on he became acquainted with Burns and Theocritus, whom he preferred even to Vergil. His imagination, nourished on these two powers, Nature and poetry, the open country and Holy Scripture, shared equally in the shaping of his genius.

Of that genius the young ploughman gave the first signs at the age of eighteen. He studied at Cherbourg under Languois, a pupil of Baron Gros, and the Municipal Council gave him a pension of 600 francs a year, and he began to finish his studies in Paris. There he entered the atelier of Delaroche in 1837; but he spent most of his time in the Louvre, with the masters of bygone ages.

The primitives of Italy rapturized him by their fervour: Fra Angelico filled him with visions. The colourists were little to his taste; he remained unmoved in the presence of their gilded visions. He liked Rubens's vigour and Murillo's homely grace. Among the Frenchmen, the beauty of Le Sueur's sentiment touched him, Le Brun and Jouvent thought "strong men". But his favourite masters were the masters of "style"—Mantegna, Michelangelo, and Poussin: they haunted him all his life. Poussin's "Letters" were his everyday food, and "I would look at Poussin's pictures forever and ever", he writes, "and always learn something". His contemporaries, Delacroix excepted, moved him but little and for the most part to indignation. Millet's early works—those of his Paris period (1837-50)—are extremely different from those which made him famous. They are now very rare, but at the point of view of art, they are probably his most pleasing and felicitous productions; in them the painter's temperament voices itself most naturally before his "conversion", without method, without ulterior purpose. They are generally idylls—eclogues—thoroughly rural in feeling, with a fresh, noble sensibility, as though Vergil's Vergilia were finding expression in little pagan scenes, antique bas-reliefs, and neutral subjects, such as "Women bathing", "Nymphs", "Offerings to Pan", and so on—thoughts but slightly defined in forms as definite as sculpture.

Some of these pieces are the most Poussinesque things in modern art. In them the young painter already appears as an accomplished stylist, with a
Correggian feeling for grace that was to be almost entirely lacking in his latest works. Here he has powerfully expressed the joy of living as it might be known to a soul like his—serious and robust, and always veiled in melancholy. His palette is brighter and less embarrassed than it afterwards became; indeed, the colour is sometimes even a little florid, as in the graceful portrait of Mlle Feuillardet. On the other hand, the severity of the modelling always saves his work from anything like carelessness or lack of dignity. Some—like the charming pastel of "Daphnis and Chloe" in the Boston Museum—are frankly reminiscent of Puvis de Chavannes. But the beauty of these pastorals had not been very well appreciated. To make a living, Millet was obliged to undertake base and ill-paid work, painting signs for mountebanks and midwives. His "Edipus taken down from the tree", a study of the nude which excels as a piece of virtuosity and an impression of savage wildness, rather shocked and astonished the public than won admiration.

His difficulties increased more and more: having lost his first wife, he married again in 1845, and with children came want. Matters were precipitated by the Revolution of 1848. At first the Republican Government took an interest in the artist, and he received some help from it; but the events of the month of June and the disorders of the following year frightened Millet and inspired him with an unquenchable dislike of Paris. He was beginning at last to understand his own nature; he turned his back forever on the frivolous, worldly public. Without disowning his earlier works, he addressed himself to another, newer and more human path, that of the contemplation of the things of the earth and the life of the rustic. In the summer of 1849 he went to Barbizon, a little village about one league from Chailly, on the borders of the Forest of Fontainebleau. He only meant to spend a few weeks there; but remained for the rest of his life—twenty-seven years. From that time Millet was at last Millet, the painter of peasants. It is impossible to recount in detail all his life during the ten or fifteen years following his exodus into the country, until his final triumph—to trace the long course of effort and of heroic sacrifice, through which the name of a little obscure hamlet of the Ile-de-France by the tenacity of a small group of painters was made one of the most important of our time. The only peasants then known to painting were comic-opeas peasants—the rude buffoons of Ostade and Teniers, or the beribboned minnies of Watteau and Greuze. They were always travestied in the interests of romance or of caricature, burlesque or preciosity. No one had ever ventured to show them in the true character of their ordinary lives—the rough beauty of the labour from which they derive their dignity.

The whole of Millet's work is a paraphrase or an illustration of the Divine Sentence: "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread". Every man, he writes, "is doomed to bodily pain". And again, "It is not always the joy to be myself that makes me identical with myself. The greatest happiness I know is calm and silence". But at the same time, this harsh law of labour, because it is God's law, is the condition of our nobility and our dignity. Millet is quite the opposite of a Utopian or an insurgent. To him the chimeras of Socialism and the wholesale regulation of the good things of life are immature, childish, and disgraceful. "I have no wish to suppress sorrow," he proudly exclaims: "it is sorrow that gives most strength to an artist's utterance". In his subsequent work, moreover, as if challenging the world, he accentuated still further the ruggedness of his painting and the harshness of his sentiment. The year 1865 marks the lowest point of this descending scale, of his last creative mood. Nothing ever exceeded his "Winter" in
desolateness, or his "Man with the Hoe" and "Vine-dresser resting" in sense of utter exhaustion. The introspection of why his characterization is the point of stupefaction and insensibility. The figures seem so thoroughly emptied of their vital energy as to be petrified. The hard look is congealed into a grimace. Nowhere has his effort, the forcing of his individual style to its utmost limit, brought the great artist to results more harsh, more grandiose, or more barbarous.

But things were getting quieter and easier for him. His extraordinary personality, his eloquence, the strong conviction of this "Danubian peasant", were all making themselves felt. The world was beginning to appreciate the loftiness of view and the moral grandeur of this man of the fields with the lion's mane and the head of a Jupiter in wooden shoes. A relaxation came over his spirit and his ideas. He travelled, rested, revisited his own part of the country, made short trips to Auvergne, to Alsace, and to Switzerland. In 1868 he was made a chevalier of the Legion of Honour—at fifty years of age. In 1870 he was elected a member of the jury. But the great work of his sister Louise and his dear friend Rousseau, finally wrecked a constitution already injured by hard work and privation. During the German invasion he and his family took refuge at Cherbourg near his native home. After that time he almost ceased to paint. His latest pictures, the tragic "November" (1870), the Church of Gréville (1871), the "Spring" (1874), are mere landscapes, with the human figure entirely absent. Thenceforward he preferred simpler, more direct processes to that of painting, using the pencil or pastel—like the great idealists, who always ended by simplifying or minimizing the material medium and contenting themselves with etching, as did Rembrandt, as Dürer, as Millet, or a Delaroche, or a Chopin, or a Beethoven. These last works of Millet's are among his finest and most precious. His colouring, formerly heavy and dark, often rusty and unpleasing, or sticky and muddy, is here more delicate than ever before. Nowhere does one feel the touching beauty of this artistic soul, and its masculine but tender eloquence, more perfectly than in his studies and sketches. The finest collections of them are in the possession of M. A. Rouart, in Paris, and of Mr. Shaw, in Boston. Millet passed away at the age of sixty years and four months.

He was one of the noblest figures in contemporary art, one of those men who in our day have done most credit to France. As a painter he was not without his faults—somewhat clumsy in technique, not pleasing in colour, while emotion, with him, does not always keep clear of declamation. These faults are most palpable in his most famous works, such as "The Sower" and "The Angelus". But on the other hand, so many others are perfect gems—marvels of execution and poetic sentimentality, like "The Morot in the Zartuk" (La Becque), "Maternal solicitude", and "The Shepherdess". Other painters have had more influence than Millet. Courbet, for example, surpassed him in scope and in prodigious sense of life; Corot, with just as much poetry, has in a higher degree the grace, the charm, the exquisite gift of harmony. But who shall say that Millet's rugged gravity was not the condition, the outward sign, of the deep import of his message? No one has done more than he to make us feel the sanctity of life and the mystic grandeur of man's mission upon the earth. His peasants, rooted to the soil and as if fixed there for eternity, seem to be performing the rites of a sacred mystery. One is conscious of the permanence, the constancy, of the bonds by which intimately they are united with the great whole of their fraternal solidarity with the rest of mankind and with the cosmic ends. Though he never handled professedly religious subjects, Millet succeeded in being the most religious painter of our times. His "Return to the Farm" irresistibly suggests the Flight into Egypt, and his "Scene of Baptism" or of the Cleaners, evokes the Biblical pictures of Ruth and Boaz. On the river where his "Washerwomen" come and beat their linen, one would think the cradle of Moses was floating. The greatness of his soul has set in relief before our eyes the dignity of our nature; he has shown us how the trivial can be made to serve as the expression of the sublime, and how the Infinite and the Divine can be discovered in the humblest existence.


LOUIS GILLET.

Millet (or Millet). PIERRE, a celebrated early Jesuit missionary in New York State, b. at Bourges, Fr., 19 November 1633; d. at Boulogne, 31 December, 1708. Having graduated Master of Arts, he entered the Society of Jesus at Paris on 3 October, 1655, studied philosophy at La Fête (1657–8), taught various classes there (1658–61) and at Compiègne (1661–3), and then returned to La Fête for a second year of philosophy (1663–4). After a four years' course in the College of Louis-le-Grand in Paris (1664–8), he was sent to Canada, and had already been chosen to help Father Allouez in the west, when, quite unexpectedly, his destination was changed. The Onondaga ambassadors had received the answer to their address, on 27 August, 1668, and Fathers Millet and de Carabé were ordered them as missionaries. At this time Millet picked up enough of the language to enable him to preside at public prayers and to his still greater satisfaction, to teach catechism. This joy, however, was soon turned to sadness and pity at the sight, new to him, of some captive Anadustes, brought in by a war party to be burnt at the stake. His feelings may be gathered from the following occasion: "I am at a loss to know how to interpret this presage. Would to God that it might betoken that I was to make of these tribes captives of Jesus Christ and prevent their burning throughout eternity. What happiness for me if it foreshadowed that one day I also might be a captive to be burnt for Jesus Christ."

His method of evangelizing the Onondagas may be judged from a letter written from the mission of St. Jean Baptiste, 15 June, 1670 (Rel. 1670, vii). In 1671 he made his solemn profession of the four vows, and received from the Onondaga nation the name of Tekroahgon, that is The Looker-up to Heaven. In 1672 he was appointed missionary of the Oneidas (q. v.), "the most arrogant and least tractable of all the Iroquois" (Rel. 1672, iii), and laboured among them until 1685 with marvellous success. He was then recalled to act as interpreter at the Grand Council of Peace to be held at Caatarakouy (now Kingston, Ontario). Both he and the other missionaries were shamefully duped by the governor and used to lure the Iroquois into the pitfall prepared for them (see MISSIONS, INDIAN; Charlevoix, I, 510). Late in 1687 or early in 1688 Millet was sent as chaplain at Fort Niagara. Here, as at Caatarakouy, scurvy was decimating the troops, affording ample scope for Millet's charity and skill. To invoke God's mercy in behalf of the afflicted, a fourteen feet high was erected in the fort by the officers and blessed by Father Millet on Good Friday, 16 April, 1688. On 15 September, however, the
remnants of the garrison were informed the fort was to be evacuated, and all were to embark for Cataraquoy. Millet was still engaged at Cataraquoy in the ordinary routine of a military chaplain, when about 30 July, 1689, a party of Iroquois presented themselves at Fort Frontenac. The story looked suspicious, but as there was question of a soul to save, Millet undertook the risk, and St. Armand, a surgeon, accompanied him. Both were immediately set upon and bound; his captors first took Millet's breviary, and were diverting him of all he carried, when Manchot, an Oneida chief, interposed on his behalf, and recommended him to the care of the other chiefs. But, when Manchot left to join the three hundred Iroquois who were lying in wait to attack Fort Frontenac, the maltreatment recommenced. Having stripped him almost naked, the Indians bitterly reproached him for all that their counsels had suffered from the French; they then threw him into the water, but he saved him. After the other Indians returned after their failure to surprise Fort Frontenac, he was escorted to an island two leagues below the fort, where the main body of 1400 Iroquois warriors were encamped. Derisive shouts and yells went up at his approach. According to custom, he was made sing his death-song, the words of which came to me and asked forms in surventure, choria (I have been made a prisoner by my children). For all thanks a Seneca Indian struck him a brutal blow in the face with his fist in such a way that the nails cut him to the bone. He was then led to the cabin of the Oneidas where he was protected from further insult. That same evening the whole force moved down the river eight leagues from the fort, and there halted three days.

On a hilltop on what is now Grenadier Island a great council was held, the war-kettle swung, and all that remained was to choose a fitting victim to cast into it. The final decision was left to the Onondagas, and no doubt the lot would have fallen on Millet, but not being given on short notice the Iroquois would have set the seal to an undying enmity and an unrelenting war, such as they seemed to desire with the French, but for an apparently insignificant detail which had been overlooked. To make the proceedings legal according to their code, all the prisoners should have been present, whereas only the surgeon and Father Millet stood before the council (ibid., 73). The captors of the other prisoners had scattered in hunting parties and had taken them along. An elderly Cayuga sachem blocked all proceedings with the simple announcement: “All are not present at this assembly!” and then bade Millet to pray to God. Informed that it was not in preparation for death, he rose and prayed aloud, especially for all those assembled. He was then told to resume his seat, one of his hands was unbound, and he was sent to the camp of the Oneidas. There he was acclaimed with joy by several of their leading men, who, to forestall further molestation, determined to send him to Oneida. The next day (about 2 August, 1689) three Indians were told off under an escort, of whom one was the friendly Manchot, to conduct him thither; from one of Millet’s letters (ibid., 87, 91), it is certain that the main body of Indians they were leaving was the identical band of Iroquois who, about 4 August, crossed during the night to the north side of Lake St. Louis, fired the houses for several leagues along the lake shore from St. Anne’s to Lachine, and butchered men, women, and children as they fled from their burning homes. Two hundred in all were massacred, and ninety carried off to be burnt at the stake. Charlevoix’s statement (Hist., I, 549) that this occurrence took place on 25 August is erroneous; the contemporaneous reports of de Denonville (de Champigny and de L’Isle, Rec. Colon. Paris. Cor. Gen. Can. X) give the correct date as 4 and 5 August, 1689. The surgeon St. Amand, whom the Iroquois had brought with them to Lachine, there made his escape (Collec. MSS. Quebec, I, 671).

On the journey to Oneida, Father Millet was not badly treated; he was unencumbered by any burden until they were nearing their last night’s sleeping place, ten leagues from their destination, when one of the friendly chiefs, probably to keep up appearances, gave him a light sack to carry. On 9 August, two leagues from their destination, they met Manchot’s wife and daughter, belonging to the first nobility of Oneida, both of whom Father Millet had formerly baptized on the same day as Manchot himself. Manchot had left the army at Otoniassa for the sole purpose of protecting Millet on the way to Oneida, and had gone ahead two days before to notify his wife of his approach. These good Christians brought with them an abundance of provisions and refreshments; they took the rope from Millet’s neck, unbound his arms, gave him clean clothes, and in general showed kindness and scarcely realizing what he saw, Millet asked if their intention was to deck out the victim, and, if on his arrival, he was to die. The Christian matron answered that nothing had yet been settled, and that the Council of Oneida would decide. Clothed with what he had just received and in a close-fitting shirt which is symbolic of simplicity, Father Millet proceeded to Otoniassa. Millet made his approach to the town, wearing the livery of the two most important families of the tribe, that of the Bear and that of the Tortoise. Warned of his near arrival the aged sachems marched out to meet him, and kindled a fire in readiness for what might occur; for they did not all entertain the same benevolent feeling toward him. He was made to sit down near the elders, and Manchot presented him to this preliminary council, declaring that he had come, not as a captive, but as a missionary returning to visit his flock; that it was the will of the other chiefs and himself that the father should be placed at the disposal of those who decided the affairs of the nation, and that he should be subjected to their will. A sachem of the Bear Clan, a great friend of the English, then proceeded to denominate Millet as a partisan of the Governor of Canada, who was bent on overthrowing the great Iroquois lodge (i.e. the Iroquois Confederacy), and had burned the Seneca towns. The orator was so violent at the beginning of his speech, that it looked as if Millet would be condemned; but towards the close he grew milder, and admitted that since such was the will of the chiefs, the prisoner should be led to the council lodge which was a privileged cabin.

Crowds of drunken Indian braves and squaws, shouting and yelling, followed him to the council lodge, where he was confined by the Mammaway. He (ibid., 81). He had, however, to be hidden from the mob of drunken Indians, who stoned the cabin, threatened to batter it down or set it on fire, heaped abuse on those who were sheltering him, and vowed that, since war had begun, they would not be cheated out of its first fruits. Two days after, when the fury of the drunken rabble had somewhat abated, the friends of the captive missionary thought it wiser to have his case adjudicated without further delay, as the popular feeling might be embittered should the army returning from Montreal have to deplore the loss of some of its braves. But once again he was placed in a state of suspense as to his fate, the assembled chiefs deciding that they must wait the return of the warriors and learn what their intentions were.
Three more weeks dragged on, but, apart from the importunities and threats of the drunkards, Millet was left in comparative quiet. That he was walking in the shadow of death, is shown by the fact that he was given the name of Genzerontzé, i.e. "The Dead (or Dying) Man." He said that as pastor served to console him, the faithful flocking to him in their spiritual necessities, even to the remote lurking places where he had frequently to be hidden, and his bodily wants were amply supplied. When the Iroquois returned after their bloody foray against Lachine and other settlements near Montreal, it was found that the Oneidas had left three dead warriors behind in the enemy’s country, including a leading war-chief. The exasperated braves considered the death and torture of the number of prisoners they had brought back insufficient to atone for this loss, and demanded that Millet should be added to the number. Fearing lest this bloodthirsty faction should, by cutting off a finger or by some similar mutilation, set the mark of death upon their missionary, the Christian Indians were more careful than ever to keep him out of sight (ibid., 87). He was made pass the night sometimes in one cabin, sometimes in another, and more than once under the starlight, anywhere in fact where a drunken Indian was not likely to find him. His people, however, had secured the support of her relatives, the most influential warriors of the tribe, towards saving Millet.

The day when the final sentence was to be pronounced arrived at last. Millet had time to hear the confessions of his fellow-prisoners, two of whom eventually died by fire. As for himself, he could only beg leave of his own accord to go into the arms of the mercy of God. His case was a knotty one for the assembled chiefs to decide: on the one hand, he was regarded by the Iroquois as a great criminal and deceiver, being held responsible for the seizure of their fellow-countrymen at Catarakouy (ibid., 89); but, on the other, he was protected by the Christians, among the most distinguished members of the nation, and thus could not be put to death without incurring their displeasure. The result was that he was sent to and fro from one special tribunal to another, his face smeared with black and red to brand him as a victim of the god of war and of the wrath of the Iroquois. At this critical juncture the Iroquois calmed and subdued anew, and ingeniously turned the difficulty in Millet’s favour by offering him as a substitute—not for one of the bravest killed by the French at Lachine, nor for any made prisoner at Fort Frontenac, but—for a captain named Otasseté, who had died long since a natural death, and whose name was famous as that of one of the founders of the Iroquois Confederation. By this presentation Chief Gannaseatonin became the sole arbiter of Millet’s life or death. He consulted only the warriors of his family, and, those having without hesitation pronounced in favour of life, he approached the father and in the set formula addressed him: "Sakonhneton Skaksi" (My elder brother, you are released). A few days later the representatives of Oneida were invited to a grand banquet, and at the ceremony the name of Otasseté was given Millet to make it manifest to all that the Oneidas had adopted him into their nation and naturalized him an Iroquois. Everything that had been taken from him was restored.

Father Millet turned his long captivity among the Oneidas to good account. Father Buryas writes to the General on 21 October, 1693: “We have received letters from Father Millet, a captive among the Iroquois for the last six years... He performs with happy results all the offices of a missionary. He stands in need of one thing only, an altar outfit (a chalice, vestments, etc., so as to say Mass); but he thinks that the time to send him this has not yet come on account of the hostility of the drunkards among the tribe and of the English who have done their best to have this saintly missionary handed over to their keeping. They cannot brook the presence of a Jesuit there.” Dablé had already in the same month and year, written to Hovey that a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneidas, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: They [his friends among the Oneida...
the defect of unceasing asperity of language, so that he continued to emit the strife. The committee of Catholic laymen, elected first in 1782, and re-elected five years later, were the centre of such opinions, and towards the end three ecclesiastics were added, two of whom (James Talbot and Charles Berington) were bishops. The object of the committee was to help to bring about Catholic emancipation. With this end in view, in 1789 they issued a "Protestation," disclaiming some of the more objectionable doctrines with which they were popularly credited, including the deposing power and papal infallibility. Despite the Cisalpine tone of the document, it was signed by nearly 1500 Catholics, including all the vicars Apostolic, though the signatures of two were afterwards withdrawn. Pitt who was then Prime Minister promised to introduce a bill of Catholic relief; but when it was drafted, it was found to contain an oath which all Catholics were to be called upon to take, based on the "protestation," but in stronger language, and containing a doctrine to which no good Catholic could set his name; while the Catholics throughout were called by the absurd title of "Protesting Catholic Dissenters".

The four vicars Apostolic met at Hammersmith, in October, 1789, Milner attending as theological adviser. They unanimously condemned the oath and the new appellation. During the following year the Bishops of the Northern and London Districts died. A great effort was made by the committees to secure the transfer of Bishop Charles Berington to the London District. This would have been a triumph for the Cisalpines; but fortunately it did not succeed. Rome, being warned, appointed Dr. Douglass, a Yorkshireman, who had been outside the late disputes.

The committee now suggested some modification of the oath; but it was not sufficient to free it from objection, and three out of the four vicars Apostolic joined in condemning it a second time. When the Relief Bill was brought forward in February, 1791, the bishops called Milner to their assistance. By means of his vigorous action an impression was made on the Government and the oath was further modified; but the situation was really saved after his return to Winchester, when the House of Lords, at the instigation of the Protestant Bishop of St. David's, substituted a totally different oath for the one objected to; and in this form the Bill was passed. It abolished the penal laws properly so-called and legalized the celebration of Mass; but Catholics continued liable to numerous disabilities for many years afterwards. After this the Catholic Committee dissolved; but the chief members re-formed themselves into an association to which they gave the name of the Cisalpine Club and which lasted for many years. Milner continued to write and speak in opposition to them. The clergy who were supporters of the Cisalpine spirit were numerous; for example, in the Midland District, one group who had acted together being known as the Staffordshire Clergy. By a strange fate it was this very district over which Milner was called to rule in 1803, when he was consecrated Bishop of Castabala, and appointed Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District. It is credit-
able both to them and to Milner himself that the resulting state of tension was of short duration. The clergy learned to value the great qualities of their new bishop, and conceived an admiration of him, the tradition of which has lasted to the present day.

Milner, however, was not satisfied with his position in the Midlands. He had formed an alliance with the Irish bishops, and with their co-operation, a determined attempt was made to have him transferred to London as coadjutor with right of succession. This scheme was opposed by Bishop Douglass, and ultimately defeated, though the pope consented that Milner should become parliamentary agent to the Irish bishops in their struggle to procure Catholic emancipation, and that for this purpose he should be permitted to remain in the country. The result was that Milner, after an uneasy and uncomfortable stay of some years, returned to Ireland. This was a great blow to the cause of Catholic emancipation in England, and it was a subject of great regret to his friends. Milner, however, was not afraid to say so publicly, in numerous pamphlets and other publications, and even in his pastoral letters. The subjects of contention were several; but two especially may be mentioned. One was the well-known "Veto" question, which first came into prominence in the year 1808. By this it was intended to concede to the Crown a negative voice in the election of Catholic bishops, by conferring a right to veto any candidate whose loyalty was open to question. The chief Irish bishops had agreed to the measure in 1799; but as nothing was done to improve the state of Catholic emancipation, the scheme had dropped. Milner revived it, and was for a time the warm advocate of the veto. He found himself in opposition to most of the Irish bishops. He visited Ireland, and afterwards wrote his "Letter to a Parish Priest" (who was really an Irish bishop) in defence of his policy. The Irish bishops, however, continued to oppose the veto in 1808. A year later Milner was converted to their way of thinking, and became as vigorous in opposition to it as he had been before in its favour. About this time the English Catholics, in presenting a petition to Parliament, embodied what was known as their "Fifth Resolution," offering a "grateful concurrence" to a Bill which would give them emancipation, accompanied by any "arrangements" for the safe-guarding of the Established Church which should not be inconsistent with their religion. Milner declared—contrary to the assertions of the framers of the Resolution—that the "arrangements" intended, included the Veto, and he denounced those who signed the Resolution as "the spokesmen of the Apostolic of England. In this he received the support of the Irish bishops. Another source of criticism was the want of vigour which he alleged against the London Vicar in combating the Blanchardist schism among the French emigrant clergy, especially the restoration of one of them, Abbé de Trevoux, to spiritual faculties without a public retraction. In this matter also he was supported by the Irish bishops.

A crisis occurred in 1813, Dr. Poynter being then Vicar Apostolic of the London District. A Bill for the full emancipation of Catholics was introduced into the House of Commons by Grattan; but Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning introduced amending clauses giving the Crown a veto on the appointment of bishops, to be exercised only on the recommendation of a committee consisting chiefly of Catholic Peers. Milner and the Irish bishops maintained that no Catholic could assent to this without incurring schism. The othervicars Apostolic did not go so far as this, though they opposed the clauses giving the Crown a veto on the appointment of bishops, on the recommendation of the Catholic Board, consisting chiefly of laymen, were in favour of accepting them as the necessary price to pay for emancipation. Milner, however, used all his influence to procure the rejection of the Bill. He printed a "Brief Memorial" in this sense, and distributed it among members of Parliament. The Bill passed its second reading, but in committees the clause admitting Catholics to Parliament was defeated by a small majority of four votes, and the Bill was abandoned. Milner took to himself the credit of having been the cause of its defeat, and the laymen were so angry with him that, to their permanent disgrace, they publicly expelled him from the committee of the Catholic Board. In the meantime Dr. Poynter approached Rome for guidance in the expected event of the re-introduction of the Bill. The pope was at that time the prisoner of Bonaparte, and the cardinals were dispersed. In their absence Mgr. Quarantotti, Secretary of Propaganda, using the powers with which he had been provisionally invested, issued a Rescript, dated February 14, 1814, approving of the Bill as it stood. Milner desired: that a decree of this kind would follow this and decided immediately to appeal to the pope, who having been liberated from captivity, was on his way back to Rome. His journey was so far successful that the Quarantotti Rescript was recalled, and the pope ordered the whole matter to be examined afresh. In the end a decision was promulgated in the shape of a letter from Cardinal Litta, Prefect of Propaganda, to Dr. Poynter, who had also come to Rome. The provisions of the late Bill were condemned; but on the general question of the veto, apart from the Lay Committees, the decision was against Milner; subject to certain safeguards, Catholics were empowered to elect bishops who, provided this negative power was so limited as not to be allowed to grow into a positive nomination. This led to further agitation in Ireland, and another deputation was sent to Rome; but the English Catholics, including Milner himself, accepted the decision without question. The English vicars Apostolic were, however, naturally opposed to the veto, and in the event it never became necessary to utilise the permission granted.

On his return from Rome Milner continued to write controversially, the new "Orthodox Journal" being a frequent medium for his communications. His language was as harsh as ever, and unbecoming in a bishop, until at length an appeal was made to Rome, and Cardinal Fonzana, who was then Prefect of Propaganda, forbade him to write in it any more. During the last years of his life Milner withdrew to a great extent from public politics. He ceased to act on behalf of the Irish bishops, and though he did not hold any intercourse with the other vicars Apostolic, he was still a man of influence in his own right. He devoted himself to literary work. In 1818 his "End of Controversy," perhaps the best known of all his books, at length appeared, and it was followed by a war of pamphlets and replies which went on for several years. Feeling his health failing, he applied for a coadjutor, and Rev. Thomas Walsh, President of Oscott College, was appointed. He was consecrated in 1825 when all the bishops of England met, and a reconciliation was effected. Milner survived less than a year, his death taking place at his house at Wolverhampton on 19 April, 1826. He left behind him a record of a life marked by whole-hearted devotion to religion, and of eminent services rendered to the cause, both as a man of two capacities his work was marred by the asperity of his language, and his intolerance of any views differing from his own. This made him many enemies through life, and cut him off from his brother bishops during the greater part of his episcopate. But his lot was cast at a difficult time, and he succeeded in combating difficulties which had assailed the cause. He had the advantage of a strong constitution; his vigour and activity were phenomenal, and, added to his devotion to the Holy See, earned him the title of the English Athenæus.

There are many portraits of Milner: (1) sketch, age about 25; (2) miniature, as a bishop about 1803; (3) miniature by Kerman (1806—considered the best
ilkness); (4) painting by Barber, drawing master at Oscott, 1817; (5) painting by Herbert, R.A.—said to be the most like, but it is in Gothic vestments and mitre, having been painted long after Milner’s death. (These are all at Oscott.) (6) Painting of Mr. Crawford, his son of the Crawford family, at Brook Street, Bergholt. (7) Painting at the presbytery, Norwich, very similar to (5). (8) Engraving in ‘Laitcy’s Directory’, 1827, from a painting by Radcliffe (Orth. Jorn., I, 173). (9) Bust, by Clarke sen. of Birmingham: many copies to be met with. (1), (2), and (6) reproduced in the ‘Dawn of the Catholic Revival’; (6) in Milner’s ‘Memoirs’; (7) in ‘Furnival’s Life of Milner’; (4) in the penny ‘Life of Milner’, by Rev. E. Burton (Catholic Truth Society). His chief works are: ‘Funeral Discourse at Consecration of Bishop Gibson’ (1791); ‘Discourse at Consecration of Bishop Challoner’ (1781); ‘The Clergyman’s Answer to the Layman’s Letter’ (1790); ‘Pastoral of the Bishop of Léon’ (translated, 1791); ‘Divine Rights of Episcopacy’ (1791); ‘Audi Altemar Partem’ (1792); ‘Ecclesiastical Democracy detected’ (1793); ‘Reply to Cisalpine Club’ (1795); ‘Serious Expostulation with Rev. Joseph Berington’ (1797); ‘History of Winchester’ (1798); ‘Brief Life of Challoner’ (1798); ‘Letters to a Prebendary’ (1799), and ‘On the Authenticity of the Consecration and Foundation of the Conduct of Pius VII’ (1802); ‘Arguments against Catholic Petition’ (1805); ‘Cure of Winefridc White’ (1805); ‘Letter to a Parish Priest’ (1808); ‘Letters from Ireland’ (1808); ‘Pastoral Letter on Blanchard’s ‘Sequel’, ‘Supplement’, and ‘Appendix’ (1808); ‘Appeal to the Catholics of Ireland’ (1808); ‘Discourse at Funeral of Sir William Jerningham’ (1810); ‘Treatise on Ecclesiastical Architecture’ (1810); ‘Instructions for Catholics of Midland Counties’ (1811); ‘Letter to Prelate of Ireland’ (1811); ‘Explanations with Bishop Poynter’ (1812); ‘Pastoral on Jurisdiction of Church’ (1812–13); ‘Brief Memorials of Catholic Laymen in Pravo Vindication’ (1813); ‘Encyclical Letter’ (1813); ‘Inquisition. A letter to Sir John Cox Hippislay’ (1816); ‘Humble Remonstrance to House of Commons’ (1816); ‘End of Bishop Hornyold’ (1816); ‘End of Religious 1819; ‘Memorials of English Catholics’ (1820); and ‘Additions Nos. I and II’ (1821); ‘Discourse on the Sacraments’ (1821); ‘Vindication of the End of Controversy’ (1822); ‘Exposer exposed’ (1824); ‘Parting Word to Dr. Grier’ (1825). (For a complete list, see Husketh, infra, 572.)

BERNARD WARD.

Milner, RALPH, VENERABLE, layman and martyr, b. at Flasestad, Hants, England, early in the sixteenth century; suffered at Winchester, 7 July, 1591. The greater part of his life was probably passed in his native village, where, being practically illiterate, he supported his wife and eight children by manual labour. He was brought up in an Anglican Family, and the contrast between the lives of Catholics and Protestants of his acquaintance, he determined to embrace the old religion, and, after the usual course of instruction, was received into the Church. On the very day of his first Communion, however, he was arrested for changing his religion and committed to Winchester jail. Here his good behaviour during the years of his imprisonment won him the jailer’s confidence to such a degree that he was frequently allowed out on parole, and was even trusted with the keys of the prison. This leniency enabled him to render valuable service to the other Catholic prisoners and to introduce priests to administer the sacraments. Soon, extending the scope of the priest’s activities, Milner laboured first to Father Thomas Stanney, and latter to his successor, at Winchester, Father Roger Deacon, conducting them to the different villages to minister to the spiritual needs of the scattered and persecuted flock. Finally seized with Father Deacon, Milner was with him placed under close confinement in Winchester jail; and, after four years, when he had apparently moved with compassion for the aged man, the judge urged Milner to attend even once the Protestant church and thus escape the gallows. The latter refused, however, to embrace a counsel so disagreeable to the maxims of the Gospel, and began immediately to prepare for death. Every effort was made to persuade him to change his purpose and renounce the Faith, and, when he was approaching the gallows with Father Deacon, his children were conducted to him in the hope that he might even then relent. Unshaken in his resolution, Milner gave his children his last blessing, declaring that he could wish them no greater happiness than to die for the sake cause, and then met his death in the manner of a true Christian. CHALLONER, Memoirs, I (1741), 290, 425; RIBANDERER, ANDER, De Schiam. Angli. (1810), appendix, p. 36; DODD, Church History, II, 149. THOMAS KENNEDY.

Milo. See Sira, DIACONE OF.

Milo Crispin, monk, and cantor of the Benedictine Abbey of Bec, wrote the lives of five of its abbots: Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, Guliemus de Bellomonte, Bose, Theobaldus, and Letardus. His life of Lanfranc is printed in the ‘Acta Sanctorum’ of the Bollandists (May 28). The other four (those of Theobaldus and Letardus being mere summaries) are included in P. L. (Vol. CL.). Milo Crispin was an old man when he wrote them, for in the last chapter of his life of Lanfranc he relates something which he himself heard St. Anselm say. As St. Anselm died in 1109, and Letardus did not die till 1114, Milo Crispin shows here incidentally that his own religious life had lasted more than forty years. He was one of the noblest of the monks of Bec, a disciple of Lanfranc, and the first of the order to send to the East for the formation of the monks of Clairvaux. He himself founded a monastery at Berghen, for the religious life of the other order, where he lived out his life. The name Crispin, according to the custom of the monks of Bec, bears its most sacred meaning, in which Milo Crispin is shown to be a saint. The name milk, the familiar and brotherly salutation, is a mark of friendship, and the monk at his entrance into the monastery received as a token of his friendliness. BUCHEK, Notices of the Franciscan Monastic Order, 364, 365; BREVIER, Histoire du Monast. de Besi, i, 1741; THEOPHILE, Histoire des Dames de Gisimen, i, 1736; THEODORE, Histoire des Dames de Gisimen, ii, 1736; BERTHET, Histoire des Dames de Gisimen, ii, 1736; BERTHET, Histoire des Dames de Gisimen, iii, 1736; BERTHET, Histoire des Dames de Gisimen, iv, 1736; BERTHET, Histoire des Dames de Gisimen, v, 1736. THOMAS KENNEDY.

EDWIN BURTON.

Milopotamos, a titular see of Crete, suffragan of Candia. Certain historians and geographers identify this locality with the ancient Pantomotium mentioned by Stephano by Byzantium, by Ptolemy (III, xv, 5), who places it between Rhethymnos and the promontory of Diom, and by Pliny (IV, xx, 3), who places it on the opposite shore. If Milopotamos, this Greek see is alluded to for the first time towards 1170 (Parthey, “Hieroclia Synecudemus,” 118); it is spoken of again in another undated “Notitia episcopatum” (Gelzer, “Ungedruckte . . . Texte der Notitiae episcop.,” 627). As to the Latin residential see, its first titular, Matthew, is mentioned about 1212, shortly after the conquest of the island by the Venetians. From 1533 to 1549 the Diocese of Cher-
Miltiades, Saint, Pope.—The year of his birth is not known; he was elected pope in either 310 or 311; died 10 or 11 January, 314. After the banishment of Pope Eusebius (q. v.) the Roman See was vacant for some time, probably because of the complications which had arisen on account of the apostates (lapsi), and which were not cleared up by the banishment of Eusebius and Hermicius. On 2 July, 310 or 311, Miltiades (the name is also written Melchiades), a native of Africa, was elevated to the papacy. There is some uncertainty as to the exact year, as the "Liberian Catalogue" (Venice, 1755), 173; 180; GEMA, 40; GRO, 403; EUSEB, Hierarchia catholica mediæ aevi, I, 337; II, 312; III, 261.

S. VAILHÉ.

Miltiades was joined to it; on the other hand, in 1641, the Diocese of Milopotamos was united with Rhethymno and after the conquest of the island by the Turks in 1670, became merely titular. We know the names of about twenty residential Latin bishops. Among the schismatic Greeks, the See of Aulopotamos is united with that of Rhethymno. The ruins of the city may be seen along the sea-shore at Castel Mylopotamo, about twelve miles from Rhethymno.

Le Quin, Orients christiani, III, 935-938; CORNELLUS, Chronicorum, cap. 189; GAMA, 82; GEMA, 403; EUSEB, Hierarchia catholica mediæ aevi, I, 337; II, 312; III, 261.

Miltiades was given a bearing in Rome, to Cecilian and his opponent, and to decide the case. On 2 October, 313, there assembled in the Lateran Palace, under the presidency of Miltiades, a synod of eighteen bishops from Gaul and Italy, which, after thoroughly considering the Donatist controversy for three days, decided in favour of Cecilian, whose election and consecration as Bishop of Carthage was declared to be legitimate. In the biography of Miltiades, in the "Libri Pontifici" (libr. II) it is stated that at that time Manicheans were found in Rome; this was quite possible as Manicheans began to spread in the West in the fourth century. The same source attributes to this pope a decree which absolutely forbade the Christians to fast on Sundays or on Thursdays, "because these days were observed by the heathen as a holy fast". This reason is remarkable; it comes most likely from the author of the "Libri Pontifici" who with this alleged decree traces back a Roman custom of his own time to an ordinance of Miltiades. The "Libri Pontifici" is probably no less arbitrary in crediting this pope with a decree to the effect that the Oblation consecrated at the Solemn Mass of the pope (by which is meant the Eucharistic Bread) should be taken to the different churches of Rome. Such a custom actually existed in the later Middle Ages (Duchesne, Études [...], London, 1903, 185); but there is nothing definite to show that it was introduced by Miltiades, as the "Libri Pontifici" asserts.

After his death, on 10 or 11 January (the "Liberian Catalogue" gives it as III. id. jan.; the "Depoisses Episcoporum" as III. id. jan.), 314, Miltiades was laid to rest in the Catacomb of St. Callistus, and here he was venerated as a saint. De Rossi regards it as highly probable his location of this pope's burial-chamber (Roma Sotterranea, II, 188 sq.). His feast was celebrated in the fourth century, on 10 January, according to the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum". In the present "Roman Martyrology" it occurs on 10 December.

Miltiades, Saint, Pope, Minor—His feast is celebrated on 10 December. "Liber Pontificalis", De sanctis, 3; DE LAIE, Historia ecclesiastica, 27; DUCHESNE, Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise, II, 96, 97, 110-112.

J. P. KRUSCH.

Militia, Karl von, papal chamberlain and nuncio, b. about 1480, the son of Sigismund von Militia, "Landvogt" of Meissen, drowned in the Main near Steinheim, 20 November, 1529. He received his humanistic and theological education at Mainz, Trier, and Meissen and went to Rome in 1514 or 1515, where he made papal chamberlain and notary, and acted as agent of Frederic, Elector of Saxony, and of Duke Kasimir of Bavaria, obtaining, for the latter the permission to transport the reliquary of the earth of the Campo Santo in Rome, which originally had been brought from Jerusalem, to Annaberg, Saxony, where it was used in the cemetery. After the endeavours of Cardinal Cajetan to silence Luther had failed, Militia appeared to be the person suited to remain silent for the present, and to let the learned Archbishop Richard of Trier preside over the examination. Luther even promised to write an humble letter to the pope. Militia then journeyed to Leipzig and covered Tetzl with mortifying, wholly unnecessary reproaches. But the movement started and fanned by Luther, had progressed too far to be extinguished by such conversations, and for this reason two further meetings between Luther and Militia at Liebenwerda (9 Oct., 1519) and Lichtenburg
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(Oct., 1520) were without success. After a short stay in Rome he returned to Germany in 1522, where he died. He was buried in the cathedral of Mainz.

SEIDEMANN, Karl von Milita, eine chronologische Unterweisung (Darmstadt: Proben von Milita, sein Leben und seine geschichtliche Bedeutung (Freiburg, 1907).

PATRICK SCHLARGER.

Milwaukee, Archdiocese of (Milwaukeens), established as a diocese, 28 Nov., 1843; became an archbishopric, 12 February, 1876, comprises seventeen counties of the state of Wisconsin: Columbia, Dane, Dodge, Fond du Lac, Green, Green Lake, Jefferson, Kenosha, Marquette, Milwaukee, Osceola, Racine, Rock, Sheboygan, Walworth, Washington, Waukesha, and 16,921 square miles. The metropolitan city of Milwaukee is picturesquely situated on Milwaukee Bay, on the eastern shore of Lake Michigan. Its name is derived from the Algonquin family of Indian dialects and means Good Land. In the history of Catholicism it is first mentioned in the "Catholic Almanac" of 1840: "Milwaukee, Rev. Mr. Kelly who visits alternately Racine, Rochester, Burlington, Southport (Kenoeha), etc." The first Mass, however, was celebrated in Milwaukee as early as 1837 by Rev. J. D. Bondel, a missionary from Green Bay, in the home of the "founder of Milwaukee", Solomon Juneau. In the same year Rev. Patrick Kelly came to the city and held services in the court-house which he built for the first Catholic church, dedicated to St. Peter, for several years the bishop's cathedral. It was afterwards removed to its present site near St. Peter and Paul's Church by Mgr. Leonard Bats, V. G. North-west territory, of which the present State of Wisconsin forming a part, belonged to the Diocese of Quebec and afterwards to the Archdiocese of Baltimore, Ky., till it was separated from the newly created See of Cincinnati in 1821. In 1833, when Detroit was made a see, it became a dependency of that see. It was in 1841 that the first bishop visited Milwaukee in the person of Rt. Rev. P. Lefevre of Detroit, accompanied by one of his zealous priests, Rev. Martin Kundig, later vicar-general, whose name is inseparably linked with the early history and subsequent growth of the diocese. In 1843, the Fathers of the Fifth Provincial Council of Baltimore petitioned the Holy See to make Milwaukee a see and to appoint the Rev. John Martin Henni as its first bishop.

Episcopal Succession.—John Martin Henni, first Bishop of Milwaukee, was born at Obersaxen, Switzerland, in 1823. He was ordained a priest at Louisville, Ky., in 1847, and received his diocesan consecration in Rome, where he met the Very Rev. Frederic Reés, Vicar-General of Cincinnati (later Bishop of Detroit), who had come there in quest of priests for the American missions. Together with his fellow-student M. Kundig, he landed in New York, in 1828. Having been ordained priest at Cincinnati, 2 Feb., 1829, he laboured with zeal and enthusiasm in the Catholic Church in Ohio. On 19 March, 1844, Henni was consecrated Bishop of Milwaukee by Bishop Purcell of Cincinnati, and soon after started for his new field of labour. He came accompanied by the Rev. Michael Heiss, who for some time acted as his secretary. The prospects of the new diocese were far from encouraging. He found only four parishes. The whole diocese was frittered over the territory, and a small frame church encumbered with a heavy debt. But unaided by these difficulties the youthful bishop set to work with apostolic zeal, and, thanks to his untiring efforts, the number of Catholics, mostly immigrants from Germany and Ireland, increased from year to year, so that after three years the number of priests had risen from four to thirty. But a rich share of this phenomenal progress is due to the arduous labours and sacrificing spirit of his priests, the pioneers of the North-west, men like Maximelli, the founder of Sinisawa, Morrissey, C. Rehr, Wisbauer, Beitler, Inama, Gaertner, Gernbauer, Holshauer, Conrad, and others. In 1847 there arrived from the Koenigsmarck seminarium, founded by St. Francis Seminary (Salesianum), in the same year Henni laid the foundation of his new cathedral, dedicated to St. John the Evangelist. To raise funds for the building, he made extensive journeys to Cuba and Mexico. The cathedral was consecrated by Archbishop (afterwards Cardinal) Bedini, 31 July, 1853. Owing to the death of Henni at that time, St. Mary's church, for the spiritual needs of the German Catholics, was erected in 1846. In the same year the first hospital was opened under Catholic auspices in charge of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul. In 1856 the Seminary of St. Francis of Sales, destined to become the fertile nursery of priests for the North-west, was erected and in the course of years became one of the most flourishing institutions of the country. Its first rector was the Rev. Michael Heiss, while its founder, the Rev. Dr. Salzmann, acted as procurator. On the elevation of Father Heiss to the episcopal dignity, Salzmann was appointed his successor, a position which he held to the time of his death in 1869. In the same year Henni was also the founder of the first Catholic normal school in the United States and of the Pio Nono College. Both institutions were opened in 1871, and have to this day faithfully carried out the intentions of their founder. In 1866 two new dioceses were established in Wisconsin with episcopal sees in La Crosse and Green Bay. In 1874, Milwaukee was made an archdiocese, with episcopal see, with Mgr. Henni as first archbishop.

During the last years of his administration his burden was considerably lightened by the appointment of Rt. Rev. M. Heiss as coadjutor, with the right of succession, and titular Archbishop of Adrianople. Archbishop Henni who is rightly called the Patriarch of the North-west, was called to his reward 7 Sept., 1881. Michael Heiss was born at Pfalldorf, Bavaria, 12 April, 1818. Having finished his theological studies at the famous University of Munich, he spent the first two years of his priesthood in his home diocese of Eichstätt, and then offered his services to the American mission. He first had charge of St. Mary's church in the new town of La Crosse, in 1838. On the death of Archbishop Henni, in 1881, he succeeded him as archbishop. Archbishop Heiss was known and esteemed as one of the most learned theologians of the country, a reputation which secured to him a place among the members of the dogmatic commission at the Vatican Council. His works "De Matrimonio" (Munich, 1861) and "De canonico jure in Matrimonio" (Milwaukee, 1863), held a prominent place in theological literature. In 1883 he was invited to Rome to take part in the deliberations preparatory to the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, which he also attended in 1884. In 1886 he convoked the First Provincial Council of Milwaukee, which opened its sessions on 23 May, in St. John's Cathedral. Bishops Bishop of La Crescent, Ireland of St. Paul, His Excellency Archbishop De L'Islet, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, His Excellency Archbishop De L'Islet, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, and other bishops and priests, arrived from Germany and Ireland, increased from year to year, so that after three years the number of priests

had risen from four to thirty. But a rich share of this phenomenal progress is due to the arduous labours and sacrificing spirit of his priests, the pioneers of the North-west, men like Maximelli, the founder of Sinisawa, Morrissey, C. Rehr, Wisbauer, Beitler, Inama, Gaertner, Gernbauer, Holshauer, Conrad, and others. In 1847 there arrived from the Koenigsmarck seminarium, founded by St. Francis Seminary (Salesianum), in the same year Henni laid the foundation of his new cathedral, dedicated to St. John the Evangelist. To raise funds for the building, he made extensive journeys to Cuba and Mexico. The cathedral was consecrated by Archbishop (afterwards Cardinal) Bedini, 31 July, 1853. Owing to the death of Henni at that time, St. Mary's church, for the spiritual needs of the German Catholics, was erected in 1846. In the same year the first hospital was opened under Catholic auspices in charge of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul. In 1856 the Seminary of St. Francis of Sales, destined to become the fertile nursery of priests for the North-west, was erected and in the course of years became one of the most flourishing institutions of the country. Its first rector was the Rev. Michael Heiss, while its founder, the Rev. Dr. Salzmann, acted as procurator. On the elevation of Father Heiss to the episcopal dignity, Salzmann was appointed his successor, a position which he held to the time of his death in 1869. In the same year Henni was also the founder of the first Catholic normal school in the United States and of the Pio Nono College. Both institutions were opened in 1871, and have to this day faithfully carried out the intentions of their founder. In 1866 two new dioceses were established in Wisconsin with episcopal sees in La Crosse and Green Bay. In 1874, Milwaukee was made an archdiocese, with episcopal see, with Mgr. Henni as first archbishop.
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nothingism (q. v.). In their bigotry and hatred of everything Catholic, they aimed their first blow at the Church which had always been interfered with the rights of Catholic parents. But the timely and united action of the bishops of Wisconsin, and their vigorous protest, by which they branded the bill as "unnecessary, offensive, and unjust," effectually defeated the iniquitous scheme. In 1888 the Diocese of St. Paul was separated from Milwaukee and made an archdiocese, at the side of which the suffragan sees were thenceforth subject to Milwaukee: La Crosse and Green Bay in the State of Wisconsin and Marquette in Upper Michigan. The Diocese of Superior was added in 1905. Archbishop Heins died at St. Francis Hospital, La Crosse, 26 March, 1890. His mortal remains rest beneath the sanctuary of the seminary chapel at St. Francis, in the side of his faithful friend and co-labourer, Joseph Salmann.

Frederic Xavier Katzer was born at Ebensee, Upper Austria, 7 February, 1844. His preparatory studies he completed at Lins, the capital of Upper Austria, under the direction of the Jesuit Fathers. He came to America in 1864. Having finished his theological studies in Wisconsin, he was ordained in the Roman Church, December, 1866. After his ordination he remained at the seminary where he taught mathematics and, later on, philosophy and dogmatic theology. In 1875 he followed Fr. Krautbauer, the newly appointed Bishop of Green Bay, to his see, where he acted as secretary, and afterwards as vicar-general. Upon the death of Bishop Henni, in 1883, he was appointed administrator of the diocese; and on 31 May, 1886, he was chosen Bishop of Green Bay and consecrated in St. Francis Xavier's cathedral, 21 September of the same year. After the death of Archbishop Heins he was promoted to the archiepiscopal dignity as third Archbishop of Milwaukee in December, 1890. Archbishop Katzer represented the Board of Missions and a very zealous theologian. His pastoral talent is evidenced by an allegorical drama, entitled "Der Kampf der Gegenwart" (The Combat of the Present Age). His administration was marked by a uniform regard for justice and strict adherence to the laws of the Church. He died at Fond du Lac, 4 August, 1903, on the same day on which the great pontiff Leo XIII breathed his last. His earthly remains found their last resting place in the little cemetery near the "chapel in the woods" at St. Francis.

Sebastian Gebhard Messmer was born at Goldach, Switzerland, 29 August, 1847. Having finished his theological studies at the University of Innsbruck he was ordained priest in the same city, 23 July, 1871. In the same year he entered the seminary of Milwaukee and joined the Diocese of Newark. For several years he taught canon law, Scripture, and dogmatic theology in Seton Hall. For a short time he also had charge of St. Peter's, Newark, N. J. In 1889 he was called to the chair of canon law in the Catholic University at Washington, but first went to Rome to study Roman civil law. After his return he entered upon his duties as professor and kept this position till his elevation to the episcopal dignity. On 27 March, 1892, he was consecrated Bishop of Green Bay in St. Peter's Church, Newark, by his former classmate, Bishop Zardetti of St. Cloud. On the death of Archbishop Katzer he succeeded him as archbishop, 23 November, 1903. Archbishop Messmer is honourably known as a very able and prolific contributor to Catholic literature, and his name is intimately linked with the principal religious movements in the country. Together with Bishop McFaul of Trenton he has been chiefly instrumental in inaugurating the American Federation of Catholic Societies.

Sisters Orders in the Diocese.—Orders of Men.—The rapid, almost miraculous growth of Catholicism in the State of Wisconsin is chiefly due to the apostolic zeal of the pioneer priests of the secular priesthood; but the labours and trials of the early missionaries belonging to religious orders ought not to be forgotten. In 1857 the first Capuchin convent was erected at St. Mary of the Woods, near Galva, in Wisconsin. It has been asserted, not without reason, that the foundation of the Wisconsin Province is a fact unprecedented in the history of the Catholic Church in this country, in as far as the order of Capuchins was introduced into Wisconsin, not by religious, but by two secular priests, Rev. Francis Hass and Rev. Bonaventure Frey. The opposition they met was not only on all sides, the main of which they had to endure, and the old religious communities they had to see them, on the miraculous. To-day, the order possesses a flourishing community with convent and college at Calvary, a convent and two parishes in Milwaukee, not to speak of the numerous religious houses and communities in other dioceses. The Society of Jesus was established in Milwaukee, in 1874, and St. Gall's church, erected in 1849, was placed in charge of the Society. In 1880 the Jesuit college known as Marquette College was opened, and has lately developed into the flourishing Marquette University. The Jesuits also have charge of the Gesu church, one of the oldest and best religious edifices in the Northern States, also the Gesu College, the School of the People of the Sacred Heart at Watertown; the Servite Fathers, a monastery and novitiate at Grandville Center; and the Discalced Carmelites, lately arrived from Ratisbon, Bavaria, attend to the chapel on "Holy Hill", a well-known place of pilgrimage.

Orders of Women.—The School Sisters of Notre Dame, in 1854, came to Milwaukee, at the invitation of Bishop Henni, who showed himself their generous friend and protector, especially during the first years when they had to struggle with poverty and violent opposition. To Mother Caroline, who brought the first band of sisters from Munich to Milwaukee, and who for forty-two years stood at the helm, is principally due the firmness of the Order and its spreading influence. The sisters have their mother-house and novitiate in Milwaukee. In 1876 the community was divided into two provinces, with the second mother-house in Baltimore; and in 1895 a third province was formed with a mother-house at St. Louis, Mo. The Sisters of St. Francis have two mother-houses in the diocese, one at St. Francis, where they built their first convent in 1847, near the present site of St. Francis Seminary, the other in Milwaukee (St. Joseph's Convent and the Sacred Heart Sanatorium). The Sisters of St. Agnes have their mother-house at Fond du Lac, where they also have charge of a hospital, a home for the aged, and an academy. The Sisters of St. Dominic have their mother-house at Racine. The Sisters of the Good Shepherd have their mother-house at Milwaukee. The sisters of these communities teach in the numerous parochial schools of Wisconsin and other states. The Sisters of Mercy, too, have a mother-house in Milwaukee. Other communities which have no mother-house in the diocese, but are in charge of some charitable or educational establishment are: the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Franciscan Sisters of St. Louis, Mo., Polish Sisters of St. Joseph, Hospital Sisters of St. Francis, Little Sisters of the Poor, Society of the Divine Saviour, Dominican Sisters of the Perpetual Rosary, Sisters of the Third Order of St. Dominic (Sinsinawa), Sisters of the Good Shepherd, Felician Sisters, and Sisters de Misericorde.

Statistics.—The official reports for 1910 give the following figures: There are in the archdiocese 377 priests (303 secular and 74 regulars). The city of Milwaukee counts 38 churches; outside of Milwaukee there are 189. Besides there are 65 mission churches without a resident priest and 41 chapels. In the seminaries of St. Francis de Sales there are 50 students of philosophy and theology studying for the different dioceses of the province and other dioceses. There is one university, one Catholic normal school, and five colleges with 770 students; six academies for young
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ladies; 142 parish schools with 33,279 pupils, four orphan asylums with 401 orphans, one infant asylum, one industrial school for girls, one deaf-mute asylum, one home for boys, one school for feeble-minded, nine hospitals and sanatoriums, two homes for aged poor, and one home for girls. The Catholic population of the archdiocese is estimated at about 238,000.

Catholic Almanac and Leit's Directory (Baltimore): WILKINSON, Catholic Directory (Milwaukee); The Catholic Church in Wisconsin (Milwaukee, 1895); Memoirs of the Gesuati (New York, 1898); HAVEN, erster Bischof von New York (New York, 1898); RAINER, A Noble Priest, Joseph Salzmann, Founder of the Congregation of the Gesuati (New York, 1898); by REID; ASSELIN, Die Ehruerfug Mutter Caroline Fries (St. Louis, 1892).

J. RAINER.

Mind (Gk. νοῦς; Lat. mens; Ger. Geist, Seele; Fr. âme, esprit).—The word mind has been used in a variety of meanings in English, and we find a similar want of fixity in the connotation of the corresponding terms in other languages. Aristotle tells us that Anaxagoras, as compared with other early Greek philosophers, appeared like one sober among drunken men in that he introduced νοῦς, mind, as efficient cause of the general order in the universe. In treating of the soul, Aristotle himself identifies νοῦς with the intellectual faculty, which he conceives as partly active, partly passive (see Intellect). It is the third essential principle, the reiterative or dynamic energy of the soul, separable from the body, and immortal. The Latin word, mens, was employed in much the same sense. St. Thomas, who represents the general scholastic usage, derives mens from metier (to measure). He identifies mens with the human soul viewed as intellectual and abstracting from lower organic faculties. Angels, or pure spirits, mentally are called minds (De Veritate, X. 1). For Descartes the human soul is simply mens, res cogitans, mind. It

stands in complete opposition to the body and to matter in general. The vegetative faculties alloted to the soul by Aristotle and the Schoolmen are rejected by him, and those vital functions are explained by him mechanically. The lower animals do not possess minds in any sense; they are for him mere machines. An early usage in English connects the word mind closely with memory, as in the sense "to bear in mind". Again it has been associated with the volitional side of our nature, as in the phrases "to mind" and "to have a mind to effect something". Still when restricted to a certain faculty, or power, it is intended to identify mind with the cognitive and more especially with the intellectual powers. In this usage it more closely corresponds to the primary meaning of the Latin mens, understood as the thinking or judging principle. Mind is also conceived as a substantial being, equivalent to the scholastic mens, partly identified with, partly distinguished from the soul. If we define the soul as the principle within me, by which I feel, think, will, and by which my body is animated, we may provide a definition of mind of fairly wide acceptability by merely omitting the last clause. That

is, in this usage mind designates the soul as the source of consciousness, of feeling, thought, and volition, abstraction being made from the vegetative functions. On the other hand the term soul emphasizes the note of substantiality and the property of animating principle.

In the English psychological literature of the last century there has indeed been exhibited a most remarkable scepticism as to the reality of our ordinary sensations arise out of an aggregate of impressions individually too faint to be separately perceivable, the fact that attention may reveal to us experiences previously unnoticed, the fact that unobserved trains of thought may result in sudden reminiscences, and that in abnormal mental conditions hypnotized, somnambulistic, and hysterical patients often accomplish difficult intellectual feats.
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whilst remaining utterly unaware of the rational intermediate steps leading up to the final results. On the other side it is urged that most of those phenomena can be accounted for by merely subconscious processes which escape attention and are forgotten; or, at all events, by unconscious (as the world) the materialist, mind, feelings, thoughts, and volitions are just "functions" or "aspects" of matter; mental life is an epiphenomenon, a by-product in the working of the Universe, which can in no way interfere with the course of physical changes or modify the movement of any particle of matter in the world; indeed, in strict consistency it should be held that successive mental acts do not influence or condition each other, but that thoughts and volitions are mere incidental appendages of certain nerve processes in the brain; and these latter are determined exclusively and completely by antecedent material processes. In other words, the materialistic theory, when consistently thought out, leads invariably to the startling conclusion that the human mind has had no real influence on the history of the human race.

On the other hand, the idealistic monist denies altogether the existence of any extra-mental, independent material world. So far from mind being a mere aspect or epiphenomenon attached to matter, the material world is a fact of mind, and mind is independent on it. Its esse is percipi. It exists only in and for the mind. Our ideas are the only things of which we can be truly certain. And, indeed, if we were compelled to embrace monism, it seems to us there can be little doubt as to the logical superiority of the idealistic position. But there is no philosophical or logical reason to adopt as either materialistic or an idealistic monism. The conviction of the common sense of mankind, and the assumption of physical science that there are two orders of being in the universe, mind and matter, distinct from each other yet interacting and influencing each other, and the assurance that the human mind can obtain a limited yet true knowledge of the material world which really exists outside and independently of it occupying a space of three dimensions, this view, which is the common teaching of the Scholastic philosophy and Catholic thinkers, can be abundantly justified (see DUALISM; ENERGY, CONSERVATION OF).

MIND AND MATTER.—The opposition of mind and matter brings us face to face with the great controversy between the Monists and Monism, of being in the universe ultimately and radically distinct? or are they merely diverse phases or aspects of one common underlying substratum? Our experience at all events appears to reveal to us two fundamentally contrasted forms of reality. On the one side, there is facing us matter occupying space, subject to motion, possessed of inertia and resistance, permanent, indestructible, and seemingly independent of our observation. On the other, there is our own mind, immediately revealing itself to us in simple unextended acts of consciousness, which seem to be born and then annihilated. Through these conscious acts we apprehend the material world. All our knowledge of the universe is founded on these immediate and limited by them. By analogy we ascribe to other human organisms minds like our own. A craving to find unity in the seeming multiplicity of experience has led many thinkers to accept a monistic explanation, in which the apparent duality of mind and matter is reduced to a single underlying principle or substratum. Materialism considers matter itself, body, mental substance without mind. For the materialist, mind, feelings, thoughts, and volitions are just "functions" or "aspects" of matter; mental life is an epiphenomenon, a by-product in the working of the Universe, which can in no way interfere with the course of physical changes or modify the movement of any particle of matter in the world; indeed, in strict consistency it should be held that successive mental acts do not influence or condition each other, but that thoughts and volitions are mere incidental appendages of certain nerve processes in the brain; and these latter are determined exclusively and completely by antecedent material processes. In other words, the materialistic theory, when consistently thought out, leads invariably to the startling conclusion that the human mind has had no real influence on the history of the human race.

On the other hand, the idealistic monist denies altogether the existence of any extra-mental, independent material world. So far from mind being a mere aspect or epiphenomenon attached to matter, the material world is a fact of mind, and mind is independent on it. Its esse is percipi. It exists only in and for the mind. Our ideas are the only things of which we can be truly certain. And, indeed, if we were compelled to embrace monism, it seems to us there can be little doubt as to the logical superiority of the idealistic position. But there is no philosophical or logical reason to adopt as either materialistic or an idealistic monism. The conviction of the common sense of mankind, and the assumption of physical science that there are two orders of being in the universe, mind and matter, distinct from each other yet interacting and influencing each other, and the assurance that the human mind can obtain a limited yet true knowledge of the material world which really exists outside and independently of it occupying a space of three dimensions, this view, which is the common teaching of the Scholastic philosophy and Catholic thinkers, can be abundantly justified (see DUALISM; ENERGY, CONSERVATION OF).

MIND AND MATTER.—The opposition of mind and matter brings us face to face with the great controversy between the Monists and Monism, of being in the universe ultimately and radically distinct? or are they merely diverse phases or aspects of one common underlying substratum? Our experience at all events appears to reveal to us two fundamentally contrasted forms of reality. On the one side, there is facing us matter occupying space, subject to motion, possessed of inertia and resistance, permanent, indestructible, and seemingly independent of our observation. On the other, there is our own mind, immediately revealing itself to us in simple unextended acts of consciousness, which seem to be born and then annihilated. Through these conscious acts we apprehend the material world. All our knowledge of the universe is founded on these immediate and limited by them. By analogy we ascribe to other human organisms minds like our own. A craving to find unity in the seeming multiplicity of experience has led many thinkers to accept a monistic explanation, in which the apparent duality of mind and matter is reduced to a single underlying principle or substratum. Materialism considers matter itself, body, mental substance without mind. For the materialist, mind, feelings, thoughts, and volitions are just "functions" or "aspects" of matter; mental life is an epiphenomenon, a by-product in the working of the Universe, which can in no way interfere with the course of physical changes or modify the movement of any particle of matter in the world; indeed, in strict consistency it should be held that successive mental acts do not influence or condition each other, but that thoughts and volitions are mere incidental appendages of certain nerve processes in the brain; and these latter are determined exclusively and completely by antecedent material processes. In other words, the materialistic theory, when consistently thought out, leads invariably to the startling conclusion that the human mind has had no real influence on the history of the human race.

On the other hand, the idealistic monist denies altogether the existence of any extra-mental, independent material world. So far from mind being a mere aspect or epiphenomenon attached to matter, the material world is a fact of mind, and mind is independent on it. Its esse is percipi. It exists only in and for the mind. Our ideas are the only things of which we can be truly certain. And, indeed, if we were compelled to embrace monism, it seems to us there can be little doubt as to the logical superiority of the idealistic position. But there is no philosophical or logical reason to adopt as either materialistic or an idealistic monism. The conviction of the common sense of mankind, and the assumption of physical science that there are two orders of being in the universe, mind and matter, distinct from each other yet interacting and influencing each other, and the assurance that the human mind can obtain a limited yet true knowledge of the material world which really exists outside and independently of it occupying a space of three dimensions, this view, which is the common teaching of the Scholastic philosophy and Catholic thinkers, can be abundantly justified (see DUALISM; ENERGY, CONSERVATION OF).
still compelled to ask how the particular arrangement of the types came about, and we are certain that the subject of the question ultimately rests in the action of mind or intelligent being.


MICHAEL MAHER.

Minden, Diocese of, a former see of Westphalia.

Minden on the Weser is first heard of in 788, and in 803 in the Treaty of Salz, made with the Saxons, it is spoken of as a see. The first bishop was Erkambert (Hermambert), probably a Saxon, who was appointed in 780 and died in 813. The third bishop, Dietrich I (853-80), fell in battle against the Northmen; the fifth, Drogo (887-902), founded a convent at Möllenbeck. The diocese gradually developed until it extended on the east across the Aller to Celle, on the west to Hunte, embracing the districts of Lidbeckegow, Enterigowe, Loingo, Merstem, Buck, and Tilitthi. From the beginning the bishops of Minden were suffragans of Cologne. The later estates of the bishopric comprised a fourth of the diocese; it extended from Porta Westfalica, on both sides of the river, to Schlüsselburg, and on the north-west across to Hunte. The most important places were Minden, Löbecke, Petershagen, Schlüsselburg, Reineberg, and Rades. The see suffered in the tenth century from the Hungarians, but began to flourish under the Saxon dynasty.

Bishop Landward (856-69) obtained from Otto I immunity from all foreign jurisdiction, and also obtained the revenues derived from the administration of justice; Milo (969-96) on account of his loyalty to Otto II received important privileges, among others the right to elect the bailiff who represented the bishop in the imperial court, in 977 penal jurisdiction, the Weser toll, the right of coinage and of conducting a mint. The bishop became so important that he was almost an independent prince. The cathedral canons obtained in 961 the right to choose the bishop, provided a worthy man was chosen. Bishops Dietrich II (1002-22), Sigebert (1022-36), and Bruno (1037-55) were in the emperor’s favour and consequently added to their church property. During the reign of Henry IV the bishops were caught in the Investitūres conflict, and more than once papal and imperial sympathizers contended for the see. After the Concordat of Worms the bishopric under Sigward (1120-40) and Heinrich I (1140-53) made great strides. Werner (1153-70) and Anno (1170-85) guided the see safely through the struggle between Frederick Barbarossa and the Saxon Duke Henry the Lion. The overthrow of the duke removed the last remnant of episcopal dependence on the ducal power, and the prelates of Minden were henceforth subject to the emperor.

Continuous conflicts with encroaching nobles brought a load of debt and forced many bishops to pledge or sell the diocesan estates. The town of Minden was ruined by the financial embarrassment of its episcopal lords, gradually acquired more rights, and partially freed itself from the overlordship of the bishops on the other hand, the authority of the bishop was restricted by the cathedral chapter which, in Minden as in other dioceses, acquired the right of choosing the provost and dean, and made all important matters of administration subject to its consent. Bishop Gottfried von Waldeck (1304-24), to evade the oppression of the burgesses, moved his residence to the castle of Petershagen. With the papal nomination of Louis of Brunswick (1324-46) began the unedifying and detrimental series of conflicts between pope and chapter as to the nomination to the see. Louis involved the see in the feuds of neighbouring nobles. The town acquired the administration of justice, the right to levy customs duties, and the right of coinage. Some energetic bishops followed: Gerhard I (1346-53); Gerhard II von Schauenburg (1361-66); Werdekind von Berge (1369-83); Otto III (1384-97).

In the fifteenth century more than one double election took place. Wulbrand, Count of Hallermund (1406-36), endeavoured to bring order out of confusion; his successor, Albert II von Hoya, as coadjutor and as bishop (1436-73), was involved in a dispute with Osnabrück and the Duke of Brunswick. His successor, Heinrich III von Schauenburg (1473-1508), sought better relations with his neighbours, but episcopal authority was so weakened that a return to
former conditions was impossible. The power of the bishop was now so restricted by the chapter and the town council that it was unable to take any important step without their consent; indeed, a complete co-regency of the chapter was set up. Almost all the castles were in the hands of the aristocratic canons, and the revenues of the bishop were extremely limited. The lives of the clergy did not in many cases conform to the canonical rules; consecration was quite general; monastic discipline had relaxed, and the faith of the laity had grown cold. For these reasons the Reformation spread rapidly in the town and the diocese under Bishop Franz I of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (1508–29), who involved the see in the Hildesheim chapter feuds, and died as the result of his excesses. His successor, Franz II von Waldeck, also Bishop of Münster and Osnabrück from 1532, led a dissolute life, and was an adherent of the new religious teachings, which he privately furthered with all his power. In 1533 he was forced to resign in favour of Julius of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (1553–54), who soon resigned in favour of his uncle, Georg (1554–66).

Under his successor, Hermann von Schauenberg (1567–82), Protestantism spread rapidly; Hermann accepted the Council of Trent and received indulgences, which it is true, but governed as a Protestant prince. Heinrich Julius of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (1582–85) declared the Confession of Augsburg the only authorized creed in his diocese. Otto von Schauenberg (1587–99) was a devoted Catholic, but, owing to disputes with the cathedral chapter and the estates, accomplished little for Catholicism. The last bishop but one, Christian of Brunswick (1599–1633), a Protestant, troubled himself little with theology, and ruled it from his paternal estates. By the terms of his election he had to allow the free exercise of both creeds. The attempt of the cathedral chapter to turn over the church of St. John at Minden to the Jesuits (1604) was frustrated by the opposition of the citizens. By the Edict of Restitution (1629) the Catholics of Minden obtained the churches of St. Martin and St. Simeon; the Franciscans in 1630 established themselves in the cathedral until 1651, and even the Jesuits, though for only a short time, were welcomed to the city. Franz von Wartenberg (1633–48), last Bishop of Minden, endeavoured to restore the Catholic faith in his Sees of Minden, Osnabrück, and Verden; but in 1633 had to flee before the Swedes, and after the Treaty of Prague (1635) was unable to return.

By the Peace of Westphalia the diocese was suppressed, Frans Wilhelm retained the title of Bishop of Engelburg, Switzerland, and entered the German Jesuit novitiate in 1836. He studied philosophy at Aachen (1861–64), and theology at Maria-Laach (1865–69). After a year’s tertianship in Westphalia he was sent to Kreuzberg, near Bonn, as a preacher, and in 1871 became lecturer in theology at Görs, Austria. In 1872 he came to the United States, where, after two years devoted to pastoral ministry, he professed theology at Milwaukee. He was transferred two years later to Spring Hill, Alabama, where he taught philosophy, in which work he was afterwards engaged for twenty-one years, mainly at Buffalo, Prairie du Chien, and St. Louis. When once he had acquired English, Father Ming began to write for the leading Catholic magazines, especially the “Messenger” and the “American Catholic Quarterly Review”, in which his first article appeared in 1879. His contributions deal mainly with evolution and socialism, the two most important questions confronting Catholics in the United States in his day. After the publication of a short but instructive
treatise on the "Temporal Power of the Pope", he undertook a more ambitious work in his "Data of Modern Ethics Examined". The prominence of the labour question led him to engage in a thorough study of that problem. To this we owe "The Characteristics and the Religion of Modern Socialism", and "The Morality of Modern Socialism". These two works supply Catholic students with not only an unprejudiced exposition of the Socialist movement as propounded by its leading advocates, but a critical refutation of the erroneous theories on which it is based.

A. A. MACERLAN.

**MINIMI**

**MINIMI** (or *Minims*) are the members of the religious order founded by St. Francis of Paula. The name is an allusion to Friar Minor, or to Matt., xxv, 40: "Quemadmodum fecisti ut ex his fratribus me minimi mihi fecisti", and suggests, as Leo X in the Bull of canonisation of the holy founder says, the great humility which should characterize the religious of this order, and by reason of which, they ought to consider themselves as the least of all religious. With the first Order of the Minims are connected a second and a third order. In this article we are concerned principally with the first.

I. **ORIGIN AND RULE.**—St. Francis of Paula, having in his youth lived one year in a Franciscan convent at S. Marco (Calabria), dedicated himself to solitary life in a hermitage near Paula. In 1435 some disciples joined him, and after a few years he founded convents at Paternopoli and Flaszar in Sicily, 1469. The new society was called "Hermits of St. Francis of Assisi". The Archbishop of Cosenza granted them of his own accord, in 1471, exemption from his jurisdiction (Lanovius, "Bullarium", 9), which privilege was confirmed by Sixtus IV, 1473 (Lanovius, "Bull.", 11). The same pontiff gave them the privileges of mendicant friars (ibidem, 1473-83) and the new foundation had no written rule, but in 1493 the first rule containing 13 chapters, which was almost a faithful copy of that of St. Francis of Assisi, was confirmed by Alexander VI. (See text Lanovius, ad ann. 1493, and Bull. Rom., V, 352.) A second version of the rule in 10 chapters, which showed more independence of the St. Francis, was approved by Alexander VI in 1501. Here the fourth solemn vow of vita quadragesimatis appears, which forms the distinctive character of the Minims. In the same Bull of confirmation is inserted the rule of the third order in 7 chapters, for seculars of both sexes. (Text Lanovius ad ann. 1501; Bull. Rom., V, 388.) Hardly different from the preceding one is the rule of 1502 (Lanovius, ad ann. 1502.) Finally a third definite text of the rule of the first order, which is still observed by the Minims, was confirmed by Julius II, "Dudum ad sacram ordinem", 28 July, 1506. (Bull. Rom., V, 421.) The rule of the second order, which is for sisters and which originated in Spain, appears for the first time in 1508. The nuns, who have a liturgical adoption of the rule of the first order, while the rule of the third order here inserted is the same as that confirmed in 1501. The spirit which permeates these rules, especially those of the first and second orders, is that of great penance and abnegation. The fourth vow imposes perpetual abstinence from all flesh and white meats, and only in case of grave sickness. The order of the physician may it be dispensed with. The Order of Minims is founded on the same principle of organisation as that of all mendicants. The superiors are called correctors. At the head is the corrector general, who formerly was elected every three years, but since 1605 every six years. The corrector post is elective, while the general superior is elected by each convent for only one year. The habit of the Minims is made of coarse black wool, has broad sleeves, and is girded by a thin black cord. The mozzetta of the capuce reaches below the cord, almost in the form of a scapular. To ensure the stricter observance of the rules of the first and second orders, Francis of Paula drew up a "Correctorium", consisting of ten chapters corresponding to the number of chapters in the rule, which determines the penance to be inflicted on those who transgress its precepts. This "Correctorium" was approved by Julius II in 1506 and by Leo X in 1517 (Digestum, see below, I, 55).

II. **PROPA GATION AND ACTIVITIES.**—The Order of the Minims, propagated at first in Italy was introduced by special royal favour into France, whether the holy founder was called in 1482. There the earliest convents were at Plessis-les-Tours, Amboise, and Nogent, near Paris. On account of their great simplicity the Minims in France received the appellation of bons hommes. In 1493 Charles VIII of France founded in Rome the convent of Trinità dei Monti, which, by Bull of Innocent X (1643), was exclusively reserved to the French fathers. From France the Minims spread to Spain, where they were once excommunicated as "Fathers of the Victory" owing to the victory of King Ferdinand over the Moors of Malaga. In 1497 the Emperor Maximilian introduced the new order into Germany (Bohemia). At the death of St. Francis of Paula, 1507, there existed five provinces spread over Italy, France, Spain, and Germany.

A little later the order counted 450 convents. In 1623 Dony d'Attichi gives the number of members as 6430, convents 359, and provinces 30, distributed in the principal Catholic countries of Europe. Lanovius in 1635 adds to the number of provinces three com- munities, the missaries of whom one was in the West Indies. In 1646 the Propaganda approved the foundation of a mission in Canada, but it is not known if this plan was ever carried out (Roberti, I, 488). In England the Minims seem not to have had any convents, still some illustrious English members are recorded, as Thomas Felton, martyred in 1588, Henry More, nephew of the chancellor, Blessed Thomas More, d. at Reims, 1587; Andrew Polere, d. at Soissons, 1594. The second order was never very widely propagated. In 1623 there existed 11 convents with 360 sisters. The third order, on the contrary, found many adherents among the faithful in the countries where convents of the first order existed.

To give some indication of its activity we mention some of its most distinguished members. The first to be named is Bernard Boil (see Bull. Bernardo), the first vicar Apostolic in America, appointed 1493, who, as
the documents published by Fita certainly indicate, belonged at that time to the Minims, although the passage in Fita's treatment of the Franciscans in Enzyklopädie, I, 414) used the words ordinis Minimorum. See Roberti, op. cit. below, I, 89-102. Distinguished theologians were: Lalemandet, d. 1647; Salier, d. 1707; Boucat, d. 1718; Falange, d. 1720; Perrimez, d. 1740; historians (see bibliography), Giry, d. 1763; Schmir, d. 1764; Richard, d. 1767; d'Abrav, d. 1768; Mercereau, d. 1769; philosophers, Saguena, d. about 1718, and some of the previously mentioned theological authors. For the bishops chosen from this order see Roberti (op. cit. below, I, 377, II, 681). The cause for beatification of two Minims has been introduced.

MINISTER.—Since the French Revolution the Minims are greatly reduced in number. At present there are 19 convents with about 330 friars. There are 15 convents in Italy, 2 in Sicily, 1 in Sardinia, and 1 in Spain. The corrector general resides at St. Andrea delle Fratte, Rome. There are two other convents at Rome, S. Francesco di Paola and S. Maria della Luce. The second order is spread especially in Spain, where it has 10 convents. There are single convents at Marseilles, Rome, and Todi. The third order is spread in Latin countries and also in South America, where secular priests are delegated and authorized to receive members.


Minister.—The term minister has long been appropriated in a distinctive way to the clergy. The language of I Cor., iv, 1-2; Heb., viii, 2; Matt., xx, 26, etc. must have helped to familiarize the thought that those charged with spiritual functions in the Christian Church were called upon to be the servants (ministri) of their brethren. Even before the Reformation the word minister was occasionally used in English to describe those of the clergy actually taking part in a function, or the celebrant as distinguished from the assistants, but it was not then used sine addito to designate an ecclesiastic. This employment of the term dates from Calvin, who objected to the name priest etc. as involving an erroneous conception of the nature of the sacred office. These Calvinistic views had some influence in England. In the Book of Common Prayer the word minister occurs frequently in the sense of the officiant at a service, and in the thirty-second of the Canons Ecclesiastical (1603) we read "no bishop shall make a person deacon and minister both upon one day" where clearly minister stands as the equivalent of priest. As regards modern usage the Hist. Eng. Dictionary says: "The use of minister as the designation of an Anglican clergyman (formerly extensively current, sometimes with more specific application to a beneficed clergyman) has latterly become rare, and is now chiefly associated with Low Church views; but it is still the ordinary appellation of one appointed to spiritual office in any non-Episcopal communion, especially one holding a pastoral charge."

As regards Catholic use, minister is the title of certain superiors in various religious orders. The head of the Franciscan Order is known as the minister general, and the superior of the different provinces of the various branches is called minister provincial. The same name is true of the Various: the Master of the Trinitarians, the Redemption of Captives and of some other orders. In the Society of Jesus the second in command in each house, who is usually charged with the internal discipline, the commissariat, etc., is called minister. The statement made in Addis and Arnold's "Catholic Dictionary" and thence incorporated into the great Dictionary says that each of the five assistants of the General of the Jesuits is called minister without foundation.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Minkelers, Jean-Pierre, inventor of illuminating gas; b. at Maastricht, Holland, 1748; d. there 4 July, 1824. At the age of sixteen, in 1764, he went to Louvain, where he studied theology and philosophy at the Collège du Faoucon, in which he became professor of natural philosophy in 1772. At this time the question of aerostats and Montgolfieres was occupying the mind of scientists, and the Due d'Arenberg, a Mecenas of learned men and art, engaged Minkelers in the question of the best gas for balloon purposes. Minkelers was on this committee, and published in 1784, after many experiments, a work entitled "Mémoire sur l'air inflammable tiré de différentes substances, rédigé par M. Minkelers, professeur de philosophie au collège du Faoucon, université de Louvain." (Louvain, 1784). As an appendix to this memoir there was a 'Table de gravité spécifiques des différentes espèces d'air', by T.F. Thyssen, a member of the committee. In his memoir Minkelers tells us how he made his precious discovery: from the very beginning of his experiments he had had the idea of enclosing oil in the barrel of a gun and heating it in a forge. Under action of the heat the oil dissolved and gave place to a remarkably light gas, having other advantageous qualities. Having proved that oil gas was the best for balloons, Minkelers used it for many balloons which rose rapidly and travelled great distances in the neighbourhood of Louvain. As we learn from his pupil von Hulstein, who was in his class in 1785, Minkelers intended to use this same gas to light his workshop. Moreover, the drift of his memoir proves clearly that in its inventor's eyes the great combustibility of the gas was one of its leading qualities. When Joseph II, in 1788, transferred the University of Louvain to Brussels, Minkelers continued as professor, but when it was re-embarked back to Louvain he refused to return. He resigned in 1794 and was appointed professor of physics and chemistry at the Central School of Maastricht, 4 July, 1824.

MINKELER, Mémoire sur l'air inflammable tiré de différentes substances (Louvain, 1784); D'AMBOISE, Verzeg. over d. P. Minkelers (Maastricht, 1867); VERHAGEN, Les cinquante dernières années de l'université de Louvain (Lille, 1894); DE BUCK, De vermaatiging van de luchtgas uit scheiden (Alkmaar, 1883).

D. Nra.

MINNESOTA, one of the North Central States of the American Union, lies about midway between the eastern and western shores of the continent, and about midway between the Gulf of Mexico and Hudson's Bay.

PHYSIOGRAPHY.—Minnesota extends from 43° 30' to 49° N. lat. and from 89° 39' to 97° 5' W. long. Its length from north to south is about 400 miles, and its greatest breadth about 354 miles. Of its total area of 84,287 sq. miles, no less than 5637 are water surface, owing to the great number of inland lakes (numbering about ten thousand) and watercourses, large and
small. Minnesota is bounded on the north by Canada, on the east by Lake Superior and Wisconsin, on the south by Iowa, and on the western by North and South Dakota. Within the wide domain of the State originate the three principal water systems of North America: those of the Mississippi and the Red River of the North, and the St. Lawrence system beginning with the St. Louis River, which rises in the north-eastern part of Minnesota and flows into the western end of Lake Superior. The northern part of the state was formerly covered with a dense growth of pine, and has supplied a large portion of the white pine utilized throughout the United States in various industries. Aside from the districts originally covered by pine and the rocky ridges near Lake Superior, the state possesses a warm, dark soil of great fertility. Its geologic formations are for the most part ancient limestone, sandstone, sand, shale, slate, trap-rock, granite, and basalt along the shore of Lake Superior and the banks of the St. Croix, with outcrops of similar formations in various other portions of the state, to the soft limestone of a later period. The granite is of various colours, ranging from dark brown to light grey, and is highly valued for building purposes, being the building material of the Kasota limestone, which has been largely used in the construction of the new and magnificent state capitol.

In the north-eastern, and to a considerable extent throughout the entire northern part of the state, are found extensive beds of iron ore of excellent quality. Shipments of this ore have been great during recent years, and the iron found in the state is of the same quality as the famous black ironstone of Clifton, N. J., which has been used to supply the iron for the American Navy. The state has also copper, lead, zinc, and silver deposits.

The climate of Minnesota is mild, enjoying correspondingly longer days in summer than any other region in which they have lived.

**NAME.**—The name of the state is derived from the Dakota language. Before the white men came to the hunting grounds, the Dakotas called the river which rises on the western border of the state and flows into the Mississippi near the site of St. Paul the Minisotah (mini, water; sodak, sky-coloured), and, when the region between the western border of Wisconsin and the Missouri River was organized by Congress into a territory, it was given the name of this river in a slightly modified form — the name which the state bears at present.

**HISTORY.**—At the time when the explorations of white men began, the region now known as Minnesota was inhabited by people of two great divisions of the American race. From the southern boundary of the state, as far north as lat. 46° 30’, the land was inhabited by the Dakotas, while the shore of Lake Superior and the northern portion of the state were occupied by the Ojibways. Many places in Minnesota bear Indian names, and those derived from the respective languages of these two aboriginal nations show very clearly at the present time the areas which they respectively occupied.

The French came into contact with the Ojibways and other kindred Indian nations of the Algonquin family, who in their language designated the Dakotas the Naudessioux (for “enemy”), and abbreviated the word to Nau. The English translated this long word into its final syllable, and called the Dakotas the Sioux, under which title they have been commonly known since the days of Marquette and Allouez.

The real history of the state may be said to begin in 1820, with the visit to the Falls of St. Anthony and adjacent regions made by Rev. Louis Hennepin and his companions, Accault and Auguelle. During the same year Sieur Daniel Greyson Du Lhut explored the northern part of the state, and, in July, joined Father Hennepin at or near the lake now known as Mille Lacs. Late in the autumn Du Lhut and Hennepin departed from the land of the Dakotas and returned to Eastern Canada. From the time of these explorations to the English conquest of Canada in 1760, France held sway over the Upper Mississippi region. Formal assertion of sovereignty was made in 1689, as appears from a document drawn up at Green Bay on the western shore of Lake Michigan, in which Nicholas Perrot, commanding for the time at that post and holding a commission from Marquis Denonville, Governor of New France, issued a declaration in these words:

"We this day, the 8th day of May, 1689, do in the presence of Reverend Father Marest, of the Society of Jesus, Missionary among the Naudoessiouxs; of Monsieur le Boreigual, commanding the French in the neighbourhood of the Ouiskochanje on the Mississippi; Augustine Legardeur, Sieur de Caumont, and of Messieurs Le Sueur, Hebert Lemire, and Blein:

Declare to all whom it may concern, that, being come to the Bay des Puants (Green Bay), and to the Lake of Ouiskochanje, and to the River Mississippi, we did transport ourselves to the country of the Naudoessiouxs, and on the borders of the River St. Croix, and to the mouth of the River St. Pierre, on the bank of which were the Nortans; and further up to the interior to the north-east of the Mississippi, as far as the Menchokatonx, with whom dwell the majority of the Songesekitos, and other Naudoessiouxs, who are to the
north-east of the Mississippi, to take possession for, and in the name of, the King, of the countries and rivers inhabited by the said tribes, and of which they are the proprietors. The present act done in our presence, and signed with our hand and subscribed."

Without delay, practical measures were taken to ensure the rights of France. A map of the year 1700 shows on the west side of the Mississippi a second post was established by Le Sueur on an island above the lake. Thus, in the beginning of the eighteenth century what was officially termed "Le Baye Department", consisting of a line of military and trading posts, was organized to command the waterway from Green Bay to the Falls of St. Anthony. Nevertheless, however, the systematic effort made to establish permanent military garrisons north of the mouth of the Wisconsin River.

In the spring of 1685 Governor De La Barre of New France sent from Quebec to the west twenty men under the command of Nicholas Perrot to establish friendly alliances with the Dakotas. Proceeding to the Mississippi, he established a post near the outlet of Lake Pepin, which was known as Fort Perrot. War having been declared in 1687 between the French and the Indians, Perrot and his followers left the Mississippi River and repaired to Mackinac. Early in 1689, however, he returned with a party of forty men to his post on Lake Pepin, and re-established trade with the Dakotas, thus publicizing the newly denominated Fort Bon Secours; three years later it was marked Fort Le Sueur, but was in that year abandoned. In a much later map it is correctly called Fort Perrot. In 1700, acting upon the recommendation of the Governor of Louisiana, Pierre Le Sueur, a native of Artois, France, came to the region now known as Minnesota. He was an intrepid, energetic, and shrewd man, and about twenty others, in search of copper which, according to earlier explorers, existed in the Sioux country. Le Sueur and his party spent the winter of that year in the neighbourhood of the Great bend of the Minisotah, and there gathered a large quantity of green earth which was supposed to contain copper in the crude state. From the circumstance that this earth is sometimes described by Le Sueur and his contemporaries as "blue earth", that name has been given to the tributary of the Minnesota River at the mouth of which Le Sueur spent a winter and built a fort, and also to the country within which the site of this old fort is situated. The Dakota word Mankato, which means "the place where the corn is corrupted in the course of time", became the name of the county seat of Blue Earth County.

A trading company, formed in Montreal to carry on traffic in furs with the Indians of the Lake Baye Department, dispatched on 16 June, 1727, an expedition under René Boucher to the land of the Sioux. The expedition arrived at a site on the shore of Lake Pepin on 17 September. Two Jesuit missionaries, Michel Guignas and Nicholas de Gonnor, accompanied Boucher and his small command. Before the end of October a small fort, called Beauharnois as a compliment to the Governor of New France, was built on the low lands opposite the towering cliff which now bears the name of Maiden Rock. A chapel was erected within the enclosure of Fort Beauharnois, and was dedicated to St. Michael the Archangel. This was the first Christian temple to cast its beneficent shadow upon the soil of Minnesota. The first ceremony of note in the new chapel was the celebration of the feast of St. Charles of which Father Guignas writes: "The ceremony was beautiful, with the Govt. and the Inhabitants in attendance. The [November] was the saint's day of the general. Holy Mass was said for him in the morning, and we were well prepared to celebrate the event in the evening, but the slowness of the pyrotechnists and the variability of the weather led to the postponement of the celebration to the 14th of the same month, when some very beautiful rockets were shot off and the air was made to resound with a hundred shouts of 'Vive le Roy' and 'Vive Charles de Beauharnois'. What contributed very much to the merry-making was the fright of some Indians. When these poor people saw fireworks in the air and the stars falling from the sky, the women and children fled and the more courageous of the men even went away. But they begged that we should stop the astonishing play of the terrible medicine." It may be stated in explanation that, among all the American Indians, any phenomenon which exerted a powerful influence upon the physical and nervous system was designated by a term corresponding to the word medicine in their languages.

In a report made in October, 1728, by the Governor of Canada to the Government of France, Fort Beauharnois was said to be badly situated on account of freshets "and, therefore," as the report says, "this fort could be removed four or five arpents from the lake shore without prejudice to the views entertained in building it on its present site." The report declares that the interests of religion, of the service, and of the colony demand that the fort on the bank of Lake Pepin be permanently maintained. In September, 1730, Fort Beauharnois was rebuilt on a plot of higher ground near the old establishment. Upon this lofty site, surrounded by some of the most beautiful scenery in North America, in 1731 the small town of St. Mary was founded. The convent chapel very properly bears the same name as its historic predecessor, St. Michael the Archangel. Sieur Linctot was made commandant of the new fort in June, 1731, and in 1735 was succeeded by St. Pierre. The Dakotas having shown a very hostile spirit, St. Pierre decided to abandon Fort Beauharnois; in March, 1737, the fort was burned. In 1743, and again in 1746, representatives of the Dakota nation made a journey to Quebec and presented to the Government of New France a petition for the re-establishment of the fort and for the restoration of trade relations. Their request was not granted until 1750, when Pierre Marin was commissioned to rebuild the little fortress. Fort Beauharnois was retained until the outbreak of the war between the English and French, but it was never occupied after the surrender which followed the defeat of Montcalm in the famous battle of Quebec (1759).

About one-third of the state, comprising its north-eastern part to the east of the Mississippi, was included in the territory ceded to the United States by France under the treaty of 1783, at the end of the War of Independence; the greater portion (about two-thirds) of the territory embraced within the boundaries of Minnesota, however, was included in the Louisiana Purchase, ceded to the United States by France in 1803. In 1805 a grant of land nine miles square, at the confluence of the Mississippi and St. Peter (now Minnesota) Rivers, was obtained from the Sioux Indians. A military post was established on the grant in 1819, and in 1820 arrangements were made for the erection of a fort, which was completed in 1822 and named, at first Fort St. Anthony, but later Fort Snelling after the commanding officer. The grant has ever since been known as the Fort Snelling Reservation. In 1823 the first steamboat ascended the Mississippi as far as Fort Snelling, and annually thereafter one or two trips were made by steamboats to this isolated post for a number of years.

From the date of the English victory over the French until the establishment of Fort St. Anthony on the Mississippi and the Union State of Minnesota, it was unfavourable for the maintenance of Catholic missions in the Upper Mississippi country. However, some colonists from Switzerland, who possessed the true Faith and spoke the French language, having migrated from their original settlements near Fort Garry in Canada to a place seven or eight miles below
the Falls of St. Anthony, Bishop Mathias Loras of Dubuque, whose diocese included the entire region now called Minnesota, visited Fort Snelling and the adjacent Swiss settlement in 1839, and in the following year sent a missionary to Minnesota, Father Lucien Galtier. This latter established himself upon the present site of the metropolitan city of St. Paul, and in the following year built a log chapel which he called by the name of the great Apostle of the Gentiles. The gradual increase of population about the chapel, the development of the community into a village, and finally into a large city under the name of St. Paul, constitute an imposing monument to the missionary zeal of Father Galtier, and for ever associate the name and fame of the capital city of Minnesota with the glories of the Catholic Faith. Minnesota was organized as a Federal territory by Act of Congress of 1849, and, on 11 May, 1858, its territorial existence terminated and it became a state.

Population.—The population of the state has shown a rapid increase. According to the successive census returns the population was: 172,023 in 1860; 250,099 in 1865; 439,706 in 1870; 780,773 in 1880; 1,117,798 in 1885; 1,301,826 in 1890; 1,997,912 in 1905. In that year, the population of the five largest cities was: Minneapolis, 261,874; St. Paul, 197,023; Duluth, 79,053; Winona, 20,304; Stillwater, 13,788. The population of Minnesota according to nationalities was thus classified by the census of the year 1905:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native born</td>
<td>366,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota born</td>
<td>1,057,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>119,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>126,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>111,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>47,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>19,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>16,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>11,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemia</td>
<td>8,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>7,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>19,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>14,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>4,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other Countries</td>
<td>18,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This makes a total foreign born population of 537,041. The inmates of state institutions, and the 10,225 Indians in the state at the time of taking the census, are not included in the above figures.

The progress of the Catholic Faith in Minnesota has been marvellous. In 1841 the mission of Father Galtier included some twenty families, and in 1851, when Father Joseph Crépin (q. v.) was named first Bishop of St. Paul, the number of Catholics in Minnesota is estimated to have been about 1000. In 1888 the See of St. Paul was raised to archiepiscopal rank, the dioceses of St. Cloud, Winona, Duluth, Fargo, Sioux Falls, and Lead becoming later its suffragans. As each of these dioceses is treated in a special article, it will be sufficient to quote here some general statistics for the State of Minnesota, which includes the Archdiocese of St. Paul and the first three of the above named suffragans: 1 archbishop; 4 bishops; 602 priests (476 secular); 406 churches with resident priests; 168 missions with churches; 67 missions without churches; 67 churches over twenty years; 6 churches over forty years; 32,426 children in parochial schools; 427,627 Catholics. The recently established Diocese of Crookston, separated from Duluth, will constitute an additional suffragan of St. Paul.

Liberty of Conscience.—The Constitution provides expressly for religious liberty by declaring that "the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any religious or ecclesiastical ministry, against his consent, nor shall any control of or interference with the rights of conscience be permitted or any preference be given by law to any religious establishment of worship." It further provides: "No religious test or amount of property shall ever be required as a qualification for any office of public trust under the State. No religious test or amount of property shall ever be required as a qualification for any voter at any election in this state; nor shall any person be rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity in consequence of his opinion upon the subject of religion." This Constitution has been interpreted by the legislature in the most liberal manner, and Minnesota has led all of the other states in the Union in providing liberty of conscience and the free exercise of religion in favour of the inmates of penal, correctional, and eleemosynary institutions. The general statutes now in force contain these provisions: "Religious Instruction.—Said Board [The State Board of Control] shall provide at least one hour, on the first day of each week, between nine o'clock a.m. and five o'clock p.m., for religious instruction to inmates of all prisons and reformatories under its control, during which clergymen prescribed shall (subject to the rules and regulations of the institution) may freely administer and impart religious rites and instruction to those desiring the same. It shall provide a private room where such instruction can be given by clergymen of the denomination desired by the inmate, or in case of minors, by the parents or guardian, and, in case of sickness, some other day or hour may be designated; but all sectaries, including atheists, shall be eligible to the office, and no officer or employee of the institution shall attempt to influence the religious belief of any inmate, and none shall be required to attend religious services against his will" (Revised Laws, 1905, chap. 25, sec. 1903). As to the state prison, the laws provide:

Visitors.—Fees.—The members of the state board of control, the governor, lieutenants of the legislature, state officers, and regularly authorized ministers of the Gospel may visit the prisoners at pleasure, but no other persons, without special permission of the warden, under rules prescribed by said board. A moderate fee may be required of visitors, other than those allowed to visit at pleasure. Such fees shall be used to defray the expenses of conducting such visitors, for the maintenance of the prison library, the prison band, and other entertainments of the inmates." (Chap. 105, sec. 5434).

Regulations Concerning Property.—The Constitution of Minnesota provides security for private rights in the declaration that "every person is entitled to a certain remedy in the laws for all injuries or wrongs which he may receive in his person, property or character; he ought to obtain justice freely and without purchase; completely and without denial; promptly and without delay; conformably to the laws", and by the further provision that, "private property shall not be taken, destroyed or damaged for public use without just compensation paid or secured". To prevent any revival of abuses and monopolies such as grew up under the feudal system, the Constitution contained this provision: "All lands within this State are declared to be alodial, and feudal tenures of every description, with all their incidents, are prohibited. Leases and grants of agricultural lands for a longer term than two years, or for services paid in money, and any estate so created, in which shall be reserved any rent or service of any kind, shall be void."

The statutes of Minnesota provide for the free and untrammeled acquisition of real property, and also for abundant security to its possessor. Estates in lands are divided by statute into estates of inheritance, estates for life, estates for years, and estates as by sufferance. The decisions of the Supreme
establish the principle that tenancies from year to year are estates at will. The laws further provide that every estate of inheritance shall continue to be termed a fee simple, or fee; and every such estate when not defeasible or conditional, shall be a fee simple absolute. All estates which would at common law be considered as estates tail are deemed and adjudged to be fee simple estates in the person who would, otherwise, be seized thereof in fee tail. Every future estate is void in its creation, which suspends the absolute power of alienation by any limitation for a longer period than during the continuance of two lives in being at the creation of the estate, except that a contingent remainder in fee may be created on a prior remainder in fee, to take effect in the event that the persons, to whom the first remainder is limited, die under the age of twenty-one years, or upon any other contingency by which the estate of such persons may be determined before they attain their full age. The rule in Shelley's case has been abolished. With a few express exceptions, no corporation, unless organised for the construction or operation of a railway, canal, or turnpike, may acquire more than five thousand (5000) acres of land. Uses and trusts, with a few exceptions, have been abolished.

Religious Corporations.—In furtherance of the liberal policy regarding the exercise of religion contained in the state Constitution, the laws of Minnesota provide for the creation of religious corporations and special statutory provisions enable a bishop of the Catholic Church, in association with the vicar-general and the chancellor of his diocese, to create such a corporation. The bishop and vicar-general, and the corporation of the parish, are likewise authorized to create parochial corporations. These corporations have the right to acquire and to hold land to the same extent as have individuals. Every person (and the term includes married women) may dispose of his estate, real and personal, or any part thereof, or right or interest therein, by a last will and testament, in writing. There is no limitation on religious bequests, and full force and effect have been given thereto by the decisions of the courts.

Charitable Societies and Institutions.—The laws of Minnesota contain the most liberal provisions for the founding and incorporation of charitable and educational societies, hospitals, orphanages, refuges, and reformatory houses. The public charitable institutions of the state are various and manifold. Provision is made for the care and treatment of all insane persons, not only in great general hospitals, but also in various institutions equipped with buildings on the "cottage plan" for the custody of the harmless and incurable insane. The state prison is situated at Stillwater and is a most admirably conducted penitentiary. The state reformatory is at St. Cloud and receives for correction, rather than for punishment, offenders whose ages range from sixteen to thirty years. This institution is managed upon the benevolent plan of instruction of the mind and the rehabilitation of the offender. For boys of wayward tendencies who have repeatedly violated the laws of the state, is provided the state training school, at Red Wing, which is not only a school of moral and mental discipline, but also a manual training school. Wayward girls are accommodated and placed under moral restraint at a similar institution for girls. Institution for paupers and a county alms-house, and also distributes out-door relief to the poor. All public charitable institutions and agencies are under the watchful care of the state board of control, consisting of three members appointed by the governor. The board of control not only has visatorial powers, but is also invested with administrative functions. It has proved highly efficient. The public charities of Minnesota are famous throughout the world for their advanced humanitarianism and general excellence.

Marriage and Divorce.—The statutes of Minnesota declare that marriage, so far as its validity in law is concerned, is a civil contract, to which the consent of the parties capable to make such a contract is essential. Every male person who has attained the full age of eighteen years, and every female person who has attained the full age of fifteen years, is capable in law of contracting marriage, if otherwise competent. No marriage may be contracted while either of the parties has a husband or wife living; nor within six months after either has been divorced from a former spouse; nor between parties who are nearer of kin than first cousin, whether of the half or full blood, computed by the rules of the civil law; nor between persons either of whom is epileptic, imbecile, feeble-minded, or insane. Marriage may be solemnized by any justice of the peace in the county in which he is elected, and throughout the state by any judge of a court of record, the superintendent of the department for the deaf and dumb (in the state school for the deaf and dumb), or by any licensed or ordained minister of the gospel in regular communion with a religious society. Before any persons are joined in marriage, a license must be obtained from the clerk of the district court of the county in which the residence of either marriage is required, or if either is a resident of the state, from such clerk in the county where the marriage is to take place.

The statutes of Minnesota are liberal in regard to divorce. A divorce from the bonds of matrimony may be adjudged by the district court for any of the following causes: (1) adultery; (2) impotency; (3) cruel and inhuman treatment; (4) imprisonment in any prison or state reformatory subsequent to the marriage, and in such case a pardon will not restore conjugal rights; (5) wilful desertion for one year next preceding the filing of the complaint; (6) habitual drunkenness for one year immediately preceding the filing of the complaint. Limited divorces, extending to a separation a mensa et terra permanently or for a limited time, may be adjudged by the district court, on the complaint of a married woman, between any husband and wife who are inhabitants of the state, or in cases where the marriage has taken place within the state and the wife is an actual resident at the time of filing her complaint; or in cases where the marriage has taken place outside the state, and the husband or wife or any other person is an actual inhabitant of the state at least one year, and the wife shall be an actual resident at the time of the filing of her complaint. The grounds upon which limited divorces may be granted are: (1) cruel and inhuman treatment by the husband; (2) such conduct on the part of a husband toward his wife as may render it unsafe and improper for her to continue with him; (3) the abandonment of the wife by the husband and his refusal or neglect to provide for her.

Public Education.—The public property of the state consists of realty used in connection with the various public institutions, and also of a large public domain consisting of land granted to the State Government of the United States at the time when the State of Minnesota was admitted into the Union; such grants having been made for the benefit of the State university, for the support of the common school system, and for the purpose of making internal improvements. The title to such lands is vested in the State of Minnesota, and the care and control of such lands is vested in the auditor of the state, who is eo occicio Land Commissioner of Minnesota. The portion of the grant assigned to the support of public education has been estimated by competent authority to be sufficient to yield ultimately a fund of $250,000,000. The educational system of the state is organized as follows: School districts of various kinds and sizes are distributed throughout the state, and are under the care of boards of education elected by the people of each district.
MINOR (Lat. minor), that which is less, or inferior in comparison with another, the term being employed, as well as the word majores, with the corresponding restriction to application to things, we may mention causa minores, matters of lesser importance, as opposed to causa majores, those more important; minor benefices as opposed to the major benefices, which imply jurisdiction and are confirmed in papal consistory; minor churches or those of inferior rank; the minor excommunication (now out of use), as opposed to the major excommunication. In reference to persons, certain uses of the word minor may also be mentioned which depend upon usage rather than upon law: the younger of two persons of the same name is sometimes called minor (or "the less") as St. James the Less. Through humility St. Francis Assisi gave his religious the monastic habit which the mendicants wore; that is, a tunic and a mule. But in its most frequent and most strictly judicial acceptation, the word designates a person who, having passed his infancy, has not yet reached the age required by law for the performance of certain acts or the exercise of certain rights; in practice the utmost limit is considered, and beyond it there exists no restriction; these are called minors who have not yet reached the age at which the law makes them capable of performing all civil acts whatever, especially the administration of their property. This age being fixed by most modern laws at twenty-one years, everyone is a minor until the age of twenty-one, or whatever may be the legal age of majority. As the matter is primarily one of civil rights, the Church leaves distinctions to the civil law. What concerns canon law and Christian acts, no uniform limit of minority has ever been established; for given acts and rights the canon law and ecclesiastical usage have established the necessary and sufficient age. In the first place children are not considered as minors; it is presumed that until the age of reason, legally fixed at seven years, a child possesses neither the intelligence nor the experience to commit sin or to exercise any rights whatsoever. When no longer a child a person becomes a minor. Minors are either under or over the age of puberty, which is fixed by the Roman law at fourteen full years for boys and twelve full years for girls; between the age of seven years and that of puberty they are said to be nearer, or less possible to innocence than any other case may be. For those under puberty, there begins with the age of reason the obligation of observing the moral law and those precepts of the Church from which they are not exempt by their age, notably the obligation to receive the Sacraments; such minors therefore are capable of sinning although their responsibility is less in proportion as they are near to childhood; for this reason they are not liable to the penalties of the forum externum, except where this is specially provided. It is presumed that with puberty the Christian begins to enjoy the plenitude of his intelligence and liberty in spiritual matters and purely moral rights: he is capable of entering into a contract marriage, he can receive minor orders, and be nominated to and administrate a benefice (Conc. Trid., sees. XXIII, c. vi, "De ref."); c. iii, "De judic.", in 6). There are, however, acts binding his future which he cannot perform until at a more advanced age; he cannot make a religious profession until the age of sixteen is attained (Conc. Trid., c. VI, "De instit."); he cannot receive the sub-diocesan before his twenty-first year (sees. XXXII, c. vii). At the age of twenty-one, too, he begins to subject to the law of fasting. (For more ample developments see Age, CANONTICAL.)

A leading characteristic in all legislation on minors is the protection afforded them in regard to the administration of property and the obligations which they can assume in reference to third parties. As a general rule the liberty of minors is unrestrained as to contracts which are to their advantage, but they cannot make any contracts which are burdensome to themselves except under certain determined formalities and according to the regulations which they consider themselves as suffering by such contracts they may, by the terms of the Roman Law ("De minorib., xxv., ann." ff., IV, iv), for four years after their majority of twenty-five years, obtain the "restituto in integrum", i.e. a judicial decree restored the condition of things which existed before the contract by which the minor suffered. These provisions have been or more or less completely embodied in the modern laws of various countries, the discussion of which would be out of place here. It is enough to say that the canon law has accepted them (Decret., lib. I, tit. xii, "De in integrum restitutione"), and applied them to churches and other juridical entities which it was desired to protect similarly. When it is said that churches are assimilated to minors (c. vii, 3, 8, "De in integrum restit.".) the meaning is that, in respect to burdensome contracts,
churches and other ecclesiastical establishments are subject to the same protective measures, and enjoy the same privileges, as minors.

MINORCA. The bishop of Minorca resided in a palace of the name of the cathedral, in the city of Mahon, the capital of the island. The bishopric of Minorca is a suffragan of the see of Mallorca. The diocese of Minorca is divided into four vicariates: Mahon, Ferreries, Port Mahon, and Iles. The cathedral of the diocese is the Catedral de Santa María, which was begun in the 13th century and completed in the 15th. The cathedral is famous for its beautiful stained glass windows, which are considered some of the finest in Spain.

MINORCA, DIOCESE OF (MINORCA), suffragan of Valencia, comprises the Island of Minorca, the second in size in the Balearic Islands, which are possessions of Spain. The civil capital is Port Mahon; the ecclesiastical, Ciutadella. The origin of the Diocese of Minorca is not known, but it certainly existed in the fifth century, as its bishop, Macarius, together with Elia and Opilio, Bishops of Majorca and Ibiza, came to Carthage in 484 to make profession of his faith. Baroni, published from a Vatican MS., a letter of Severus, Bishop of Minorca in the fifth century. De meto translates and inserts it. The learned Antonio Roig, a native of Minorca, rector of Felanitx, published in 1787 a Latin treatise commenting upon it and defending its authenticity. But the account of the expedition undertaken, under the direction of a certain Theodore, to convert the Jews who were in possession of Minorca, and the events therein related, are of uncertain authenticity.

The Vandals took possession of Minorca, as well as of Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily, and during their dominion the Diocese of Minorca was under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan See of Sardinia. The Bull of Pope Adrian II, dated 897, in which among other territories assigned to the Bishop of Gerona we find the island of Minorca, is attributed by some to the conquest of Spain by the Mohammedans brought the existence of the Diocese of Minorca to an end. It was not re-established until the eighteenth century. When Minorca was recovered, in 1783, from the English, who obtained possession of it in the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-14), the rector, in the first place of the diocese was considered Pius VI by the Bull of 23 July, 1795, erected the new Diocese of Minorca. Its first bishop, Antonio Vila, a native of Minorca, took possession of the see on 2 September, 1798. He was a man of learning, and the author of "El noble bien educado" (Madrid, 1770), "Viaj de Virtudes del infante, mas no de la gente" (Madrid, 1777), and "El Valsalvo instruido" (Madrid, 1792). The last-named work for his author his canonry in the cathedral of Minorca. He also worked on an encyclopedic dictionary of which twenty volumes in folio are still preserved in the cathedral of Alarcon. On 25 July, 1802, Bishop Vila was transferred to the Diocese of Gerona, where he died on 12 December, 1803. D. Pedro Antonio Juano was appointed to succeed him in 1814, and was followed by the famous D. Jaime Creus y Martí, canon of Urgell, president of the Junta Suprema of Catalonia during the War of Independence, deputy in the Cortes of Cadiz, and a member of the Royal Council. Having been raised to the dignity of Archbishop, he was succeeded in succession by D. Antonio de Cervelo and the Dominican Fray Antonio Díaz Merino, who, since 1825, had been an active collaborator in the "Biblioteca de Religión". In 1837 Fray Antonio was exiled first to Cadiz and then to France, and died at Marseilles in 1844. His successor, D. Mateo Jaume was present at the Vatican Council. Since then the see has been filled in succession by D. Manuel Mercador (1874-90), D. Juan Comes y Vidal, founder of the Academia de la Juventud Católica (26 July, 1906), D. Salvador Castellote y Pinao (1901-6), and D. Juan Torres y Ribas, the present bishop.

Port Mahon, which has a population of about 15,445, is on the east coast and has the best port in the Mediterranean. The town is a pleasant place to visit, with its narrow streets, colorful houses, and beautiful harbor. It is also the site of the famous Andrea Doria. At the entrance stand the fortresses of San Felipe, built by Philip II, la Mola, and Isabel II. The Isla del Rey (Island of the King), so called from the fact that Alfonso III landed there when he invaded Minorca in 1297, is in the centre. In the thirteenth century the famous military hospital was built on this island. Port Mahon has a school for secondary instruction and a custom-house of the first order.

Among the public buildings the most noteworthy are the court-house and the parish church built by order of Alfonso III. The latter has a magnificent organ. A handsome façade ornaments the entrance to the cemetery. Ciutadella, the episcopal city, is believed to be the Jamona of the Carthaginians, founded by their captain Janna, or Iama. Many traces of an earlier Celtic civilization are to be found here, among which may be mentioned the talayots (Cyclopean constructions of huge blocks of stone in the shape of a tower with a high entrance), obelisks, dolmens, covered galleries, and cornellons, or Celtic cemeteries. Many Roman inscriptions, vases, and coins are also to be found. The city is fairly well laid out and well kept, and has a population of about 8,000. It has a fortress and other defensive works. On the Paseo del Borne there is an obelisk about 22 feet in height, erected to the memory of the heroes that fell in 1909 when the Turks attacked Ciutadella. The defenders of the city on this occasion were commanded by Negrete y Arquimbau, and the monument was erected on the initiative of the Franciscan, José Niu, who died caring for the victims of the cholera epidemic of 1865.

The cathedral of Minorca had, from the time of its foundation in 1297, all the characteristics requisite for the only parish church of Ciutadella, then the capital of the island. A memorial tablet of the year 1302 says that Juan Corca held a benefice in this church. Constructed in the Gothic style of architecture, with a single nave, it presents an imposing appearance. The belfry is square, finished with a octagonal spire.

In the beginning of the second century the territory was enriched with a mass of Greco-Roman architecture, but the original Gothic portal is still preserved beneath this. When the Turks attacked the city they fired the church. Bishop Comes y Vidal restored it, adding numerous small windows, and restoring the main altar. Other church buildings of interest are the chapel of the Poor Clares (aigival style), and the church of San Agustín, very spacious and elegant. The latter has two towers on each side of the portico, colossal frescoes, now in a bad state of preservation, and rich gildings; it is used at present for the chapel of the diocesan seminary which was installed by Bishop Jaume in 1301. On 30 October, 1568, the cathedral of San Ildelfonso was founded by the learned Francisco Niu, in 1588. Lastly, there may be mentioned the church of San Francisco, in the Gothic style.

Crónica general de España: P.蔵格, Crónica de las islas Baleares (Madrid, 1867); Biografía eclesiástica completa (Madrid, 1848-69); de la Fuente, Historia eclesiástica de España (Barcelona, 1885), III: Pfeiffer and Quadrado, España, sus monumentos y artes: Islas Baleares (Barcelona, 1888).
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Minor Clerks Regular. See Francis Caracciolo, Saint.

Minorites. See Franciscan Order; Friars Minor.

Minor Orders (Lat. Ordines Minores).—The lower degrees of the hierarchy are designated by the name of minor orders, in opposition to the "major" or "sacred" orders. At the present time the ranks of the clergy are entered by the tonsure (q. v.), after which all the orders without omission are received in succession. In some cases, e.g., the Benedictines, these are a general rule, no longer remain in the lower orders, the liturgical functions which are discharged either by the clergy in the higher orders, as in exorcism, or by the
laiety, as in singing and serving at the altar. Formerly one entered the clergy by being appointed to discharge any of the functions reserved to ecclesiastics. Such functions were of two kinds. The liturgical ones consisted of orders, though of a lower rank; by ordination the recipients of the minor orders received official authority to perform these functions. The other ecclesiastical functions were rather offices entrusted to clerics, whether ordained or not. Thus in the first centuries there figured in the ranks of the clergy notaries, defensores ecclesie, acacomi, catechists, cantors, fossores (for the cemeteries), etc., to say nothing of deaconesses. But these various offices did not constitute orders, and those who filled them formed part of the clergy without having been ordained, like today the brothers of the Order of Malta. As to the liturgical functions attached to the various minor orders, they are really but a participation, originally rather indefinite, in the liturgical ministry formerly confined entirely to the deacons. This explains why minor orders differ in the Latin Church and in the various Eastern Churches.

In the East, though most at an early date we hear of porters and exorcists (ne'er of acolytes), after the Trullan Synod in 692, in accordance with its sixth canon, only lectors and cantors are known, and often even these orders coalesced, or are conferred at the same time; the three other minor orders of the Latin Church (porter, exorcist, acolyte) are held to be included in the subdiaconate. However, the subdiaconate has remained a minor order; in the West it was gradually detached from the minor orders, on account of its higher liturgical functions and also because of the vow of celibacy it called for. Finally, Innocent III definitively included it in the major orders, and made the subdeacon, as well as the deacon and priest, eligible for the admitance to them. "De die et tempore" (Trit. tit. 14, an. 1207). There are, then, in the Western Church four minor orders: porter, lector, exorcist, and acolyte; the cantors merely exercise an office and are not an order. These four orders are all mentioned about the year 252 in the famous letter of Pope Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch (Euseb., "Hist. Ecc.", 1, vi, 43): "Novanian knew that there were in this Church (of Rome) 46 priests, 7 deacons, 7 subdeacons, 42 acolytes, and 52 exorcists, lectors, and porters." This quotation shows that besides the acolytes, who were enumerated separately and were at Rome almost assimilated with the subdeacons, there was a kind of indefinite class formed by the clerics of the three latter orders. It is seen that all clerics, even the subdeacons, necessarily pass through the four lower orders; as a matter of fact the Council of Sardica (can. xiii) mentions only the lectorate as obligatory before receiving the diaconate. Pope Siricius (Ad Himerium, nn. 9–10) and Pope Zosimus (Ad Hesychium, nn. 1 and 3) describe for us the ordinary career of Roman clerics: from boyhood or youth they are lectors; about the age of twenty, acolytes or subdeacons; those who enter the clergy when already grown up are first exorcists or lectors, after a certain time acolytes or subdeacons. Briefly, it appears that the obligation of receiving all the minor orders without exception is a law dating from the time when the minor orders ceased to be exercised in the original way. Moreover, there is no longer any fixed age at which the minor orders may be received. Canon law is silent on the subject. Canonists, including Benedict XIV (Constitution, "Eo quamvis", 4 May, 1745), admit that minor orders may be conferred not only on those who have reached the age of puberty, but on boys over seven years of age, the see remitting the expenses of the ecclesiastical students during their seminary studies. The Council of Trent requires merely that the candidates understand Latin (Sess. XXXIII, c. xii).

Although several medieval theologians regarded minor orders as sacramental, this opinion is no longer held, for the fundamental reason that minor orders, also the subdiaconate, are not of Divine or Apostolic origin. The rites by which they are conferred are quite different from ordination to holy orders. Minor orders are conferred by the presentation to the candidate of the appropriate instruments, in accordance with the ritual given in the "Statuta Ecclesiae antiqua", a document which originated in Gaul about the year 500. We do not know how even in Rome the porters and exorcists were ordained in former times. Lectors received a simple benediction; acolytes were created by handing them the linen bag in which they carried the Eucharist; subdeacons by the reception of the chalice. Moreover, while deacons and priests could be ordained only on the four Ember Saturdays of the year or two Saturdays in Lent, minor orders could be conferred on any day. Even at the present time the latter may be conferred, apart from general ordinations, on all Sundays and on Holy Days of obligation, not necessarily at Mass. The usual minister of these orders, as of the others, is a bishop; but regular abbots who have received episcopal benediction may give the tonsure and minor orders to their subjects in religion. By papal privilege several prelates Nullius (i.e., exempt) can confer these orders. It is an almost universal custom now to confer the four minor orders at one time, and the Council of Trent (loc. cit.) leaves the bishop quite free to dispense with the interstices (q.v.) with which clerics in minor orders enjoy all ecclesiastical privileges. They may be nominated to all benefits not major, but must receive within a year the major orders necessary for certain benefices. On the other hand, they are not bound to celibacy, and may lawfully marry. Marriage, however, causes them at once to forfeit every benefice. Formerly it did not exclude them from the ranks of the clergy, but at present, all clerical privileges, provided they contracted only one marriage and that with a virgin, and wore clerical costume and the tonsure (c. unie, "de cler. conjug. in VI"); they might even be appointed to the service of a church by the bishop (Conc. Trid., Sess XXIII, c. vi). This earlier discipline, however, is no longer in accordance with modern custom and law. A minor cleric who marries is regarded as having forfeited his clerical privileges. (See Orders; Acolyte; Exorcist; Lector; Porter; Subdeacon; Abbot; Tonsure.)

Many. Prefect. de sacra ordinatione (Paris, 1806), 29, 127, 285, etc. P. Caprani, De sacra ordinatio (Paris, 1903); Pasquale Pruni, Prompta bibliothca, s. v. Ordo. See also commentaries of various canonists on the Decretals, De clericis conjupatis, I, tit. 11–14; III, tit. 2.

A. Boudinon.

Minskin Diocese of Miniscensin, suffragan of Mohilef, in Western Russia. The city of Minsk is situated on the Svishlach, a tributary of the Beresina, which again flows into the Dvina. In 1893 it numbered 91,500 inhabitants, of whom 27,280 were Catholics. It is the nominal see of a Roman Catholic, a Greco-Ruthenian Uniat, and a Russian Orthodox bishop. After the suppression of the See of Smolensk and Livland, Catherine II sought and obtained from the pope the establishment of the metropolitan See of Mohilef, at the same time arbitrarily abolishing the See of Kieff. To make amends for this suppression, Paul I, with the concurrence of Pius VI, established, 17 Nov., 1798, the Latin See of Minsk, and placed it under the Metropolitan of Mohilef. The first bishop was Jacob Ignatius Dederko, formerly a canon of Wilna (d. 1829). After his resignation (1812), the see remained vacant until 1826, when Pope Gregory XVI appointed Mathias Lipski, after whose death the see again remained for some time without an occupant, the pope and the Russian Government being unable to agree as to a successor. Like the other dioceses of Western Russia and of Poland,
Minsk suffered much from the violent attempts at proselytism on the part of Emperor Nicholas I and Alexander II, by which the Uniate Lithuanians and Ruthenians were driven out. After the death of Bishop Hermann Woitkiewicz (1852–69) no successor was appointed, owing to governmental opposition, and since then the diocese has been administered by the Archbishop of Mohileff. According to the census of the Archdiocese of Mohileff for 1910, the Diocese of Minsk had 51,571 parishes and 296,374 faithful. The Uniat Ruthenian See of Minsk was erected by Pius VI, 9 August, 1798, but has been left vacant on account of the opposition of the Russian Government. (See Russia.)

JOSEPH LINS.

MINT, Papal.—The right to coin money being a sovereign prerogative, there can be no papal coins of earlier date than that of the temporal power of the popes. Nevertheless, there are coins of Pope Zacharias (741–52), of Gregory III (Ficoroni, “Museo Kircheriano”), and, possibly, of Gregory II (715–741). There is no doubt that these pieces, two of which are of silver, are true coins, and not merely a species of medals, like those which were distributed as “presbyterium” at the coronation of the popes since the time of Valentine (827). Their stamp resembles that of the Byzantine and Merovingian coins of the seventh and eighth centuries, and their square shape is also found in Byzantine pieces. Those that bear the inscription “SACRAMENTUM” (Sancti Petri) cannot be attributed to Pope Gregory IV (827–44), because of the peculiarity of minting. The existence of these coins, while the popes yet recognised the Byzantine domination, is explained by Hartmann (Das Königreich Italien, Vol. III), who believes that, in the eighth century, the popes received from the Byzantine emperors the right to mint coins. Under the empire, coins that were struck in the provinces bore the name of some local magistrate, and those coins of Gregory and of Zacharias are simply imperial Byzantine pieces, bearing the name of the first civil magistrate of the City of Rome. There are no coins of Stephen III or of Paul I, who reigned when the Duchy of Rome was already independent of the Eastern Empire; the first true papal coins are those of Adrian I, from whose time until the reign of John XIV (984) the popes coined money at Rome.

There is no pontifical money of a date between the last-named year and 1305; this is explained, in part, by the fact that the Senate of Rome, which sought to be the papal master, was the sovereign of the city, took over the mint in 1143. On the other hand, Prince Alberic had already coined money in his own name. The coins of the Senate of Rome usually bear the inscription “ROMA CAPUT MUNDI”, or, S. P. Q. R., or both, with or without emblems. In 1188 the mint was restored to the pope (Clement III), with the agreement, however, that half of its profits would be devoted to the Senado, or Senate. The Senate, meanwhile, continued to coin money, and there is no reference, on the coins of that time, to the papal authority. In the thirteenth century the Senado caused his own name to be stamped upon the coins, and, consequently, we have coins of Brancaleon, of Charles I of Anjou, of Francesco Anguillara, von der Reina, of Napolitano, of Jean Ladislas. Cola di Rienzi, during his brief tribunitate, likewise struck coins, with the inscription: N. TRIBUN. AUGUST. ROMA CAPU. MUR. Papal coins reappeared with the removal of the pontifical Court to Avignon, although there exists a single coin that is referred to Benedict XI (1303–4), with the legend CORT. VENAE. SIS. Here, however, this pope is not named in Venaisin, which had belonged to the Holy See since 1274, the coin should be referred to Benedict XII. There are coins of all the popes from John XXII to Pius IX.

The popes, and also the Senate when it coined money, appear to have used the imperial mint of the Capitoline, which was the Campanidoglio, not far from the Arch of Septimius Severus, but, in the fifteenth century, the mint was near the bank of Santo Spirito. Finally, in 1665, Alexander VII moved it to the rear of the apse of St. Peter’s, where it is at present. Bernini invented for it a machine to do the work more rapidly, and Francesco Girardini furnished a bomb for the machine, so that the mint of Rome was technically the most perfect one of those times. In 1845 Pius IX equipped it with the most modern appliances. The administration of the mint was at first entrusted to the cardinal camerlengo; direct supervision, however, was exercised by the senate, from the time at least when that body took the direction of the mint. But the real regent was the Senado. The sindacato and the conservatorio of the Camera Capitolina appointed the masters of the mint, while the minting was witnessed by the heads of the guild of goldsmiths and silversmiths. In 1322 John XXII created the office of treasurer for the mint of Avignon, and its incumbent, little by little, made himself independent of the camerlengo. Later, the office of prelate president of the mint was created. According to Lunadori (Relaz. della Corte di Roma, 1646), the establishments for the coining of money were in charge of a congregation of cardinals.

Rome was not the only city of the Pontifical States that had a mint: prior to the year 1000, there existed a mint at Ravenna where Gregory I (Gregorius Magnus) in 996 to Archbishop Gerberto by Gregory V; there were mints also at Spoletto and at Benevento, former residences of Lombard dukes. The Archbishop of Ravenna, who was a feudatory of the emperor rather than of the pope, coined money as long as his temporal power over that city and its territory lasted. The Venetian Senate took over the mint in 1264. Venice acquired Bologna in 1194, and nearly all of the coins struck there bear the motto BONONIA DOCET, or BONONIA MATER STUDIORUM. The boiocioti of Bologna were called bologinni, while the gold bolognino was equivalent to a gold sequin. The fior, also a Bolognese coin, was worth 20 bologinni. These coins were struck in the name of the commune; it is only from the time when Bologna was recovered by the Holy See, under Clement VI, that Bolognese coins may be regarded as papal.

Other cities had mints because they were the capitals of principalities subject to the Holy See, or in virtue of a privilege granted them by some prince; sometimes, when those princes government was over, they retained the mints as papal establishments. This was so in the case of Camerino (from Leo X to Paul III), Urbino, Pessaro and Gubbio (under Julius II, Leo X, and Clement XI), Ferrara (from Clement VIII), Parma and Piacenza (from Julius II to Paul III). There were other cities to which the popes granted a mint for limited periods of time, as Ancôna (from Sixtus IV to Pius VI), Aquila (1486, when that city rebelled against Ferdinand I of Naples and gave its allegiance to Innocent VIII; its coins, which are very rare, bear the inscription AQUILANA LIBERTAS), Ascoli (from Martin V to Pius VI), Avignon (from Clement V on), Carpentras (under Clement VIII), Venaisin (from Boniface VIII), Fabriano (under Leo X), Fano (from Innocent VIII to Clement VII), Ferrara (from Boniface IX to Leo X), The Marches (from Boniface IX to Gregory XIII), Macerata (from Boniface IX to Gregory XII), Modena (under Leo X and Clement VII), Montalto (under Sixtus V), Orvieto (under Julius II), the Patrimony (from Benedict XII), Pesaro (from Julius II to Julius III), Ravenna (from Leo X to Paul II, and under Benedict XIV), Recanati (under Nicholas V), Reggio (from Julius II to Adrian VI), Spoletto (under Paul II), Duchi of
Spoleto, Provincie ducatus (under Paul V), Viterbo (under Urban VI and Sixtus IV). Pius VI, being obliged to coin a great deal of copper money, gave the minting of it to a great many cities of the Patrimony, of Urbino, and of the Marches, which, together with the towns already named, continued to strike these coins, among them were Civitavecchia, Gubbio, Matelica, Ronciglione (the coins of 1799 showing the burning of this city are famous), Terni, and Tivoli. Pius VII suppressed all the mints except those of Rome and of Bologna.

Far back as 1370 there were coins struck during the vacancies of the Holy See, by authority of the cardinal camerlengo, who, after the fifteenth century at least, caused his name and his coat of arms to be stamped on the reverse of the coin, the obverse bearing the words "Sebe vacante" and the date, surrounding the crossed keys surmounted by the pavilion. All papal coins, with rare exceptions, bear the name of the pope, preceded (until the time of Paul II) by a Greek cross, and nearly all of the more ancient ones bear, either on the obverse or on the reverse, the words s. petrus, and some of them, the words s. paulus also. From Leo III to the Ottos, the coins bear the name of the emperor as well as that of the pope, but in the coinage of the pope alone frequently appears on pontifical coins.

There are also found images of the Saviour, or of saints, symbolic figures of men or of animals, the keys (which appear for the first time on the coins of Benevento), etc. From the sixteenth century to the eighteenth, Biblical or moral phrases are added, in the coinage of the same pope, that is stamped upon the coin, as, for example, monstra te esse matrem, spe nostro, sub tuum praesidium, tota pulchra, supra firmam petram, da recta sapere (during the Conclave), ubi thesaurus ibi cor, crescentem sequitur cura pecuniam, hilarem datorem dilecti propter munificentiam aedibus in sudore vultus, conservate perseverant, tolle et proinde, etc. Sometimes allusion is made to an historical event, as the acquisition of Ferrara, or the deliverance of Vienna (1683), or to some concession of the pope to his subjects, or to a jubilee. From the time of Clement X the coins struck with his portrait were minted, and the gold coinage of the counterfeit of arms of the prelate in charge of the mint, a custom that obtained until 1817. The only instance of a cardinal camerlengo stamping his coat of arms on the coins during the lifetime of the pope is that of Cardinal Armellini, under Adrian VI, in the case of four gross.

The coinage of Rome stamped the coins with the arms of their respective cities, or with those of the cardinal legate, of the vice-legate, or of the governor; thus, Cardinal Scipione Borghese in 1612 struck coins at Avignon with his own name and arms, omitting the name of the pope, an example that was followed a year later by the pro-legate Cardinal Liborio Scipione Borghese, who also stamped the patron saint on its coins. The date came to be stamped on coins that were struck during the vacancies of the Holy See, occasionally at first, and later as a rule; it rarely appears on other coins before 1550; the practice became general in the seventeenth century, the year of the Christian era or that of the pontificate being used; and Gregory XVI established it by law, as also the requirement that each coin should bear upon it an expression of its value. At Bologna as early as the seventeenth century, the value of gold or silver coins was usually indicated with the figures 20, 40, 80, etc., i. e. so many bolognini or baiocchi; at Rome, in the eighteenth century, nearly all the copper coinage, established by Pius VI, bore the denomination of the papal coins rarely bore an inscription; at most, the monogram of the city in which the coin was struck was stamped upon it. From the sixteenth century, the engravers, also, put their ciphers on the coins; among these engravers may be named Benvenuto Cellini, Francesco Raibolini, called il Francia (Bologna), the four Hammerini, Giulio Romano (trident), Cavaliere Lucenti, Andrea Per Bentelli, etc. Until the time of Pius VI, the dies for the mint remained the property of the engravers.

The Byzantine monetary system is followed in the papal coinage until the reign of Leo III, after which the system of the Frankish Empire obtains. John XIII adopted the Florentine system, and coined gold florins; the weight of this coin, however, varied from 22 carats to 30, until Gregory XI reduced it to the original 24 carats; but deterioration came again, and then there were two kinds of florins, the papal florin, which maintained the old weight, and the florin di Camera, the two being in the ratio of 69 papal florins = 100 florins di Camera = 1 gold pound of 410 carlini. The ducat was coined in the papal mint from the year 1432; it was a coin of Venetian origin that circulated with the florin, which, in 1531, was succeeded by the scudo, a piece of French origin that remained the monetary unit of the Pontifical States. At the same time, there appeared the zecchino. The papal florin florin was equal to 2 scudi and 11 baiocchi (1 baiocco = 901 scudi); the zecchino was equal to one scudo and 9 baiocchi. The scudo also underwent fluctuations, in the market and in its weight: the so-called scudo delle stampe (1695) was worth 184:2 baiocchi, that is, a little less than 2 scudi. Benedict XIII re-established the good quality of the florin, but under Pius VII it came to deteriorate. In 1835 Gregory XVI regulated the monetary system of the Pontifical States, establishing the scudo as the unit, and dividing it into 100 baiocchi, while the baiocco was divided into 5 quadrinarii (the quadrinario, until 1591, had been equal to ¼ of a baiocco). The scudo was coined both in gold and in silver; there were no coins of silver; instead, there were 5 scudi, and of 2 scudi were also coined. The scudo of the eighteenth century was equal to 1-65 scudi of Pius VII, which last was adopted by Gregory XVI; the zecchino was worth 2:2 scudi. The scudo is equal to 5-3 lire in the monetary system of the Latin Union. The fractional silver coins were the half scudi, were also the mezzo scudo, and the testone = 30 giulli. The copper coins were the baiocco or soldo (which was called bolognino, at Bologna) and the 2 baiocchi piece. The name baiocco is derived from that of the city of Baeux.

Other coins that were used at various times in the Pontifical States were the baiocchella = 1 baiocco, a copper piece with a silver surface, and therefore smaller than the copper baiocco; there were coins made of the two metals of the values, respectively, of 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, and 16 baiocchi; the copper madonnina (Bologna) = 5 baiocchi; the sampietrino (Pius VI) = 2 baiocchi; the paludella was a soldo, made of an alloy of copper and silver, established by Pius VI as a more easily portable specie with which to pay the workmen of the Pontine Marshes; the sessino = 0:4 of a baiocco = 2 quadrinarii; the leonina (Leo XIII) = 4:4 Gregorian scudi; the dobloone = 2 old scudi = 3:3 scudi of the nineteenth century; there were dobloni of the relative values of 4, 8, and 16 scudi; the roppio was worth a little less than the 12 scudi, that is, 3:21 scudi of the nineteenth century; at Bologna there were also coined scudi of 80 baiocchi, and half-scudi of 40 baiocchi; the gabella was a Bolo-
Minucius Felix, Christian apologist, flourished between 160 and 300; the exact date is not known. His "Octavius" has numerous points of agreement with Tertullian. The similarities that have been explained by the theory of a common source—an apology written in Latin, and which is supposed to have disappeared without leaving any trace, not even in the name of its author. This hypothesis is now generally abandoned. It seems improbable that such a work, from which Minucius or Tertullian might have drawn, could have so thoroughly disappeared. Lactantius (Diu. Inst., V, i, 21) enumerates the apologists who preceded him and does not even suspect the existence of such a writer. The most natural supposition is that one of the two writers, Minucius or Tertullian, is directly dependent on the other. Formerly, Menepages, and others, had advanced such a view. The first doubts in this respect were expressed in France by Blondel in 1641, by Dalleu in 1660, and in England by Dodwell. The theory of the priority of Minucius was defended by van Hoven in the second edition of Lindner in 1773. In modern times it was most ably defended by Ebert. The priority of Tertullian is firmly defended by Ilmardt and has been refuted by A. Krueger. M. Waltzing, the scholar best acquainted with Minucius Felix and what has been written about him, is inclined to think him anterior to Tertullian. The arguments in favour of one or the other of these theories are not decisive. However, it may be said that in the passages taken from the ancient authors, such as Seneque, Varro, and especially Cicero, Minucius seems to be more exact and closer to the original; consequently he seems to be intermediary between them and Tertullian. The ecclesiastical authors were probably not better informed than we are with regard to Minucius. Lactantius puts him before Tertullian (Diu. Inst., I, xi, 55; V, i, 21). This was refuted and he has been put by him after St. Cyprian (Ep. lxx, (lxxxii); v; lx: xlvii; "In Isaïam"; VIII, prf.), and elsewhere putting him between Tertullian and St. Cyprian (De Viris, lviii). Fronto (d. about 170) is mentioned by Minucius. If the treatise "Quod idola non dixi sint" is by St. Cyprian (d. about 258) there is no need of a second treatise; in this case the treatise is based on the "Octavius". It is true that the attribution of the aforesaid treatise to St. Cyprian has been contested, but without serious reason. If this he rejected there is no period ante quem before Lactantius.

The birthplace of the author is believed to be Africa. This is not proved by Minucius's imitation of African authors, any more than it is by the resemblance between Minucius and Tertullian. At this period the principal writers were Africans, and it was natural that a Latin, of whatever province he might be, would read and imitate them. The allusions to the customs and belief of Africa are numerous, but this may be explained by the African origin of the champion of paganism. The "Octavius" is a dialogue of which Ostia is the scene. Cæcilius Natalis upholds the cause of paganism, Octavius Januarius that of Christianity; the author himself is the judge of the debate. Cæcilius Natalis was a native of Cirta; he lived at Rome and attentively followed Minucius Felix. He had just arrived from a foreign country where he had left his family. Minucius lived at Rome. All three were advocates. The name Minucius Felix has been found on inscriptions at Tebessa and Carthage (Cor. Inscr. Lat. VIII, 1964 and 12499); that of Octavius Januarius at Saldae (Bougie; ib., 8962); that of Cæcilius at Carthage (Cor. Inscr. Lat. VIII, 2066). The M. Cæcilius Natalis of the inscriptions discharged important municipal duties and gave pagan festivals with memorable prodigality. He may have belonged to the same family as the interlocutor of the dialogue. Attempts have been made to make them identical or to establish family relationship between them. There are purely theoretical and opinion entertained regarding the date of the dialogue.

The persons are real. The dialogue may likewise be so, despite the fact that Minucius has transformed into an almost judicial debate what must have been a mere conversation or series of conversations. Owing to the adjournment of the court during the vintage time, the two protagonists lived together. At one time, they walked on the sea-shore, and when they passed before a statue of Serapis, Cæcilius saluted it with the customary kiss. Octavius thereupon expressed his indignation that Minucius should allow his daily companion to fall into idolatry. They resume their walk while Octavius gives an account of his voyage; they go to Tertullian, and then to Tertullian's wife, and watch children jumping about in the sea. This beginning is charming; it is the most perfect portion of the work. During the walk Cæcilius, silenced by the words of Octavius, has not spoken. He now explains himself and it is agreed to settle the debate. They seat themselves on a lonely pier; Minucius seated in the centre, and Tertullian, with his back to Cæcilius. The dialogue begins by attacking Christianity; Minucius says a few words, and then Octavius replies. At the end Minucius and Cæcilius express their admiration and the latter declares that he surrenders. Fuller explanations of the new religion are postponed until the next day. The dialogue therefore consists of two discourses, the attack of Cæcilius and the refutation of Octavius.

The discussion bears on a small number of points: the possibility of man arriving at the truth, creation, Providence, the unity of God, the necessity of keeping the religion of one's ancestors and especially the advantage to the Romans of the worship of the gods. The new character of Christians, their tendency to conceal themselves, their crimes (incest, worship of an animal's head), the adoration of the generative organs of the priest, prayers addressed to a criminal, sacrifice of
children) their impious and absurd conception of the Divinity, their doctrine of the end of the world and the resurrection of the dead, the hardships of their life, threatened, and expelled without remedy to escape dangers, cut off from the joys of life. In this debate the conception of Christianity is very limited, and is reduced almost solely to the unity of God, Providence, the resurrection, and reward after death. The name of Christ does not appear; among the apostles, the second century Aristides, St. Justin, and Tertullian are the only ones who pronounced that the Crucified One was neither a man nor guilty (xxix, 2) and he is silent with regard to the mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption which would have made clear his reply. He merely repels the accusation of incest and infanticide without describing the ape or the Eucharist (xxx and xxx). He refuses to answer (xlii), and he does not mention the fulfillment of the prophecies. On the other hand he makes only a brief allusion to the manner of proceeding against the Christians (xxiii, 3). He does not speak of the loyalty of the Christians towards the state and the emperors. Political and judicial considerations, which are given space to in Tertullian, are almost entirely absent here. These omissions are explained by a voluntary limitation of the subject. Minucius wished only to remove the prejudices of the pagans, to possess his readers by a pleasant discussion, and to show them the possibility of Christianity. He himself indicated this intention by putting off until the next chapter the profound discussion (xI, 2). He addressed himself chiefly to the learned, to sceptics, and to the cultured; and wished to prove to them that there was nothing in the new religion that was incompatible with the resources of dialectics and the ornaments of rhetoric. In a word his work is an introduction to Christianity, a Protoscriptum.

The modes of imitations, especially of Cicero, Seneca, and Virgil. The plan itself is that of the "De natura deorum" of Cicero, and Celsus here plays the role of Cotta. However the personages have their peculiar characteristics. Celsus is a young man, presumptuous, somewhat vain, sensitive, yielding to his first impression. Octavius is more sedate, but persistent. He seems to mimic his model without being appreciable; his pleading is hot and emotional. Minucius is more indulgent and calm. These learned men are charming friends. The dialogue itself is a monument of friendship. Minucius wrote it in memory of his dear Octavius, recently deceased. In reading it one thinks of Plato, the Younger and his friends. These monologues of the conversations and the culture. The style is composite, being a harmonious combination of the Ciceronian period with the brilliant and short sentences of the new school. It sometimes assumes poetic tints, but the dominating colour is that of Cicero. By the choice of subjects treated, his ease in reconciling very different ideas and styles, the art of constructing his work in language, Minucius Felix belongs to the first rank of Latin writers whose talent consisted in blending heterogeneous elements and in proving themselves individual and original in imitation.

MINUCIUS FELIX, Octavius, ed. WALTZING (LOUVAIN, 1903); WALTZING, Studio minucianum, I and II (LOUVAIN, 1906); IDLE, Octavius de Minucius Felix, introduction, texte, commentaire, redaction; GONZALEZ, opuscules, vol. I and II (LIEGE, 1896). A complete bibliography will be found in the first three works, with analyses and discussion. Recently ELTER in his Prolegomena zu Minucius Felix (BONN, 1900), has attempted to show the Octavius to be a "moralization," exclusively for Christian readers; this theory is without probability.

PAUL LEJAY.

Mirabilia Urbis Romae, the title of a medieval Latin description of the city of Rome, dating from about 1150. Unhampered by any very accurate knowledge of the historical continuity of the city, the unknown author has described the monuments of Rome, displaying a composite view of both history and faculty. From the pontificate of Boniface VIII (1294-1303) to that of John XXXII (1316-34) it was revised and attained unquestioned authority, despite the increase in the already large number of misconceptions and errors. Attention was first called to these different recensions by de Rossis in the first volume of his "Roma figurata," 1880, where two most simultaneously appeared two editions of the text, by Parthey ("Mirabilia Romae et codicibus Vaticinis emendata", Berlin, 1869) and by Jordan ("Topographie der Stadt Rom im Altertum", II, Berlin, 1871, 605-43), respectively. In the third section Jordan discusses at some length the Mirabilia and its recensions (385 sqq.), and at least vouches for the authenticity of the work (401 sqq.), and in the fifth, the topography of the Mirabilia (421 sqq.), presenting the most valuable information, the result of much research on all the questions involved. The latest edition is that of Duchesne in the "Liber Censuum de l'Eglise Romaine" (I, Paris, 1905, 262-70), being the text of the Codex Cuxiensis C 28, the earliest of the extant, in four other manuscripts. Especially valuable for a proper conception of the Mirabilia are the 125 notes appended by Duchesne on pp. 273-83, many of them of considerable length. (The concordance with the text in the "Excursus politici a presbitero Benedicto compositi de ordinibus ecclesiae et ecclesiasticis Urbis et Sacri Palatii" may be found in the "Liber Censuum", vol. II, 91, 92, n. 5.) A critical edition of the "Mirabilia Urbina" is still lacking. The contents of the Mirabilia fall into the following sections, the titles being taken from the "Liber Censuum": (1) De muro urbis (concerning the wall of the city); (2) De portis urbis (the gates of the city); (3) De milliaribus (the milestones); (4) Nomina portorum (the names of the gates); (5) Quot portae sunt Tiberisim (how many gates are beyond the Tiber); (6) De arcubus (the arches); (7) De montibus (the hills); (8) De termis (the baths); (9) De palatii (the palaces); (10) De theatris (the theatres); (11) De locis qui inveniuntur in ecclesiis passiones et sanctae (the "passions" of the saints); (12) De pontibus (the bridges); (13) De cimiteris (the cemeteries); (14) De insule Octavitani imperatoris et responsione Sibille (the demand of the Emperor Octavian and the Sibyl's response); (15) Quare facti sunt caballi marmorei (why the marble horses were made); (16) De nominiibus judicium et eorum instructionibus (the names of the judges and their instructions); (17) De columna Antonii et Trajani (the column of Antony and Trajan); (18) Quare factus sit equus qui dicitur Constantinus (why the horse was made, which is called of Constantine); (19) Quare factum sit Pantheon et postmodum oratio B. (why the pantheon was built and later oration B.); (20) Quare Octavianus vocatus sit Augustus et quare dictur ecclesia Sancti Petri ad vincula (Why Octavianus was called Augustus, and why the church of St. Peter ad Vincula was so called); (21) De vaticano et Agullo; (22) Quot sunt tempula trans Tiberim (how many temples are beyond the Tiber); (23) Predicatio sanctorum (the preaching of the saints).

The reader may consult in addition to the above-mentioned authors, the Monatshberichte of the Berlin Academy (1899), redaction in the text in the "Annali di Roma" (1851, 228 sqq.), of the "History of Rome" (1852) of NISSAY, Ephemerae literariae di Roma (1830), 63 sqq. part of this was reprinted without alteration under the title of Mirabilia annua le cose meravigliose di Roma (Rome, 1884). In editing the second of the two recensions mentioned above
Miracle (Lat. miraculum, from mirari, "to wonder").—In general, a wonderful thing, the word being so used in classical Latin; in a specific sense, the Latin Vulgate designates by miracula wonders of a peculiar kind, expressed more clearly in the Greek texts as τέρατα (II Cor., xii, 12). Wonders performed by supernatural power as signs of some special mission or gift and explicitly ascribed to God. These terms are used habitually in the New Testament and express the meaning of miraclum of the Vulgate. Thus St. Peter in his first sermon speaks of Christ as approved of God, διά τέρατος, καὶ ἔργων δυνάμεως, καὶ ἔργων ἐκ ταχέων αἰτίας (Acts, iii, 22). Paul says that the signs of his Apostleship were wrought, σημαίνει τα καὶ τέρατα καὶ δυνάμεις (II Cor., xii, 12). Their united meaning is found in the term ἔργα i. e., works, the word constantly employed in the Gospels to designate the miracles of Christ. The analysis of these terms therefore gives the nature and scope of the mirabile. 

I. Nature. A. The word τέρατα literally means "wonders", in reference to feelings of amazement excited by their occurrence; hence effects produced in the material creation appealing to, and grasped by, the senses, usually by the sense of sight, at times by hearing, e. g., the baptism of Jesus, the conversion of St. Paul. Thus, though the works of Divine grace, such as the Sacramental Presence, are above the power of nature, and due to God alone, they may be called miraculous only in the wide meaning of the term, i. e., as supernatural effects, but they are not miracles in the sense here understood, for miracles in the strict sense are apparent. The miracles fail under the graver terrors inherent in the sacred oracles (e.g., raising the dead to life) or in its effects (e.g., the result of infused knowledge with the Apostles). In like manner the justification of a soul in itself is miraculous, but is not a miracle properly so called, unless it takes place in a sensible manner, as, e. g., in the case of St. Paul. The wonder of the miracle is due to the fact that the effect can be seen, hidden as it is from us, and an effect is expected other than what actually takes place. Hence, by comparison with the ordinary course of things, the miracle is called extraordinary. In analysing the difference between the extraordinary character of the miracle and the ordinary course of nature, the Fathers of the Church and theologians employ the terms above, contrary to, and outside nature. These terms express the matter in which the miracle is extraordinary. 

A miracle is said to be above nature when the effect produced is above the native powers and forces in creatures of which the known laws of nature are the expression, as raising a dead man to life, e. g., Lazarus (John, xi), the widow's son (III Kings, xvii). A miracle is said to be outside, or beside, nature when nature forces have not produced the effect, at least in part, but could not of themselves alone have produced it in the way it was actually brought about. Thus the effect in abundance far exceeds the power of natural forces, or it takes place instantaneously without the means or processes which nature employs. In these respects, human multiplication of loaves by Jesus (John vi), the changing of water into wine at Cana (John, ii)—for the moiture of the air by natural and artificial processes is changed into wine—or the sudden healing of a large extent of diseased tissue by a draught of water. A miracle is said to be contrary to nature, when the effect produced is contrary to the natural course of things. 

The term miracle here implies the direct opposition of the effect actually produced to the natural causes at work, and its imperfect understanding has given rise to much confusion in modern thought. Thus Spinoza calls a miracle a violation of the order of nature (properti, "Tract. Theol. Polit., viii"). Hume says it is a "violation" or an "infraction" and many writers—e. g., Martensen, Hodge, Baden-Powell, Theodore Parker—use the term for miracles as a whole. But every miracle is not of necessity contrary to nature; for there are miracles above or outside nature. Again, the term contrary to nature does not imply a total or absolute untrammel of the forces and discords and confusion. The forces of nature differ in power and are in constant interaction. This produces interferences and counteractions of forces. This is true of mechanical, chemical, and biological forces. So, also, at every moment of the day I interfere with and counteract natural forces about me. I study the forces and forces of nature and view with conscious control by intelligent counteractions of one force against another. Intelligent counteraction marks progress in chemistry, in physics—e. g., steam locomotion, aviation—and in the prescriptions of the physician. Man controls nature, nay, can live only by the counteraction of natural forces. Though all this goes on acondus us, the natural forces violated. These forces are still working after their kind, and no force is destroyed, nor is any law broken, nor does confusion result. The introduction of human will may bring about a displacement of the physical forces, but no infraction of physical processes. Now in a miracle God's action relative to the bearing on natural forces is analogous to the action of human personality. Thus, e. g., it is against the nature of iron to float, but the action of Eliseus in raising the axe-head to the surface of the water (IV Kings, vi) is no more a violation, or a transgression, or an infraction, of natural laws than if he raised it with his hand. Again, it is of the nature of fire to burn, but when the Virgin Mary, e. g., returned a burned and untouched in the fiery furnace (Dan., iii), there was nothing unnatural in the act, as these writers use the word, any more than there would be in erecting a dwelling absolutely fire-proof. In the one case, as in the other, there was no paralysis of natural forces and no consequent disorder. 

The extraordinary element in the miracle—i. e., an event apart from the ordinary course of things—enables us to understand the teaching of theologians that events which ordinarily take place in the natural or supernatural course of Divine Providence are not miracles, although they are beyond the efficiency of natural forces. Thus, e. g., the creation of the soul is not a miracle, for it takes place in the ordinary course of nature. Again, the justification of the sinner, the Eucharistic Presence, the sacramental effects, are not miracles for two reasons: they are beyond the grasp of the senses and they have place in the ordinary course of God's supernatural Providence. 

B. The word δυνάμεις, "power" is used in the New Testament to signify: (a) the power of God in healing (Acts ii, 43; Acts iv, 30; Acts v, 19); (b) mighty works as the effects of this power, i. e., miracles themselves (Acts iv, 30; Acts v, 19; Matt., xi, 20) and expresses the efficient cause of the miracle, i. e.
Divine power. Hence the miracle is called supernatural, because the effect is beyond the productive powers of nature and human providence. Thus St. Thomas teaches: "Those effects are rightly to be termed miracles which are wrought by Divine power apart from the order usually observed in nature" (Contra Gent., III, ciii), and they are apart from the natural order because they are "beyond the order or laws of the whole created nature." (Summa Theol., I, Q. ciii, a. 4). Hence, natural, i.e., an uncaused event without meaning or place in nature. With God as the cause, the miracle has a place in the designs of God's Providence (Contra Gent., III, xcvii). In this sense—i.e., relatively to God—St. Augustine speaks of the miracle as natural (De Civit. Dei, XXI, viii, n. 2).

The miracles we can trace in the course of nature and beyond its productive powers: (a) with regard to its substantial nature, i.e., when the effect is of such a kind that no natural power could bring it to pass in any manner or form whatsoever, as, e.g., the raising to life of the widow's son (Luke, vii), or the cure of the man born blind (John, ix). These miracles are called miracles of the nature of (qua natura). (b) With regard to the manner in which the effect is produced, i.e., where there may be forces in nature fitted and capable of producing the effect considered in itself, yet the effect is produced in a manner wholly different from the manner in which it should naturally be performed, i.e., instantaneously, by a word, e.g., the cure of the centurion's servant (Matthew, viii, 5). These are called miracles as to the manner of their production (qua modum operationis).

God's power is shown in the miracle: (a) directly through His own immediate action or (b) mediatey, through creatures as means or instruments. In this case the effects must be ascribed to God, for He works in and through the instruments. "Ipse Deo in illis operante" (Augustine, "De Civit. Dei", X, xii). Hence God works miracles through the instrumentality of angels, e.g., the Three Children in the fiery furnace (Dan., iii), the deliverance of St. Peter from prison (Acts, xii); (2) of men, e.g., Moses and Aaron (Exod., vii), Elias (III Kings, vii), Eileisus (IV Kings, v), the Apostles (Acts, ii, 43), St. Peter (Acts, iii, 38), Eileisus (Galat., iii, 5). (3) In the Bible also, as in history, we learn that inanimate things are instruments of Divine power, not because they have any excellence in themselves, but through a special relation to God. Thus we distinguish holy relics, e.g., the mantle of Eileisus (IV Kings, ii), the body of Eileisus (II Kings, iii), the arm of Christ (Matthew, ix), the Mandersheifs of St. Paul (Acts, xii, 12); holy images, e.g., the brazen serpent (Num., xxii); holy things, e.g., the Ark of the Covenant, the sacred vessels of the Temple (Dan., vi); holy places, e.g., the Temple of Jerusalem (II Par., vi, vii), the waters of the Jordan (IV Kings, v), the Pool of Bethesda (John, v). Hence the contention of some modern writers that the miracle requires an immediate Divine power, is not true. It is sufficient that the miracle be due to the intervention of God, and its nature is revealed by the utter lack of proportion between the effect and what are called means or instruments.

The word ἑξωτερικὸς means "sign", an appeal to intelligence, and expresses the purpose or final cause of the miracle—a factor in the evidence of God over men. Hence the glory of God and the good of men are the primary or supreme ends of every miracle. This is clearly expressed by Christ in the raising of Lazarus (John, xi), and the Evangelist says that Jesus, in working His first miracle at Cana, manifested His glory" (John, ii, 2). Therefore the miracle must be worthy the holiness, goodness, and justice of God, and conducive to the true good of men. Hence they are not performed by God to repair physical defects in His creation; nor are they intended to produce, nor do they produce, disorder or discord; nor do they contain any element which is wicked, ridiculous, useless, or vulgar; and Eileisus they are not on the same plane with mere wonders, tricks, works of ingenuity, or magic. The efficacy, usefulness, purpose of the work and the manner of performing it clearly show that it must be ascribed to Divine power. This high standing and dignity of the miracle is shown, e.g., in the miracles of Moses (Exod., vii-x), Eileisus (III Kings, vii-xvi), and those of Eileisus (IV Kings, v). The multitude glorified God at the cure of the paralytic (Matt., ix, 8), of the blind man (Luke, xviii, 43), at the miracles of Christ in general (Matt., xv, 31; Luke, xix, 37), as at the cure of the lame man by St. Peter (Acts, iv, 21). Hence miracles are signs of the supernatural world and our connexion with it. Thus they point to distant, remote, ultimate ends, subordinate, however, to the primary ends. Thus (1) they are evidences attesting and confirming the truth of a Divine mission, or of a doctrine of faith or morals, e.g., Moses (Exod., iv), Eileisus (III Kings, xvii, 24). For this reason the Jews see in Christ "the prophet" (John, vi, 14), in whom "God wrought His miracles" (John, xiv, 10). These miracles proved the disciples believed in Him (John, ii, 11) and Nicodemus (John, iii, 2) and the man born blind (John, ix, 38), and the many who had seen the raising of Lazarus (John, xi, 45). Jesus constantly appealed to His "works" to prove that He was sent by God and that He is the Son of God, e.g., to the Disciples of John, vi, 27 and vii, 31. Thus He claims that His miracles are a greater testimony than the testimony of John, v, 30, condemns those who will not believe (John, xv, 24), as He praises those who do (John, xvii, 8), and exhibits miracles as the signs of the True Faith (Mark, xvi, 17). The Apostles appeal to miracles as the confirmation of Christ's Divinity and mission (John, xx, 31; Acts, x, 38), and St. Paul counts them as the foundation of his Apostleship (II Cor., xii, 12). (2) Miracles are wrought to attest true sanctity. Thus, e.g., God defends Moses (Num., xii), Eileisus (IV Kings, i), Eileisus (IV Kings, viii). Hence the testimony of the man born blind (John, ix, 30 sqq.) and the official recognition of the Ephesians in the temple (Acts, xix, 34). As St. Paul writes, "As St. Paul also testifies, either spiritual or temporal. Thus temporal favours are always subordinate to spiritual ends, for they are a reward or a pledge of virtue, e.g., the widow of Sarepta (III Kings, xvii), the Three Children in the fiery furnace (Dan., iii), the preservation of Daniel (Dan., v), the deliverance of St. Peter from prison (Acts, xii), the conversion of St. Paul from showmanship (Acts, xxvi). Thus ἐνασκίαν, i.e., "sign", completes the meaning of ἀγάμος, i.e., "[Divine] power". It reveals the miracle as an act of God's supernatural Providence over men. It gives a positive content to ἑξωτερικός, i.e., "wonder", for, whereas the wonder shows the miracle as a deviation from the ordinary course of nature, the sign gives the purpose of the deviation. This analysis shows that (1) the miracle is essentially an appeal to knowledge. Therefore miracles can be distinguished from purely natural occurrences. A miracle is a fact in material creation, and falls under the observation of the senses or comes to us through testimony, like any natural fact. Its miraculous character is proved from the positive knowledge of natural forces, e.g., the law of gravity, the law that fire burns. To say that we do not know all the laws of nature, and therefore cannot know a miracle (Rousseau, "Lett. de
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Is Mont.”, let. iii), is beside the question, for it would make the miracle an appeal to ignorance. I may not know all the laws of the penal code, but I can know with certainty that in a particular instance a person violates one definite law. (b) From our positive knowledge of the limits of natural forces. Thus, e. g., we may not know the strength of a man, but we do know that he cannot by himself move a mountain. In enlarging our knowledge of natural forces, the progress of science has curtailed their sphere and defined their limits, as in the law of abiogenesis. Hence, as soon as we have reason to suspect that any event, however uncommon or rare it appear, may arise from natural causes or be conformable to the usual course of nature, we immediately lose the conviction of having a miracle. A miracle is a manifestation of God’s power; so long as this is not clear, we should reject it as such.

(2) Miracles are signs of God’s Providence over men; hence they are of high moral character, simple and obvious in the forces at work, in the circumstances of their working, and in their aim and purpose. Now philosophy indicates the possibility, also revelation teaches the fact, that spiritual beings, both good and bad, exist, and possess greater power than man possesses. Apart from the speculative question as to the native power of these beings, we are certain (a) that God alone can perform those effects which are called substantial miracles, e. g., raising the dead to life; (b) that miracles performed by the angels as recorded in the Bible, and always ascribed to God, and Holy Scripture gives Divine authority to no miracles less than these; (c) that Holy Scripture shows the power of evil spirits as strictly conditioned, e. g., testimony of the Egyptian magicians (see, viii, 19), the story of Job, evil spirits acknowledging the power of God (Matt., viii, 23); the testimony of Christ himself (Matt., xxiv, 24) and of the Apocalypse (Apoc., ix, 14). Granting that these spirits may perform prodigies—i.e., works of skill and ingenuity which, relatively to our powers, may seem to be miraculous—yet these works lack the meaning and purpose which would stamp them as the language of God to men.

4. Examples.—Deists reject miracles, for they deny the Providence of God. Aposeutics, also, and Positivists reject them: Comte regarded miracles as the fruit of the theological imagination. Modern Pantheism has no place for miracles. Thus Spinoza held creation to be the aspect of the one substance, i.e., God, and, as he taught that miracles were a violation of nature, they would therefore be a violation of God. The Pantheistic Spinoza believed that the power of God and nature is false and, secondly, that in fact miracles are not a violation of nature. To Hegel creation is the evolutive manifestation of the one Absolute Idea, i.e., God, and to the neo-Hegelians (e. g., Thos. Green) consciousness is identified with God; therefore to both a miracle has no meaning. Erroneous definitions of the supernatural lead to a false definition of a miracle. Thus (a) Bushnell defines the natural to be what is necessary, the supernatural to be what is free; therefore the material world is what we call nature, the world of man’s life is supernatural. So also Dr. Strong (“Baptist Rev.”, vol. I, 1879), Rev. C. A. Row (“Supranat. in the New Test.”, London, 1875). In this sense Spinoza’s denial of a miracle is a supernaturally act and a miracle. (b) The natural supernaturalism proposed by Carlyle, Theodore Parker, Prof. Pfeiderer, and, more recently, Prof. Everett (“The Psychologi Ele. of Relig. Faith”, London and New York, 1902), Prof. Bowman (“Immanence of God”, Boston and New York, 1895), Hastings (“Dictionary of Christ and His Goerds”, New York, 1902). In this sense the natural and the supernatural are in reality one: the natural is its aspect to man, the supernatural is its aspect to God. (c) The “immediate theory” that God acts immediately without second causes, or that second causes, or laws of nature, must be defined as the regular methods of God’s acting. This teaching is combined with the doctrine of evolution. (d) The “relative” theory of miracles is by far the most popular with non-Catholic writers. This view was originally proposed to hold Christian miracles and at the same time hold belief in the uniformity of nature. Its main forms are: (1) the mechanical view of miracles, e.g., the mechanical explanation of the Duke of Argyll (Reign of Law). Thus nature is presented as a vast mechanism wound up in the beginning and containing in itself the capacity to deviate at stated times from its ordinary course. The theory is ingenious, but it makes the miracle a natural event. It admits the assumption of opponents of miracles, viz., that physical effects are physical causes, but this assumption is contradicted in the confirmation of facts of experience, e. g., will acts on matter. (2) The “unknown” law of Spinoza, who taught that the term miracle should be understood with reference to the opinions of men, and that it means simply an event which we are unable to explain by other events familiar to our experience. Locke, Kant, Eichhorn, Paulus, hold the same view. Prof. Conant states, “The miracle of one age becomes the ordinary working of nature in the next” (“Ref. Ch. R.”, July, 1900). Hence a miracle never happened in fact, and is only a name to cover our ignorance. Thus Matthew Arnold could claim that all Biblical miracles will disappear with the progress of science (Lit. and Bib.) and that “the miracles are the miracle of a more mellowed and more seeming” (n. Rel., pref., p. 10). The advocates of this theory assume that miracles are an appeal to ignorance. (3) The “higher-law” theory of Argyll of “Unseen Universe”, Trench, Lane (on Matt., p. 153), Gore (Bampton Lect., p. 36) proposed to refute Spinoza’s theory that miracles exist only in a prescriptive of disorder. Thus with them the miracle is quite natural because it takes place in accordance with laws of a higher nature. Others—e. g., Schleiermacher and Ritschl—mean by higher law, subjective religious feeling. Thus, to them a miracle is not different from any other natural event; it becomes a miracle by relation to the religious feeling. A writer in “The Biblical World” (Oct., 1908) holds that the miracle consists in the religious significance of the natural event in its relation to the religious appreciation as a sign of Divine favour. Others explain higher law as a moral law, or law of the spirit. Thus the miracles of Christ are understood as illustrations of a higher, graver, moral condition, which is the process of the interiorization of a new life, of higher forces acting according to higher laws as manifestations of the spirit in the higher stages of its development. The criticism of this theory is that miracles would cease to be miracles: they would not be extraordinary, for they would take place under the same conditions as other natural events. To Hegel the existence to deny their existence. Thus, when Trench defines a miracle as “an extraordinary event which beholders can reduce to no law with which they are acquainted”, the definition includes hypnotism and clairvoyance. If by higher law we mean the high law of God’s holiness, then a miracle can be referred to this law, but the higher law in this case is God Himself and the use of the term is apt to create confusion.

III. ANTECEDENT IMPROROBABILITY.—The great problem of modern theology is the place and value of miracles. In the opinion of certain writers, their antecedent improbability, based on the universal reign of law, is so great that they are no law in this case is God Himself and the use of the term is apt to create confusion.

1. The fundamental principle is that whatever happens is
natural, and what is not natural does not happen. On belief in the uniformity of nature is based the profound conviction of the organic unity of the universe, a characteristic trait of nineteenth-century thought. It has dominated a certain school of literature, and it is the basis of the philosophy of nature, as Mill has himself shown (Logic, IV, xxii). The latter is an induction based upon a long and careful observation of facts: it is not a self-evident truth, nor is it a universal and necessary principle, as Mill himself has shown (Logic, IV, xxii). In fact uniformity of nature is the result of the principle of causation.

(4) The main contention, that the uniformity of nature rules miracles out of consideration, because they would imply a break in the uniformity and a violation of natural law, is not true. The laws of nature are the observed modes or processes in which natural forces act. These forces are the properties or potencies of the essences of natural things. Our experience of causation is not the experience of a mere sequence but of a sequence due to the necessary operation of essences viewed as principles or sources of action. Now essences are necessarily what they are and unchangeable; therefore their properties, or potencies, or forces, under given circumstances, act in the same way. On this, Scholastic philosophy bases the truth that nature is uniform in its action, yet holds that constancy of succession is not an absolute law, for the succession is only constant so long as the nomenal relations remain the same. Thus Scholastic philosophy, in its defense of essences, the ordinary reign of law in this sense, and its teaching is in absolute accord with the methods actually pursued by modern science in scientific investigations. Hence it teaches the order of nature and the reign of law, and openly declares that, if there were no order, there would be no miracle. It is significant that the Bible, in its innumerable miracle narratives, while it attests the actual occurrence of miracles, now human will, in acting on material forces, interferes with the regular sequences, but does not paralyze the natural forces or destroy their innate tendency to act in a uniform manner. Thus a boy, by throwing a stone into the air, does not disarrange the order of nature or do away with the law of gravity. A new force only is brought in and counteracts the tendencies of the natural forces, just as the natural forces interact and counteract among themselves, as is shown in the well-known truths of the parallelogram of forces and the distinction between kinetic and potential energy. The analogy from man's act to God's act is not a violation of the uniformity of nature or a violation of its laws. The extent of the power exerted does not affect the point at issue. Hence physical nature is presented as a system of physical causes producing uniform results, and yet permits the intersection of personal agency without affecting its stability.

(5) The truth of this position is so manifest that Mill admits Hume's argument against miracles to be valid only on the supposition that God does not exist, for, he says, "a miracle is a new effect supposed to be produced by the introduction of a new cause . . . of the adequacy of that cause, if present, there can be no doubt" (Logic, III, xxvi). Hence, admitting the existence of God, Hume's "uniform succession" holds for the phenomena. But Huxley also denies that physicists withhold belief in miracles because miracles are in violation of natural laws, and he rejects the whole of this line of argument ("Some Controversial questions", 209; "Life of Hume", 132), and holds that a miracle is a question of evidence pure and simple. That the real meaning of the word nature includes both the phenomenon and the noumenon. Huxley has also concluded that physicists withhold belief in miracles because miracles are in violation of natural laws, and he rejects the whole of this line of argument ("Some Controversial questions", 209; "Life of Hume", 132), and holds that a miracle is a question of evidence pure and simple. Hence the objection to miracles on the ground of their consequent improbability has been abandoned. "The Biblical World" (Oct., 1908) says "The old rigid system of 'Laws of Nature' is being broken up by modern science. There are many events which scientists recognise to be inexplicable by any known law. But this inability to furnish a scientific explanation is no reason for denying the existence of the event, if it is adequately attested. Thus the old a priori argument against miracles is gone." Thus in modern thought
the question of the miracle is simply a question of fact.

IV. Place and Value of Miracles in the Christian View of the World.—As the great objection to miracles rests mainly on natural views of the universe, so the true world-view is necessary to grasp their place and value. Christianity teaches that God created and governs the world. This government is His Providence. It is shown in the delicate adjustment and subordination of the tendencies proper to material things, resulting in the marvelous stability and harmony which prevail throughout the physical creation, and in the moral order, which through conscience, is to guide and control the tendencies of man's nature to a complete harmony in human life. Man is a personal being, with intelligence and free-will, capable of knowing and serving God, and created for that purpose. To Him nature is the book of God's work revealing the Creator through the design visible in the material order and through conscience, the voice of the moral order based in the very constitution of his own being. Hence the relation of man to God is a personal one. God's Providence is not confined to the revelation of Himself through His works. He has manifested Himself in a supernatural manner. Few floods of light have been given in spiritual beings and departed souls. Both spheres, the natural and the supernatural, are under the overruling Providence of God. Thus God and man are two great facts. The relation of the soul to its Maker is religion.

Religion is the knowledge, love, and service of God; its expression is called worship, and the essence of worship is prayer. Thus between man and God there is constant intercourse, and in God's Providence the appointed means of this intercourse is prayer. By prayer man speaks to God in acts of faith, hope, love, and contrition, and implores His aid. In answer to prayer God acts on the soul by His grace, confirming the miracles, by working miracles. Hence the great fact of prayer, as the connecting link of man to God, implies a constant interference of God in the life of man. Therefore, in the Christian view of the world, miracles have a place and a meaning. They arise out of the personal relation between God and man. The conviction that the pure of heart are pleasing to God, in some mysterious way, is world-wide; even among the heathens pure offerings only are prepared for the sacrifice. This intimate sense of God's presence may account for the universal tendency to refer all striking phenomena to supernatural causes. Error and exaggeration do not change the nature of the belief founded in the abiding conviction of supernatural Providence. To think, St. Paul appealed in his discourse to the Athenians (Acts, xvii). In the miracle, therefore, God subordinates physical nature to a higher purpose, and this higher purpose is identical with the highest moral aims of existence. The mechanical view of the world is in harmony with the teleological, and when purpose exists, no event is isolated or nothing. Man created for God, and a miracle is the proof and pledge of His supernatural Providence. Hence we can understand how, in devout minds, there is even a presumption for and an expectation of miracles. They show the subordination of the lower world to them; they are the breaking in of the higher world on the lower. (C. G. Herford, xlvii, xcvii; Benedict XIV, 1, c 1, 1 IV, p. 1, c 1.)

Some writers—e.g., Paley, Mansel, Mosley, Dr. George Fisher—push the Christian view to the extreme, and say that miracles are necessary to attest revelation. Catholic theologians, however, take a broader view. They hold (1) that the great primary end of miracles is to effect the faith of God and the good of men; that the particular or secondary ends, subordinate to the former, are to confirm the truth of a mission or a doctrine of faith or morals, to attest the sanctity of God's servants, to confer benefits and vindicate Divine justice. (2) Hence they teach that the attestation of Revelation is not the primary end of the miracles, but its main secondary end, though not the only one. (3) They say that the miracles of Christ were not necessary but "most fitting and altogether in accord with His mission" (decentissimum et maximopere convenienti)—Bened. XIV, IV, p. 1, c. 2, n. 3; Summa, III, Q. xliii as a means to attest its truth. At the same time they place miracles among the strongest and most certain evidences of Divine revelation. (4) Yet they teach that, as evidences, miracles have not a physical force, i.e., absolutely compelling assent, but only a moral force, i.e., they do no violence to free will, though their appeal to the assent is of the strongest kind. (5) That, as evidences, they are not wont to show the primary truth of the doctrine, but the secondary and more fitting reasons why we should accept the doctrines. Hence the distinction: not evidenter vera, but evidenter credibilia. For the Revelation, which miracles attest, contains supernatural doctrines above the comprehension of the mind and positive institutions in God's supernatural Providence over men. Their opinion of God's Providence, therefore, must be that of St. Thomas, i.e., that the doctrine proves the miracle, not the miracle the doctrine, is not true. (6) Finally, they maintain that the miracles of Scripture and the power in the Church of working miracles are of Divine faith, not, however, the miracles of church history themselves. Hence they teach that the former are both evidences of faith and objects of faith; that the latter are evidences of the purpose for which they are wrought, not, however, objects of Divine faith. Hence this teaching guards against the other exaggerated view recently proposed by non-Catholic writers, who hold that miracles are now considered not as evidences, but as objects of faith.

V. Testimony.—A miracle, like any natural event, is known either from personal observation or from the testimony of others. In the miracle we have the fact itself as an external occurrence and its miraculous character. The miraculous character of the fact consists in this: that its nature and the surrounding circumstances are of such a kind that even natural forces alone could not have produced it, and the only rational explanation is to be had in the interference of Divine agency. The perception of its miraculous character is a rational act of the mind, and is simply the application of the principle of causality with the methods of induction. The general rules governing the acceptance of miracles is that they are not to be attributed to other facts of history. If we have certain evidence for the fact, we are bound to accept it. The evidence for miracles, as for historical facts in general, depends on the knowledge and veracity of the narrators, i.e., who testify to the occurrence of the events must know what they tell and tell the truth. The extraordinary nature of the miracle requires more complete and accurate investigation. Such testimony we are not free to reject; otherwise we must deny all history whatsoever. We have no rational warrant for rejecting miracles than for rejecting accounts of stellar eclipses. Hence, they who deny miracles have concentrated their efforts with the purpose of destroying the historical evidence of miracles whatsoever and especially the evidence for the miracles of the Gospel.

Hume held that no testimony could prove miracles,
for it is more probable that the testimony is false than that the miracles are true. But (1) his contention that "a uniform experience," which is "a direct and full proof," is against miracles, is denied by Mill, provided that in studying the Gospel narratives we must distinguish between the facts as they actually took place and the subjective emotions of those who witnessed them, their strong excitement, tendency to exaggeration, and vivid imagination. Thus they appeal not to the "fallacies of testimony" so much as to the "fallacies of the senses". But this attempt to transform the Apostles into nervous visionaries cannot be held by an unbiased mind. St. Peter clearly distinguished between a vision (Acts, x, 17) and a reality (Acts, xii), and St. Paul mentions two cases of visions (Acts, xxii, 17; II Cor., xii), the latter by way of contrast with his ordinary missionary life of labours and sufferings (II Cor., xi). Renan even goes so far as to present the glaring inconsistency of a Christ remarkable, as he says, for moral beauty of life and doctrine, who nevertheless is guilty of conscious deception, as, e. g., in the make-believe raising of Lazarus. This teaching is in reality a denial of testimony. The miracles of Christ must be taken as a whole, and in the Gospel setting where they are presented as a part of His mission. The argument rests upon the rejected philosophical principle that external experience is the sole source of knowledge, rests upon the discredited basis that miracles are opposed to the uniformity of nature as violations of natural laws, and was advanced through prejudice against Christianity. Hence later sceptics are not entitled to express their experience, e. g., that miracles cannot be proved, but that as a matter of fact they are not proved. The attack by Hume on miracles in general has been applied to the miracles of the Bible, and has received added weight from the denial of Divine inspiration. Varying in form, its basic principle is the same, viz., that miracles are contrary to experience and testimony not conformable to experience, and holds that the latter may be accepted—e. g., testimony of ice to the Indian prince. But this admission is fatal to his position.

(4) Hume proceeds on the supposition that, for practical purposes, all the laws of nature are known, yet experience is part of this experience, and this supernatural part Hume prejudices, arbitrarily declares it untrue, which is the point to be proved, and assumes that miraculous is synonymous with absurd. The past, so expurgated, is made the test of the future, and should prevent the consistent advocates of Hume from accepting the discoveries of science. (3) Hard-pressed, Hume is forced to make the distinction between testimony contrary to experience and testimony not conformable to experience, and holds that the latter may be accepted—e. g., testimony of ice to the Indian prince. But this admission is fatal to his position.

The theory of the Taoist. The fundamental idea of Hegel's metaphysics (viz., that existing things are the progressive manifestation of the idea, i. e., the absolute) gave a philosophical basis for the organic conception of the universe, i. e., the Divine as organic to the human. Thus revelation is presented as a human process, and history—e. g., the New Testament—creates a human life. This philosophy of history was applied to explain the miraculous in the Gospels and appears under two forms: (a) the Tubingen School. Baur regards the Hegelian process in its objective aspect, i. e., the facts as things. He held the books of the New Testament to be states through which the human life and thought of early Christianity had passed. He attempted to do with reference to the origin what Gibbon tried with reference to the spread of Christianity—i. e., get rid of the supernatural by the tacit assumption that there were no miracles and by the enumeration of natural causes, chief of which was the Messianic idea to which Jesus accommodated Himself. The Tubingen School constrained Him to deny that we possess contemporaneous documents of our Lord's life, to hold that the New Testament literature was the result of warring factions among the early Christians, and therefore of a much later date than tradition ascribes to it, and that Christ was only the occasional cause of Christianity. He accepted as genuine only the Epistles to the Galatians, Romans, I and II Corinthians, and the Apocalypse. But the Epistles addressed by Baur show that St. Paul believed in miracles and asserted the actual occurrence of them as well-known facts both in regard to Christ and in regard to himself and the other Apostles (e. g., Rom., xv. 18; I Cor., i. 22; 9; II Cor., xi. 5). He attempted to do with reference to the Resurrection of Christ, I Cor., xv). The basis on which the Tubingen School
rests, viz., that we possess no contemporaneous records of Christ's life, and that the New Testament writings begin to be known many years after his death and are so false by the higher criticsm. Hence Huxley admits that this position is no longer tenable (The Nineteenth Century, Feb., 1889), and in fact there is no longer a Tubingen School at Tubingen. Harnack says: "As regards the criticisms of the sources of Christianity, we stand unquestionably in a movement of return to tradition. The chronological framework in which tradition set the earliest documents is to be henceforth accepted in its main outlines" (The Nineteenth Cent., Oct., 1899). Hence Romanes said that the outcome of the battle on the Bible documents is a signal victory for Christianity (Thoughts on Religion, p. 165). Dr. Emil Reich speaks of the bankruptcy of the higher criticism ("Contemp. Rev.", April, 1905).

(b) The "Mythical" School.—Strauss regarded the Hegelian process in its subjective aspect. The facts as matters of consciousness with the early Christians concerned him exclusively. Hence he regarded Christ within the Christian consciousness of the time, and he put aside the question of the New Testament as the origin of this consciousness. He did not deny a relatively small nucleus of historical reality, but contended that the Gospels, as we possess them, are mythical inventions or fabulous and fanciful embellishments and are to be regarded only as symbols for spiritual ideas, e.g., the Messianic idea. Strauss attempted to expunge the miraculous in the unconsidered the unhistorical matter—from the text. But this view was too fanciful to hold currency after a careful study of the truthful, matter-of-fact character of the New-Testament writings, and a comparison of them with the Apocrypha. Hence it has been rejected, and Strauss himself confessed to disappointment at the results (The Critical Agnostic School.—Pp. 50-51). The Critical Agnostic School.—Its basis is the organic idea of the universe, but it views the world-process apart from God, because reason cannot prove the existence of God, and therefore, to the Agnostic, He does not exist (e.g., Huxley); or to the Christian Agnostic, His existence is accepted on Faith (e.g., Baden-Powell). To both there is no miracle, for we have no way of knowing it. Thus Huxley admits the facts of miracles in the New Testament, but says that the testimony as to their miraculous character may be worthless, and strives to explain it by the subjective mental conditions of the writers ("The Nineteenth Cent.", Mar., 1889). Baden-Powell in "Essays and Reviews" (May, 1889) and Harnack (The Essence of Christianity) admit the miracles as recorded in the Gospels, but hold that their miraculous character is beyond the scope of historical proof, and depends on the mental assumptions of the readers.—Criticism: The real problem of the historian is to state well-authenticated facts as are an explanation of the testimony. He should show how such events must have taken place and how such a theory only can explain them. He takes cognizance of all that is said about these events by competent witnesses, and from their testimony he draws the conclusion. To admit the facts and to deny an explanation is to furnish very great evidence for their historical truth, and to show qualities not consistent with the scientific historian.

(4) The theory of liberal Protestantism.—(a) In its older form, this was advocated by Carlyle (Froude's "Life of Carlyle"), Martineau (Seal of Authority in Religion), Rathbone Grev (Creek of Christendom), Prof. Wm. H. Green (Works, Ill, pp. 230, 253), professors and pupils of the "new Reformation" ("The Nineteenth Cent.", Mar., 1889) and popularized by Mrs. Humphry Ward in "Robert Elsmere". As the old Reformation was a movement to destroy the Divine authority of the Church by ex-
of His will. (1) The miracles of the Old Testament reveal the Providence of God over His chosen people. They are convincing proof for the commission of Moses (Exod., iii, iv), manifest to the people that Jehovah is Sovereign Lord (Exod., x, 2; Deut., v, 25), and are represented as the “finger of God” and “the hand of God.” God punishes Pharaoh for refusing to obey His commands given by Moses and attested by miracles, and is displeased with the infidelity of the Jews for whom He worked many miracles (Num., xiv). Miracles convinced the widow of Sarepta that Elias was “a man of God” (III Kings, xvii, 24), made the people cry out in the dispute between Elias and the prophets of Baal, “the Lord he is God” (II Kings, xviii, 21), caused Naaman to confess that “there is no other God” (II Kings, v, 11), and Nebuchadnezzar to issue a public decree in honour of God upon the escape of the Three Children from the fiery furnace (Dan., iii), and Darius to issue a like decree on the escape of Daniel (Dan., v). The ethical element is conspicuous in the miracles and is in consonance with the exalted ethical character of Jehovah, “a king of absolute justice, whose love for his people was conditioned by a law of absolute righteousness, as foreign to Semitic as to Aryan tradition,” writes Dr. Robertson Smith (“Religion of the Semites”, p. 74; cf. Kuenen, Hibbert Lect., p. 124). Hence the tendency among recent writers on the history of religion to postulate the direct intervention of God, in contrast with the interpretation for the exalted conception of the Deity set forth by Moses and the prophets (R. Kettel, “Geschichte der Hebräer,” 1889-92).

(2) The Old Testament reveals a high ethical conception of God who works miracles for high ethical purposes, and unfolds a dispensation of prophecy leading up to the fact that Christ works miracles. His answer to the messengers of John the Baptist was that they should go and tell John what they had seen (Luke, vii, 22; cf., Isa., xxxv, 5). Thus the Fathers of the Church, in proving the truth of the Christian religion from the miracles of Christ, join them with prophecy (Origen, “C. Celsum”, I, ii; Ireneaus, Adv. her. I, ii, 32; St. Augustine, “C. Faustum”, XII). Jesus openly professed to work miracles. He appeals repeatedly to His “works” as most authentic and decisive proof of His Divine Sonship (John, v, 18-36; x, 24-37) and of His mission (John, xiv, 12), and for this reason concerns the obstinacy of the Jews as inexcusable (John, xv, 22, 24). His miracles are connected with the Church (Matt., xi, 5; Luke, ii, 49), and they are delivered to the Apostles (Matt., x, 8) and disciples (Luke, x, 19) the power of working miracles, thereby instructing them to follow the same method, and promised that the gift of miracles would persist in the Church (Mark, xvi, 17). At the sight of His marvellous works, the Jews (Matt., ix, 8), Nicodemus (John, iii, 2) and Jesus His own blind man (John, x, 33) confess that they must be ascribed to Divine power. Pfeiderer accepts the second Gospel as the authentic work of St. Mark, and this Gospel is a compact account of miracles wrought by Christ. Ewald and Weiss speak of the miracles of Christ as a daily task. Miracles are not accidental or external to the Christ of the Gospels; they are inseparably bound up with His supernatural doctrine and supernatural life—a life and doctrine which is the fulfillment of prophecy and the source of Christian civilization. Miracles form the very substance of the Gospel narratives, so that, if removed, there would remain no recognizable plan of work and no intelligent portrait of the worker. We cannot even think at all of the life of Christ for Dr. Holtmann says that the very traits whose astonishing combination in one person presents the highest kind of historical evidence for His existence are indissolubly connected with miracles. Unless we accept miracles, we have no Gospel history. Admit that Christ wrought many miracles, or confess that we do not know Him at all—in fact, that He never existed. The historical Christ of the Gospels stands before us remarkable in the charm of personality, extraordinary in the elevation of life and beauty of doctrine, strikingly consistent in tenor of life, exercising Divine power in varied ways and at every turn. He rises supreme over, and apart from, His surroundings and cannot be regarded as the fruit of individual invention or as the product of the age. The simplest, clearest, only explanation is that the testimony is true. They who deny have yet to offer an explanation strong enough to withstand the criticism of the sceptics themselves.

(3) The testimony of the Apostles to miracles is twofold: (a) They preached the miracles of Christ, especially the Resurrection. Thus St. Peter speaks of the “miracles, and wonders, and signs” which Jesus did as a fact well-known to the Jews (Acts, ii, 22), and as published through Galilee and Judea (Acts, x, 37). The Apostles profess themselves witnesses of the Resurrection (Acts, ii, 32), they say that the characteristic of an Apostle is that he be a witness of the Resurrection (Acts, i, 22), and upon the Resurrection base their preaching in Jerusalem (Acts, iii, 15; iv, 10; v, 30; x, 40), at Antioch (Acts, xii, 30 sq.), at Athens (Acts, xvii, 31), at Corinth (I Cor., xv), at Rome (Rom., vi, 4), and in Thessalonica (I Thess., i, 10). (b) They worked miracles themselves, wondrous signs and mighty deeds (Acts, x, 38). For the healing of lame (Acts, iii, xiv), heal the sick, and drive out demons (Acts, viii, 7, 8), raise the dead (Acts, xx, 10 sq.). St. Paul calls the attention of the Christians at Rome to his own miracles (Rom., xv, 18, 19), refers to the well-known miracles performed in Galatia (Gal., iii, 5), calls the Christians of Corinth to witness to the tokens of his apostleship (II Cor., xii, 12), and gives to the working of miracles a place in the economy of the Christian Faith (I Cor., xiii). Thus the Apostles worked miracles in their missionary journeys in virtue of the power given them by Christ (Mark, iii, 15) and confirmed after His Resurrection (Mark, xvi, 17).

(4) Dr. Middleton holds that all miracles ceased with the Apostles. Mozley and Milman ascribe later miracles to pious myths, fraud, and forgery. Trench admits that few points present greater difficulty than the attempt to determine the exact period when the power of working miracles was withdrawn from the Church. This period is one of polemical bias against the Church and its teaching as against pagan cults. All kinds of objections are levelled against the miracles; and behind all attacks on the miracles of scripture. Now we are not obliged to accept every miracle alleged as such. The evidence of testimony is our warrant, and for miracles of church history we have testimony of the most complete kind. If it should happen that, after careful investigation, a supposed miracle should turn out to be no miracle at all, a distinct service to truth would be rendered. Throughout the course of church history there are miracles so well authenticated that their truth cannot be denied. Thus St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch speak of the miracles wrought in their time. Origen says he has seen examples of demons expelled, many cures effected, and prophecies fulfilled (“C. Celsum”, I, ii, III, VII). Ireneaus taunts the magic-workers of his day that “they cannot give sight to the blind nor hearing to the deaf, nor put to flight demons; and they are so far from raising the dead, as Our Lord did, and the Apostles, by prayer, and as is most frequently done among the brethren, that there is no instance of it.” (Act, ii, 28). Ac- St. Athanasius writes the life of St. Anthony from what he himself saw and heard from one who had long been in attendance on the saint. St. Justin in his second apology to the Roman Senate appeals to miracles wrought in Rome and well attested. Tertullian
challenges the heathen magistrates to work the miracles which the Christians perform (Apol., xxiii); St. Paulinus, in the life of St. Ambrose, narrates what he has seen. St. Augustine gives a long list of extraordinary miracles wrought before his own eyes, mentions names and particulars, describes them as well known, and says they happened within two years before he published the written account (De civit. Dei, XXII, vili; Retract. I, viii). St. Jerome wrote a book to confute Vigilantius and prove that relics should be venerated, by citing miracles wrought through them. Theodoret published the life of St. Simon Stylites while the saint was living, and thousands were alive who had been eye-witnesses of what had happened. St. Victor, Bishop of Viterbo, wrote the history of the Miracles of St. Agnes. The descriptions of these miracles have all been cut out by command of Hunneric, and who yet retained the power of speech, and challenges the reader to go to Reparatus, one of them then living at the palace of the Emperor Zeno. From his own experience Sulpician Severus wrote the life of St. Martin of Tours. St. Gregory the Great writes to St. Augustine of Canterbury not to be elated by the many miracles God was pleased to work through his hands for the conversion of the people of Britain. Hence Gibbon says, "The Christian Church, from the time of the Apostles and their disciples, has claimed an uninterrupted succession of miraculous powers, the gift of tongues, of visions and of prophecy, the power of exorcising evil spirits, the power of healing the sick and of the dead" (Decline and Fall, I, pp. 264, 288); thus miracles are so interwoven with our religion, so connected with its origin, its promulgation, its progress and whole history, that it is impossible to separate them from it. The existence of the Church, the kingdom of God on earth, in which Christ and His Holy Church is to be reconciled, is the only way of salvation. The history of the miracles of the Divine life of saints of all countries and all times, is a perpetual standing witness for the reality of miracles (Bellar., "De notis eccl.", LIV, xiv). The well-attested records are to be found in the official processes for the canonization of saints. Mosley held that an enormous distinction exists between the miracles of the Gospel and those of church history, through the false notion that the sole purpose of miracles was the attestation of revealed truth: Newman denies the contention and shows that both are of the same type and as well-authenticated by historical evidence.

VII. PLACE AND VALUE OF THE GOSPEL MIRACLES.

In studying the Gospel miracles we are impressed by the fact that only a very small proportion of them is related by the Evangelists in detail; the Gospels speak only in the most general terms of the miracles Christ performed in the great missionary journeys through Galilee and Judea. We read that the people, seeing the things which He did, followed Him in crowds (Matt., iv, 25) to the sea of Galilee. The multitude of people so great that He could not enter the cities, and His fame spread from Jerusalem through Syria (Matt., iv, 24). His reputation was so great that the priests of Jerusalem sent word to the people (Luke, ix, 1, 2) to the sea of Galilee that He could enter the cities, and His fame spread from Jerusalem through Syria (Matt., iv, 24). The Book of the Dead (Resurrection of Lazarus (John, xi, 15), Christ's last prayer for the, Apocalypse, ii, 9), and the Transfiguration (Matt., xviii), the Transfiguration of the Lord (Luke, viii), and the Resurrection of Lazarus (John, xi, 15) and the Incarnation of the Word, and adds, "We saw His glory" (John, i, 14). Hence Ireneus (Adv. haer. V) and Athanasius (Incar.) teach that the works of Christ were the manifestations of the Divine Word who in the beginning made all things and who in the Incarnation displayed His power over nature and man, as a manifestation of the new life imparted to man and a revelation of the character and purposes of God. The repeated references in the Acts and in the Epistles to the "glory of Christ" have relation to His miracles. The source and purpose of the miracles of Christ is the reason for their intimate connexion with His life and work. They were not only a means of testing the faith of the people, but the purpose of the miracles, as it was of the doctrine and life of the eternal Son of God. (c) Their motive was mercy. Most of Christ's miracles were works of mercy. They were performed not with a view to awe men by the feeling of omnipotence, but to show compassion for sinful and suffering humanity. They are described by the Gospel writers as acts of sympathy, but as prompted by a deep and abiding mercy which characterizes the office of Saviour. The Redemption is a work of mercy, and the miracles reveal the mercy of God in the works of His Incarnate Son (Acts, x, 38).

(d) Hence we can see in them a symbolical character. They were signs, and in a special sense they signified by the typical language of external facts, the inward renewal of the soul. Thus, in commenting on the miracle of the widow's son at Naim, St. Augustine says that Christ raised three from the death of the body, but thousands from the death of sin to the life of Divine grace (Serm. de verbis Dom., xviii, xi). The miracle of the loaves and fishes is the religious, and by the fact that only a very small proportion of them is related by the Evangelists in detail; the Gospels speak only in the most general terms of the miracles Christ performed in the great missionary journeys through Galilee and Judea. We read that the people, seeing the things which He did, followed Him in crowds (Matt., iv, 25) to the sea of Galilee. The multitude of people so great that He could not enter the cities, and His fame spread from Jerusalem through Syria (Matt., iv, 24). His reputation was so great that the priests of Jerusalem sent word to the people (Luke, ix, 1, 2) to the sea of Galilee that He could enter the cities, and His fame spread from Jerusalem through Syria (Matt., iv, 24). The Book of the Dead (Resurrection of Lazarus (John, xi, 15), Christ's last prayer for the, Apocalypse, ii, 9), and the Transfiguration (Matt., xviii), the Transfiguration of the Lord (Luke, viii), and the Resurrection of Lazarus (John, xi, 15) and the Incarnation of the Word, and adds, "We saw His glory" (John, i, 14). Hence Ireneus (Adv. haer. V) and Athanasius (Incar.) teach that the works of Christ were the manifestations of the Divine Word who in the beginning made all things and who in the Incarnation displayed His power over nature and man, as a manifestation of the new life imparted to man and a revelation of the character and purposes of God. The repeated references in the Acts and in the Epistles to the "glory of Christ" have relation to His miracles. The source and purpose of the miracles of Christ is the reason for their intimate connexion with His life and work. They were not only a means of testing the faith of the people, but the purpose of the miracles, as it was of the doctrine and life of the eternal Son of God. (c) Their motive was mercy. Most of Christ's miracles were works of mercy. They were performed not with a view to awe men by the feeling of omnipotence, but to show compassion for sinful and suffering humanity. They are described by the Gospel writers as acts of sympathy, but as prompted by a deep and abiding mercy which characterizes the office of Saviour. The Redemption is a work of mercy, and the miracles reveal the mercy of God in the works of His Incarnate Son (Acts, x, 38).

(d) Hence we can see in them a symbolical character. They were signs, and in a special sense they signified by the typical language of external facts, the inward renewal of the soul. Thus, in commenting on the miracle of the widow's son at Naim, St. Augustine says that Christ raised three from the death of the body, but thousands from the death of sin to the life of Divine grace (Serm. de verbis Dom., xviii, xi). The miracle of the loaves and fishes is the religious, and by
finally set the great seal upon His mission by rising from death, and He had explicitly foretold. Thus Roman Catholic theology, "the miracle of miracles, "the powers of nature and purpose of His kingdom, and show a connexion with some of the greatest doctrines and principles of His Church. Its catholicity is shown in the miracles of the centurion's servant (Matt., viii) and the Syro-phenician woman (Mark, vii). The Sabbatical miracles reveal its purpose, i.e., the salvation of men, and it was that Christ's kingdom is to be the Old Dispensation. His miracles teach the power of faith and the answer given to prayer. The central truth of His teaching was life. He came to give life to men, and His teaching is emphasized by raising the dead to life, especially in the case of Lazarus and His own Resurrection. The sacramental teaching of the miracles is manifested in the multiplication of loaves (John, vi), the raising of the paralytic, to show he had the power to forgive sins (and he used this power (Matt., ix) and gave it to the Apostles (John, xxi. 23)), in the multiplication of the loaves (John, vi) and in raising the dead. Finally, the prophetic element of the fortunes of the individual and of the Church is shown in the miracles of stilling the storm and walking on the water, the part of the part of nature, of fishes, of the drachma and the barren fig-tree. Jesus makes the miracle of Lazarus the type of the General Resurrection, just as the Apostles take the Resurrection of Christ to signify the raising of the soul from the death of sin to the life of grace, and to be a pledge of the power of the resurrection and deification of the final resurrection (I Thess., iv, 14).

(2) The miracles of Christ have an evidential value. This aspect naturally follows from the above considerations. In the first miracle at Cana He "manifested His glory", therefore the disciples "believed in Him" (John, ii, 11); Jesus constantly appealed to His "wonders" as evidences of His mission and His divinity. He declares that His miracles have greater evidential value than the testimony of John the Baptistist (John, v, 36); their logical and theological force as evidences is expressed by Nicodemus (John, iii, 2). And to the miracles Jesus adds the evidence of prophecy (John, v, 31). Now their value as evidences for the people that were not his own is in constant conflict with the presence and power of the Church. The last word in the divine solution of the mystery of His mission but also in the multitude of His works. Thus the unrecorded miracles had an evidential bearing on His mission. So we can see an evidential reason for the selection of the miracles as narrated in the Gospels.

(a) This selection was guided by a purpose to make clear the main events in Christ's leading up to the Crucifixion and to show that certain definite miracles (e.g., the cure of the lepers, the casting out of demons in a manner marvellously superior to the exorcisms of the Jews, the Sabbath, miracles, the raising of Lazarus) caused the rulers of the Synagogue to conspire and put Him to death. (b) A second reason for the selection was the expressed purpose to prove that Jesus was the Son of God (John, xx, 31). Thus, for us, who depend on the Gospel narratives, the evidential value of Christ's miracles comes from a comparatively small number related in detail, though of a most stupendous and clearly supernatural kind, some of which were performed almost in private and followed by no immediate success. In considering them as evidences in relation to us now living, we may add to them the constant reference to the multitude of miracles unrecorded in detail, their intimate connexion with our Lord's teaching and life, their relation to the prophecies of the Old Testament, their own prophetic character, as fulfilled in the development of His kingdom on earth. VIII. SPECIAL PRAYER. Prayer is a great fact, which finds expression in a persistent manner, and enters intimately into the life of humanity. So universal is the act of prayer that it seems an instinct and part of our being. It is the fundamental fact of religion, and religion is a universal phenomenon of the human race. Christian philosophy teaches that in his spiritual nature man is made to the image and likeness of God, therefore his soul instinctively turns to his Maker in aspirations of worship, of hope, and of intercession. The real value of prayer has been a vital subject for discussion in modern times. Some, like O. B. Frothingham (Recollections and Impressions, p. 296), Dr. M. W. Herber (Pfeiffer, "Phil. of Religion", II, p. 296), hold that its value lies only in its being a factor in the culture of the moral life, by giving tone and strength to character. Thus Professor Tyndall, in his famous Belfast address, proposed this view, maintaining that modern science has proved the physical value of prayer to be unbelievable (Fragments of Science). He based its contention on the uniformity of nature. But this basis is no longer held as an obstacle to prayer for physical benefits. Others, like Baden-Powell (Order of Nature), admit that God answers prayer for spiritual favours, but denies its value for physical effects. But his basis is the same as that of Tyndall, and besides an answer for spiritual benefits is in fact an interference with the operation of nature. Christian philosophy teaches that God, in answer to prayer, confers not only spiritual favours but at times interferes with the ordinary course of physical phenomena, so that, as a result, particular events happen otherwise than they should. This interference takes place in miracles and spiritual providence.

When we kneel to pray we do not always beg God to work miracles or that our lives shall be constant prodigies of His power. The sense of our littleness gives an humble and reverential spirit to our prayer. We trust that God, through His Infinite knowledge and power, will in some way best known to Him bring about what we ask. Hence, by special providences we mean events which happen in the course of nature and of life through the instrumentality of natural laws. We cannot discern either in the event itself or in the manner of its happening any deviation from the known course of things. What we do know, however, is that events shape themselves in response to our prayer. The last word in the divine solution of the mystery of His mission but also in the multitude of His works. Thus the unrecorded miracles had an evidential bearing on His mission. So we can see an evidential reason for the selection of the miracles as narrated in the Gospels.
his play in the East, and mingles with heroic episodes of the crusades realistic pictures taken from taverns. His drama concludes with a general conversion of the Mussulmans secured through a miracle of St. Nicholas. Rutebeuf, who flourished in the second half of the thirteenth century, was born in Champagne, but lived in Paris. Though at first a gambler and glutton, he seems to have had a new experience. His miracle depicts the legend, so famous in the Middle Ages, of Theophilus, the "Economus of the Church of Adana in Cilicia, who on losing his office bartered his soul to the devil for its recovery, but, having repented, obtained from the Blessed Virgin the miraculous return of the nefarious contract.

MIRACLES OF OUR LADY.—Save for the play of Griselisa, whose heroine, a poor shepherdess, married to the Marquis de Saluces, is subjected to cruel trials by her husband, and through the protection of St. Agnes triumphs over all obstacles, the entire dramatic activity of the fourteenth century was devoted to the miracles of Our Lady. Forty-two specimens of this style of drama are extant. Herein the Blessed Virgin saves or consoles through marvellous intervention those who are guiltless and unfortunate and sometimes great sinners who have confidence in her. The author or authors of these works are unknown.

MIRACLE PLAYS AND MYSTERIES.—These two names are used to designate the religious drama which developed among Christian nations at the end of the Middle Ages. It should be noted that the word "mystery" has often been applied to all Christian dramas prior to the sixteenth century, whereas it should be confined to those of the fifteenth century, which represent the great dramatic effort anterior to the Renaissance. Before this period dramatic pieces were called "plays" or "miracles". The embryonic representations, at first given in the interior of the churches, have been designated as liturgical dramas.

The mystic origin of the medieval drama was in religion. It is true that the Church forbade the faithful during the early centuries to attend the licentious representations of decadent paganism. But once this immoral theatre had disappeared, the Church allowed and itself contributed to the gradual development of a new drama, which was not merely educational for the devout but a fitting accompaniment of solemn feasts, such as Easter and Christmas, the Office was interrupted, and the priests repeated, in the presence of those assisting, the religious event which was being celebrated. At first the text of this liturgical drama was very brief, and was taken solely from the Gospel or the Office of the day. It was in prose and in Latin. But by degrees versification crept in. The earliest of such dramatic "tropes" (q.v.) of the Easter service are from England and date from the tenth century. Soon verse pervaded the entire drama, prose became the exception, and the vernacular appeared beside Latin. Thus, in the French drama of the "Wise Virgin" (first half of the twelfth century), in which a little maidservant, parable of the wise and foolish virgins, the chorus employs Latin, while Christ and the virgins use both Latin and French, and the angel speaks only in French. When the vernacular had completely supplanted the Latin, and individual inventiveness had at the same time asserted itself, the drama left the precincts of the Church. It is written to be listened to in the theatre, without, however, losing its religious character. This evolution seems to have been accomplished in the twelfth century. With the appearance of the vernacular a development of the drama along national lines became possible. Let us first trace this development in France.

PLAYS AND MIRACLES OF THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES.—The first French drama offered by the twelfth century is called "Adam", and was written by an Anglo-Norman author whose name is unknown. The subject extends from the Fall in the terrestrial Paradise to the time of the Prophets who foretell the Redeemer, relating in passing the history of the Jews. It is written to be listened to in the theatre, the directions to the actors are in Latin. It was played before the gate of the church. From the thirteenth century we have the "Play of St. Nicholas" by Jean Bodel, and the "Miracle of Theophilus" by Rutebeuf. Jean Bodel was a native of Arras, and followed St. Louis on the crusade to Egypt. He lays the scene of
contemporaries would care to submit. In some "passions" the actor who represented Christ had to recite nearly 4000 lines. Moreover, the scene of the crucifixion had to last as long as it did in reality. It is related that in 1437 the curé Nicolle, who was playing the part of Christ at Metz, was on the point of dying on the cross, and had to be revived in haste. During the same representation another priest, Jehan de Missey, who was playing the part of Judas, remained hanging for so long that his heart failed and he had to be cut down and borne away.

As regards the aesthetic side of this drama, modern standards should not be applied. This theatre does not even offer unity of action, for the scenes are not derived from one another; they succeed one another without any other unity than the interest which attaches to the chief personages and the general idea of eternal salvation, whether of a single man or of humanity, which constitutes the common foundation of the picture. Moreover, side by side with pathetic and exalted scenes are found others which savour of buffoonery. The plays used as many as one, two, and even five hundred characters, not counting the chorus, and until 1548, 1549, they were performed on one occasion. This is true at least of the mysteries dating from the middle of the fifteenth century; on the other hand, the oldest of them and the miracles were rather short. Two faults have at every period characterized this dramatic style, viz. weakness and wordiness. The poets said things as they occurred to them, with references to the Bible for historical information. The miracles, generally speaking, were written by the Confrères de la Passion to play henceforth "the Sacred mysteries". The prohibition was due to the opposition of the Protestants against the mixing of comedy and fabulous traditions with Biblical teachings. These attacks aroused the scruples of some Catholics, and the judiciary considered it time to intervene. The mystery-games were forbidden by decree of the Paris, where they were forbidden to be played, was by degrees followed by the provinces. Thus the religious drama of the Middle Ages disappeared in France at the height of its success.

GEORGES BERKIN.

ENGLAND.—There is no record of any religious drama in England previous to the Norman Conquest. About the beginning of the twelfth century we hear of a play of St. Catharine performed at Dunstable by Geoffroy, later abbot of St. Albans, and a passage in Fitzstephen's "Life of Becket" shows that such plays were common in London about 1170. These were evidently "miracle plays", though for England the distinction between miracles and mysteries is of no importance, all religious plays being called "miracles". Of miracle plays in the strict sense of the word nothing is preserved in English literature. The earliest religious plays were undoubtedly in Latin and French. The oldest extant miracle in English is the "Harrowing of Hell" (thirteenth century), an apocryphal descent of Christ to the hell of the damned, and it belongs to the cycle of Easter-plays. From the fourteenth century dates the play of "Abraham and Isaac", A great impetus was again given to the religious drama in England as elsewhere by the institution of the festival of Corpus Christi (1264); generally observed since 1312, it was used for the recital of the Passion. Presently the Eastern and Christmas cycles were joined into one great cycle representing the whole course of sacred history from the Creation to the Last Judgment. Thus arose the four great cycles still extant and known as the Towneley, Chester, York, and Coventry plays, the last three designated from the place of their performance. The Towneley mysteries owe their name to the fact that the single MS, in which they are preserved was long in the possession of the Towneley family. They were performed, it seems, at Woodkirk, near Wakefield. These cycles are very heterogeneous in character, the plays being by different authors. In their present form the number of plays varies from 44 to 48, according to the source, York 48, Coventry 42. Four other plays are also preserved in the Digby codex at Cambridge. The so-called "morality" (q. v.) are a later offshoot of the "miracles". These aim at the incitement of ethical
truths and the dramatic personas are abstract personifications, such as Virtue, Justice, the Seven Deadly Sins, etc. The character called "the Vice" is especially interesting as being the precursor of Shakespeare's fool. After the Reformation the miracle plays declined, though performances in some places are on record as late as the seventeenth century.

GERMANY.—In Germany the religious drama does not show a development on as grand a scale as in France or England. The oldest extant plays hail from Freisingen and date from the eleventh century. They are in Latin and belong to the Christmas cycle. Religious dramas were early taken up by the schools and performed by travelling scholars, and this tended to secularise them. The great Tegernseer play of "Antiochus and Stratonice" was composed in Latin, but is pervaded by strong national feeling and devoted to the glorification of the German imperial power. German songs interspersed in the Latin text are found in a Passion play preserved in a MS. of the thirteenth century from Benedictbeuren. The oldest Easter-play wholly in German dates from the beginning of the thirteenth century and hails from Muri, Switzerland. Unfortunately, it is preserved only in fragmentary form. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the religious drama flourished greatly, and specimens are extant from all parts of German territory, in High as well as Low German dialects. We also meet with attempts at a comprehension of the religious drama in the manner of the great English cycles—e.g., in the Corpus Christi plays of Eger and Künzelsau in Swabia (both from fifteenth century). Subjects taken from Old Testament history are not frequently met with. Of dramatic versions of New Testament parables the "Play of the Wise and Foolish Virgins", performed in the Low German, is particularly noted on account of its tragic outcome. Landgrave Frederick of Thuringia, who was a spectator, was plunged into despair over the failure of the Blessed Virgin to save the foolish virgins, and brooding over this is said to have brought on a stroke of apoplexy, to which he succumbed in 1324. Of German miracles dealing with legendary figures are preserved. Of miracles in praise of Our Blessed Lady we have a Low German play of Theophilus and the well-known play of "Frau Jutten" (1480) by a cleric of Mühlhausen named TheodERIC Schernberg. It is the story of an ambitious woman who assumes man's disguise and attains to high ecclesiastical office, finally to the papacy itself; but her aims are disappointed, her devoted suitor, in the most rigorous penance and is ultimately saved through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin. In Germany, as in England and France, the Reformation sapped the life of the medieval religious drama. Plays continued to be produced, but the drama was often used for polemical purposes. In Catholic parts of the country the traditional performances of miracle plays have been kept up even to the present. (See article on PASSION PLAYS.)

Netherlands.—Of miracle plays and mysteries in the Netherlands few have been preserved. One of the best-known is the miracle "Van Sinte Trudo", written about 1550 by Christian Fastraets. The performance of such plays in the Netherlands was undertaken by associations formed for that purpose, especially the Rederijkerskamer (Roterijker corrupted from Rhoterico), which sprang into existence at the end of the fourteenth century. Besides the mysteries and miracles, the Netherlands also have "Spelen van Sinne"; symbolic plays corresponding to the morality plays. (See PARABLE.)


Arthur F. J. REY.

Miracles, Gift of.—The gift of miracles is one of those mentioned by St. Paul in his First Epistle to the Corinthians particularly. The gift is a manifestation of the graces of the Holy Ghost. These have to be distinguished from the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost enumerated by the Prophet Isaiah (xi, 2 sqq.) and from the fruits of the Spirit given by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians (v. 22). The seven gifts and the twelve fruits of the Holy Ghost are always infused with sanctifying grace in the souls of the just. They belong to ordinary sanctity and are within the reach of every Christian. The gifts mentioned in the Epistle to the Corinthians are not necessarily connected with sanctity of life. They are special and extraordinary powers vouchsafed by God only to a few, and primarily for the spiritual good of others. The gifts mentioned in I Cor. vii, 7: "I have given..." is the description of those "gifts of grace" which are known as the Charisv an, the name given by Latin authors; they are also designated in theological technical language as gracia gratia data (graces gratuitously given) to distinguish them from gratia grattam facientes, which means sanctifying grace or any actual grace granted for the salvation of the recipient.

The gift of miracles, as one of these charismata, was expressly promised by Christ to His disciples (John, xiv, 12; Mark, xvi, 17, 18), and St. Paul mentions it as abiding in the Church: "To another [is given] the grace of healing... To another, the working of miracles..." (I Cor., xii, 9, 10). Christ imparts this gift to chosen servants as He did to the Apostles and disciples, that His doctrine may become credible and that Christians may be confirmed in their faith, and this the Vatican Council has declared in chapter iii, "De Fide." This gift is not given to any created being as a permanent habit or quality of the soul. The power of effecting supernatural works such as miracles is not of the Omnipotence, but of God's good pleasure, which is given to either men or angels. The greatest thaumaturgus that ever appeared in this world could not work miracles at will, neither had he any permanent gift of the kind abiding in his soul. The Apostles once asked concerning a cure of demoniacal possession: "Why
could we not cast him out?" Christ replied, "this kind is not cast out but by prayer and fasting." (Matt., xvii, 18 sqq.). Elseus could not raise to life the son of the Sununmites with his staff.

The grace of miracles is therefore only a transient gift by which God moves a person to do something without his own will. Sometimes it makes use instrumentally of contact with the relics of the saints, or visits to sacred shrines for this purpose. The miraculous work is always the effect of Omnipotence; nevertheless, men and angels may be said to work miracles in a thirdfold way (1) by their prayers invoking a miraculous effect; (2) by disposing of the material, so that it is said of angels that they will in the resurrection collect the dust of the dead bodies that these may be re-animated by the Divine power; (3) by performing some other act in co-operation with the Divine agency, as in the case of the application of relics, or of visits to holy places which God has marked out for special and extraordinary favours of this kind. To Christ as a man, or to His humanity, was granted a perpetual and constant power of miracles. He was able of His free will to work them as often as He judged it expedient. For this He had the ever-ready concurrence of His Divinity, although there was in His Humanity no permanent quality which could be the immediate cause of miracles.

Benedict XIV tells us sufficient with regard to miracles in their relation to sanctity of life when explaining their estimate in the cause of the beatification and canonization of the saints. He says: "It is the common opinion of theologians that the grace of miracles is a grace gratia data, and therefore that it is given only to the just but also to sinners (though only rarely). Christ says that He knows not those who have done evil, though they may have prophesied in His name, cast out devils in His name, and done many wonderful works. And the Apostle said that without charity He was nothing, though he might have faith to remove mountains. On this passage of the Apostle, Eutius remarks: "For as it offers no contradiction to the Apostle that a man should have the gift of tongues or prophecy, or knowledge of mysteries, and excel in knowledge, which are first spoken of; or be liberal to the poor, or give his body to be burned for the name of Christ, which are afterwards spoken of and yet not have charity; so also there is no contradiction in a man having faith to remove mountains, and being without charity." (Treatise on Heroic Virtue, III, 130).

These graces manifest themselves in two ways: one way as dwelling in the Church, teaching and sanctifying her, as, for example, when even a sinner in whom the Holy Ghost does not abide works miracles to show that the faith of the Church which he preaches is true. Hence the Apostle writes: "God also bearing them witness by signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and distributions of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will" (Heb., ii, 4). In another way, the manifestation is made by the graces of the Holy Ghost as belonging to him who performs the works. Hence the Apostle says that St. Stephen, "full of grace and fortitude, did great wonders and signs among the people" (Acts, vi, 8). Here we have a distinction clearly drawn out as to the manner in which gratia gratia data may be to the advantage of the person receiving them as well as to the utility of others, and how it is that by these graces persons without the graces of the Holy Spirit, yet with the signs and wonders for the good of others. But these are rare and exceptional cases, and real miracles cannot be performed by a sinner in proof of his own personal sanctity or in proof of error, because that would be a deception and derogatory to the sanctity of God Who alone can perform miracles.

Basilian CXLIV. Heroic Virtue (London Oratorian Series.

MIRANDOLA, Giovanni Francesco Pico della, Italian philosopher, nephew of Mirandola, Giovanni Pico della (see next article), b. about 1469; d. 1533. Though very gentle and pious he was drawn into the bitter feud of his family and fell at the foot of the crucifix with his son Albert, killed by his nephew Galeotto II, who had just seized the Castle of Mirandola. His wife and the children of his other son were shut up in dreadful dungeons. At Rome he defended the eclectic Latin style against the Ciceronian style of his nephew. Like his uncle he devoted himself chiefly to philosophy, but made it his object to the theologic, that he is maturity of his, he wrote a detailed biography of his uncle and another of Savonarola. Having observed the dangers
to which Italian society was exposed at the time, he sounded a warning on the occasion of the Lateran Council: “Joannis Francisci Pici oratio ad Leomem X et concilium Lateranense de reformatione Ecclesiae Monasterii (1512)." He was created cardinal on January 1, 1512, and was made a peer of Ferrara.

He was dispatched on missions to Lillio Giraldino when the catastrophe occurred which carried him off. Giraldino commemorated the tragic event in a touching postscript to the "De secularia"

(Ins works, Basle, 1580, I, 640)."

Mirandola, Giovanni Pico della, Italian philosopher and scholar, b. 24 February, 1463; d. 17 November, 1494. He belonged to a family that had long lived in the Castles of Mirandola (Duchy of Modena), which had become independent in the fourteenth century and had received in 1414 from the Emperor Sigismund the sief of Concordia. To devote himself wholly to study, he left his share of the ancestral principality to his two brothers, and in his fourteenth year went to Bologna to study canon law and fit himself for the ecclesiastical career. Repelled, however, by the purely purely religious vocation, he devoted himself to the study of philosophy and theology, and spent seven years wandering through the chief universities of Italy and France, studying also Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic. An impostor sold him sixty Hebrew manuscripts, asserting positively that they were written by order of Eadras, and contained the secrets of nature and religion. For many years he believed in the Kabballah and interpolated its fancies in his philosophical theories. His aim was to reconcile religion and philosophy. Like his teacher, Marsilius Ficinus, he based his views chiefly on Plato, in opposition to Aristotle the doctor of scholasticism at its decline. But Pico was constitutionally a freethinker, and represented a reaction against the exaggerations of pure humanism. According to him, we should study the Hebrew and Talmudic sources, while the best products of scholasticism should be retained. His "Heptaplus," a mystico-allegorical exposition of the creation according to the seven Biblical senses, follows this idea (1512); the book was received as a book of secrets. "De ente uno," with its explanations of several passages in Moses, Plato, and Aristotle; also an oration on the Dignity of Man (published among the "Commentationes").

With bewildering attainments due to his brilliant and tenacious memory, he returned to Rome in 1486 and undertook to maintain 900 theses on all possible subjects ("Conclusiones philosophiae, cabalistica et theologicae"); Rome, 1486, in fol.). He offered to pay the expenses of those who came from a distance to engage with him in public discussion. Innocent VIII was made to believe that at least thirteen of these theses were heretical, though in reality they merely revolved around each of the seven senses of the word. Even such a mind as Pico's showed too much credulity in nonsensical beliefs, and too great a liking for childish and unsolvable problems. The proposed disputation was prohibited and the book containing the theses was interdicted, notwithstanding the author's defence in "Apologia J. Pici Mirandolani, Concordiae comitiis" (1489). One of his detractors had maintained that Kabbala was the name of an impious writer against Jesus Christ. Despite all efforts Pico was condemned, and he decided to travel, visiting France first, but he afterwards returned to Florence. He destroyed his poetical works, gave up profane science, and determined to devote his old age to a defence of Christianity against Jews, Mohammedans, and astrologers. A collection of this work was published after his death ("Disputaciones adversus astrologiam divinatricem," Bologna, 1495). Because of this book and his controversy against astrology, Pico marks an era and a decisive progressive movement in ideas. He died two months after his intimate friend Bitiani, on the day Charles VIII of France entered Florence. He was interred at San Marco, and Savonarola delivered the funeral oration.

Besides the writings already mentioned, see his complete works (Bologna, 1496; Venice, 1498; Strasburg, 1504; Basle, 1557, 1573, 1601). He wrote in Italian an imitation of Plato's "De Republica" and "Laws" ("Aurea familiae epistola"); Paris, 1490) an important study of the history of contemporary thought. The many editions of his entire works in the sixteenth century sufficiently prove his influence.

Nicchos, Mémoires, XXXIV; Straboni, Bibliotheca Moder- na, IV, 9; biography by F. Bocchi in "Storia della letteratura Italiana, VI, part I, 397; Sandusy, A History of Classical Scholarship, II (Cambridge, 1908), 113. His works are appended to those of his uncle in the ed. of Basle, 1601.)

Paul Lejay.

Miridit, Abbey of (Minditariam, or Sancti Alexandri de Orobius), the name of an abbate nullius in Albania, where there formerly stood a Benedictine abbey, now destroyed, dedicated to St. Alexander, martyr. By decree of the Council of Tours the name of its two affiliated parishes, together with five other parishes in the Diocese of Ljes (Alessio, or Alise), were removed from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Ljes. In 1893 three parishes from the Diocese of Sappa were added, and in 1894 five from Ljes. The country forms part of the Turkish dominions in Europe and is inhabited by Mohammedans and Christians. The Muslims. The Catholics number 16,650, and are under the care of secular and regular clergy. The abbot is chosen from among the secular clergy. The present abbot, Mgr. Primus Docchi, who resides at Orobi, was born at Bulgari, 7 Feb., 1846, and studied at the Propaganda College, Rome. The Franciscans have a parish and a hospital at Gomazza.

Roukin, Ethnographische und statistische Mittheilungen uber Albanien in Petermann' s Mittheilungen (1884), 367 seq.; Miserere Catholicae; Miserereve, Serafinski Periodo, XXXIII (Lavro, 1909), 126. A. L. Gancacvici.

Miserere, the first word of the Vulgate text of Psalm I (Hebrew, II). Two other Psalms (iv and ivi) begin with the same word, and all three continue with the same meaning. Psalms iv and ivi are not included in the Mishnaic or Talmudic compendia, and are not found in any of the old Septuagintic and Latin alphabetic indexes to the (Latin) Psalms they are interdistinguished by the fourth word, which in Ps. i is secundum; Ps. iv, quoniam; in Ps. ivi, mizerere: so that Ps. i will appear as "Miserere... secundum." So liturgically and musically pre-eminent is Ps. i, however, that it is commonly referred to as the Miserere, without further qualification. The psalm has a title which is one of the best authenticated of all, as it is found in the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Latin, and which in the Vulgate reads: "In finem, Psalmus David, Cum venit ad eum Nathan propheta, quando intravit ad Balthabae." This title forms vv. 1 and 2 of the psalm, and refers to the sin of David (II Kings, xi) and the rejoicing of the people when Nathan appeared with the word of God to the father of the prophets, Nathan (II Kings, xii). Some commentators think that the last two verses of the psalm were added in the time of the Captivity. Delitzsch nevertheless considers them quite admissible in the mouth of David, arguing that the Hebrew word for "building" means not only "to rebuild," but "to complete what is being built," and that Solomon's "building" (II Kings, iii, 1) can be regarded as a fulfilment of David's prayer "that the walls of Jerusalem may be built up." (The appended bibliography, which gives the suffrages of some recent Catholic commentators to the traditional ascription, in addition to the opinions of several of the more recent non-Catholic commentators.)

The Miserere has a most prominent place in the Di-
vire Office and in various ceremonies. It is the first psalm at Lauds in all the ferial (week-day) Offices throughout the year, outside of Paschal Time, and in the Stations Office from Septuagint to Palm Sunday inclusive. It holds the same place in the Office of the Dead. It is the psalm chosen for the preces feriales at Vespers for all the weekdays in Lent with the exception of the triduum of Holy Week, for those in Advent, for the ember-days except those of the Pentecost season, and for the vigils, except those of Christmas, Epiphany, the Ascension, and Pentecost. In addition it is said just before the oratio, or prayer, in all the Canonical Hours in the triduum of Holy Week, except the Vespers and Compline of Holy Saturday. As it is also the fourth in order of the seven penitential psalms (q.v.), its times of recitation will be governed by the appropriate rubrics in the Breviary. Its (or an alternative Ps. cxvi, "Te laudate omnes") is said daily in the prayers after dinner (post prandium), except on days when only one meal is taken (in which case the prayers are those styled post cernam, "after supper") and also except the times from Christmas to the Octave of the Epiphany, from Holy Saturday until Low Sunday exclusively, and from Low Sunday until Pentecost exclusively. It is very prominent in the ceremony of the Asperges (q.v.), during which the choir sings the antiphon "Asperges me, Domine, hyssopo," etc. (i.e. Ps. I, verse 8; Vulg., 9), then the verse "Miserere mei, Deus," etc. (i.e. Ps. l, 1; Vulg., 3), then the Gloria Patri, and finally the antiphon "Asperges me," the selection is repeated a number of times, generally with the sacred ministers, the entire Miserere. On Passion and Palm Sundays the Gloria Patri is omitted, and during Paschal Time the antiphon and psalm are "Vidi aquam" and "Confitemini" (Ps. cxvii) respectively.

The Miserere is found in many other ceremonial functions: at the Burial of the Dead, with the antiphon "Exultabunt Domino ossa humiliata," taken from the 9th (Vulg., 10th) verse of the psalm; at the episcopal visitation of parishes; the blessing of a bell; the consecration of an altar-stone; the laying of the corner-stone of a church; the blessing of a church, of a cemetery, of a house, of congregations, and fields; the recitation of the psalm in脑子 or of a profaned cemetery. It is especially prominent in the consecration of a church, when it is first said like other psalms, and afterwards in a more solemn manner, with the antiphon "Asperges" repeated after each group of three verses, during the sprinkling of the altar with holy water. It is a psalm which is absolutely free from excommunication (in foro externo), and by the absolving priest in the case of a deceased excommunicate who had given some sign of contrition before death, the ceremony entitling to ecclesiastical burial. At the Visitation of the Sick the priest may say the Miserere or any other of the first three penitential psalms. When the last three penitential psalms are said by the priest the same verse is repeated after each three verses, unless the priest is said the Miserere ("which is the best suited for obtaining divine mercy for the sick"—de Herdt, "Praxis") and other psalms and prayers. In monasteries it is said during the customary "discipline." It figured prominently in the ancient ceremony of the reconciliation of Penitents on Maundy Thursday, both as one of the seven penitential psalms recited by the bishop in the sanctuary, and as one of the three psalms commencing with Miserere during the prostration of clergy and laity (including the penitents). For an interesting description of this ancient function, cf. the volume entitled "Passiontide and Holy Week," of Gudranger's "Liturgical Year."

The Miserere at the Miserere is recited on the Day of Atonement. It is also found in the Anglican Communion Service. In a fragmentary form it is also prominent, in the selection of some of its most searching verses, for the preces of Prime in the Divine Office; in the verse "Domine labia mea aperiatur," etc. (i.e. Ps. cxvii, 11), in the Office commonly called Prime, in the use of the antiphon "Asperges," and the verse "Miserere" in the Communion of the Sick, and of the antiphon alone at Extreme Unction (de Herdt, "Praxis"); in the selection of various verses for use as antiphons in the Office, and for an Offertory, a Communion, and an Alleluia—verse at Mass. The partial use made of it at Mass and Office has been minutely described in Bishop Mynheer's "Essays on Divine Office work," "Carmina Scripturamur" (Strasburg, 1907), 134-36.

As remarked above, the Miserere is not only the first psalm at Lauds in the ferial Office, but is also repeated just before the oratio at the end of Lauds in the triduum of Holy Week. The thought of giving to this psalm a more traditional name than the ordinary plain-song used for the psalms in general, and of making it serve as a climax to the dramatic ceremonial of the Tenebrae, is probably due to Leo X. In 1514 the Miserere was sung to a falsobordone. The oldest example extant is that of Costanzo Festa (1517), which alternated verses in three- and four-part counterpoint with the voices singing in unison. This interestingly contrasted setting or method of treatment formed the type for imitation ever since.

The musical settings of the Miserere vary very much. Three of them (Bain's on Wednesday, Bais's on Thursday, and Allegri's on Friday afternoons) are especially famous because on one year only they are permitted to be repeated in the Chapel during the Tenebrae. Among the numerous estimates recorded by musicians and travellers on these three settings, mention may be made of Mendelssohn's, Cardinal Wiseman's, Madame de Staël's (in "Corinne"), Mr. Rockstro's (in Grove, Dictionary of Music), and especially of the young Mozart's sincerest tribute in the famous copy of the new Holy Week Music at one hearing of Allegri's Miserere with corrections made at a subsequent hearing). In the second of his "Four Lectures on the Offices and Ceremonies of Holy Week," Cardinal Wiseman gives a comparative estimate of these settings and, in accord with all who have heard them, awards the palm of supremacy to Allegri. His description is glowing and enthusiastic, but that of Mr. Rockstro is both more judicious and more precise and detailed in respect of Allegri's Miserere, of which he gives many illustrations, and which he defends against certain criticisms. (Cf. in the same dictionary articles on Bais, Baim.)

P. Maria, Translation of the Psalms and Canticles with Commentary (St. Louis, 1901), 158-90, gives a bi-columnar translation from the Vulgate and the Hebrew Masoretic text, 158-90: With the exception of the last two verses, probably added to the Psalm during the Babylonian captivity, there is no valid reason for assigning this Psalm to a poet of a later age, who undertook to set forth the thoughts and emotions of David, on the occasion mentioned in the title." D'EtRAGUES, Les Psalms traduits de l'Hebreu (Paris, 1904), 146-51, describes it to David: "Verses 20-21 were undoubtedly added after the return from captivity in the time of Ezechias when he again raised the walls of the temple. The congressional acclamation praises the work of Ps. 92 in irreproachable learning. Against the Davidic authorship: CHEVRE, The Book of Psalms (New York, 1892), 144-149; BONNER, A Study of Psalms (Cambridge, 1901), bks. II, III, 294-95, briefly disposed of some objections to the Davidic authorship and allows weight to others; LECLERCQ, Le Livre de Psalms, 150-54; KENNER, The Psalms, etc. (Baltimore, 1861), very condensed, but satisfactory; WOLGER, Psallit Sapienter (Leipzig, 1903); FREIBURG, Psalme 102 (Freiburg, 1903). For an extensive account of the mystical and liturgical uses of the Miserere—Metrical translations into English: BASHWAHR, The Psalms and Canticles in English, Proposes the use of metrical versions of the Psalms by Catholics, prescribes the use of 105 (to 108) metrics of the Psalms of David in English Metre (London, 1898), 105-9, gives two translations into English verse: THE PEALE, A revised metrical version of the Scottish, The Metrical Psalter of the Scots of the Psalms of David in English metre (Dublin, 1880), 68.—Latin metrical versions: GROSSU
CRANFORD, Paraphrasis Psalmorum Davidis Poetica (Edin- burgh, 1736), a version of nineteen Psalms in the Stile of the Sapphic and Pindaric Odes, and a Mass Sacro (Edinburgh, 1739), 44, a version into thirty-nine elegiac couplets.—MATHEW, The Psalms of David. (London, New York, 1889-98, 2 vols.) argues that the text is a representation of the Psalms' view of sin as being "infrastural." A life of disorder existing in the midst of order. TAYLOR, David, King of Israel (New York, 1874), 252-73, argues for the sincerity of the Psalmist and includes the anecdote of Voltaire's attempt to parody the Messiaens. SCHULTE, Conspectus, Benedicite (New York, 1907), 2 vols., gives an overview of the ceremonial and rubrical details of many functions in which the Psalms are included. GUGGENBERGER, Guide to Catholic Music (St. Francis, Wis., 1905), gives (202) author, voices, and grade of twenty-four settings for Burials of the Dead, and (200-01) of twenty-eight settings for Lauds of Holy Week.

H. T. HENRY.

MISERICORDE

Misericorde, Congregation of the Sisters of, a congregation of women founded 16 January, 1848, for the purpose of procuring spiritual and corporal assistance for poor matrons and unfortunate girls. The foundress, Madame Rosalie Jetté, in religion Mother Mary of the Nativity, declining to serve as superior, Sister St. Jane de Chantal held that office. The institution was approved by Pius IX, 7 June, 1867, and the constitutions, revised according to the latest rules of the Roman Congregations, received the approbation of Pius X, 21 March, 1905. The community is governed by a superior general, assisted by four councilors, a secretary, and a bursar, who reside at the mother-house, Montreal, Canada. All branch houses are under the control of the general administration. Each house is governed by a local superior and two assistants forming her council; in each a bursar has charge of property, and a chaplain is appointed by the council. There is one novitiate at Montreal, although the rules authorize more if necessary. Candidates are received from all parts of the world. The novitiate lasts a year, during which the novice is instructed in the constitutions of the order and other matters of the religious life; a supplementary noviciate of six months, in which the novice becomes familiar with the work of the order, is given before taking the vows, renewed annually during a period of five years and then made perpetual. The sisters also conduct Magdalen asylums. In receiving patients no discrimination is made in regard to religion, colour, or nationality. After their convalescence, those who desire to remain under a special religious direction are accepted and are known as "Daughters of St. Margaret." They follow a certain rule of life but contract no religious obligations. Should they desire to remain in the convent, after a period of probation, they are allowed to become Magdalen and eventually to make the vows of the Magdalen order. The congregation celebrated its five hundredth anniversary 16 January, 1953.

At present the congregation numbers professed sisters, 189; novices, 23; candidates, 10. Branch houses have been established throughout Canada and the United States. The mother-house contains 60 sisters; with this is associated an Orphan Asylum with 7 sisters, 3 infants, 525; also a hospital with 5 sisters, 25 patients. A modulation of 15 patients at the Sault-au-Recollet, P. Q., the sisters conduct a home for aged and retired priests and an Orphan Asylum with 15 sisters, 10; attendants, 15; priests, 5; orphans, 40. The hospital at Ottawa, founded in 1879, was destroyed by fire in 1900. The new building, completed in 1904, accommodates sisters, 10; nurses, 5; patients, 100. A house was established at Winnipeg, Manitoba, in 1898, of which a branch was founded at St. Norbert, Man., in 1904. The two houses have sisters, 19; trained nurses, 15; attendants, 25; average number of patients and children during the year, 700. In 1900 a house was opened at Edmonton, Alberta, with sisters, 12; trained nurses, 6; average number of patients and children during the year, 520. In 1905 the sisters have a large hospital in New York City, containing sisters, 19; average number of patients during the year, 496. From this, in 1901, was established the Orphan Asylum and Kindergarten of St. Mary's of the Angels, at Hartdale with sisters, 10; attendants, 20; average number of children during the year, 150. In Green Bay, Wis., a house was established in 1900 with sisters, 13; nurses, 13; average number of patients and children during the year, 450. In Oak Park, III., a hospital was founded in 1905 with sisters, 15; patients, 712. The establishment at Milwaukee contains accommodations for sisters, 9; patients, 112.

Sister St. Beatrice.

Misericordia. See Burial, sub-title Burial Confraternities.

Mishna. See Talmud.

Missisco and Calanca, Prefecture Apostolic of (Mesauincu et Calancu), in the canton of Grisons, Switzerland, comprises the valley of the Moesa, which starts at the pass of San Bernardino and flows into the Ticino, and also the valley of Calanca, through which the Calasanca flows. The population is 6027, of whom 6011 are Catholic (5945 Italians). For administrative purposes the prefecture is divided into two chapters, both of which are subject to an episcopal Vicar of the See of Chur. In the chapter of Missisco, which embraces the valley of Moesa, there are 8 parishes, 5 Capuchins and 4 secular priests. In the chapter of Calanca there are 11 parishes, with 5 Capuchins and 3 secular priests. At Maloja (Missisco) there is a canonic with a prior and six canons of whom three reside in Missisco and three in San Vittore. At Roveredo there is a Catholic Institute of St. Anna, under the Fathers of the "Piccola Cassa della Providenza". The prefecture was established in 1635 at the suggestion of Bishop Joseph Mohr of Chur, at whose instance the Propaganda sent Capuchin missionaries to the Italian-speaking inhabitants of Grisons valleys of Missisco and Calanca. Capuchins from Milan were the first missionaries; from 1790-1802 Novara and then until 1850 Pavia Capuchins had charge; since then the mission has been administered by the Capuchins of Ticino. The vice-prefect, Father Hilariu Odelino, resides at Canale.

Bucholz, Die katholische Kirche in der Schweiz (Munich, 1902);
Daucourt, Les églises suisses (Fribourg, 1901);
Misericordia Confraternities in Germany, Geographical Sketch of the Schweiz (Neuenburg, 1902-08).

JOSEPH LINZ.

Missal (Latin Missale from Misca, Mass), the book which contains the prayers said by the priest at the altar as well as all that is officially read or sung in connexion with the offering of the holy Sacrifice of the Mass throughout the ecclesiastical year.

The present Roman Missal, now almost universally used in the Catholic Church wherever the Latin Rite prevails, consists essentially of two parts of very unequal length. The smaller of these divisions containing that portion of the liturgy which is said in every Mass, the "Ordo Missae" with the prefaces and the Canon, is placed, probably with a view to the more convenient arrangement of the offices of the Mass, in the volume immediately before the proper Mass for Easter Sunday. The remainder of the book is devoted to those portions of the liturgy which vary from day to day according to feast and season. Each Mass consists usually of Introit, Collect, Epis- tle, Gradual and Alleluia or Tract, Gospel, Offertory, Secret, Communion, and Post-Communion, the passages or prayers corresponding to each of these titles being commonly printed in full. The beginning of the volume to the "Ordo Missae" is devoted to the Masses of the season (Proprium de Tempore) from Advent to the end of Lent, including the Christmas cycle. After the "Ordo Missae" and Canon follow immediately the Masses of the Easter season. The Missal for the day after Pentecost. Then come the proper Masses of the separate festivals (Proprium Sanctorum) for the ecclesiastical year; while these are often printed in full,
it may also happen that only a reference is given, indicating that the larger portion of each Mass (sometimes everything except the collect) is to be sought in the Common of Saints (Commune Sanctorum), printed at the conclusion of the Proprium Sanctorum (Proper of Saints). This is supplemented by a certain number of votive Masses, among the rest Masses for the dead, and a collection of sets of collects, secrets, and post-communions for special occasions. Here also are inserted certain benedictions and other miscellaneous matter, while appendixes of varying bulk supply a number of Masses conceded for use in certain present day, reproducing in substance the manuscript forms of the latter part of the Middle Ages, has resulted from the amalgamation of a number of separate service books. In the early centuries, owing to the lack of competent scribes, the scarcity of writing materials, and various other causes, economy had greatly to be studied in the production of books. The book used by the priest at the altar for the prayers of the Mass usually contained no more than it belonged to him to say. It was known commonly as a "Sacramentary" (Sacramentarium), because all its contents centred round the great act of the conserra-

localities or in certain religious orders, and arranged according to the order of the calendar. To the whole book is prefixed an elaborate calendar and a systematized collection of rubrics for the guidance of priests in high and low Mass, as also prayers for the private use of the celebrant in making his preparation and thanksgiving. It may be mentioned here once for all that the collection of rubrics now printed under the respective headings "Rubricae generales Missalis", "Ritus celebrandi Missam", and "De Defectibus circa Missam occurritibus" are founded upon a tractate entitled "Ordo Missae" by John Burchard, master of ceremonies to Innocent VIII and Alexander VI, at the close of the fifteenth century. They are consequently absent from the first printed edition of the "Missale Romanum" (1474).

**Origin of the Missal.**—The printed Missal of the
step in this evolution seems to have been furnished by the introduction of certain smaller volumes called "Libelli Missae" intended for the private celebration of Masses of devotion on ordinary days. In these only one, or at most two or three Masses, were written; but in those of the curious and small red booklets that the monks carried with them when going on their pilgrimages, all the service had to be said by the priest and all was consequently included in the one small booklet. A typical example of such a volume is probably furnished by the famous "Stowe Missal". This little book of Irish origin of which the leaves measure only five and a half by four inches, is nevertheless one of our most priceless liturgical treasures. The greater part is devoted to a single Mass of the Blessed Sacrament, in which the Epistle and Gospel are inserted entire as well as a number of communion anthems, the private preparation of the priest, and the other matter including rubrical directions in Irish. Thus, so far as Mass was concerned, it was in itself a complete book and is probably the type of numberless others—fragments of similar Irish "libelli Missae" are preserved among the manuscripts of St. Gall—which were used by missionaries in their journeys among peoples as yet only half christianized.

The convenience of such books for the private celebration of Mass where sacred ministers and choir were wanting, must soon have made itself felt. When one thinks that a single monk could supply the liturgical needs of Masses which in the eighth and ninth centuries every large monastery was called upon to say for deceased brethren in virtue of its compacts with other abbeys (see details in Ebner, "Gebeta-Verbrüderung", Ratisbon, 1890), it appears obvious that there must have been great need of private Mass-books. Consequently the custom soon became common to adapt in the larger sacramentaries to the use of priests celebrating privately by inserting in some of the "misae quotidiane votive et diverse", or sometimes again in the "commune sanctorum" such extracts from the "Graduale", "Epistolare", and "Evangelarium" as made these particular Masses complete in themselves. Examples of Sacramentaries thus adapted may be found as early as the ninth century. Ebner for instance, appeals to a manuscript of this date in the capitolar library of Verona (No. 86) where in the "Misae votiva et diverse" the choral passages are written as well as the prayers. Whether the word Missale liber was specially employed for service books for private use at that time we are not in a position to determine. Aecul in writing in 801 certainly seems to contrast the term "Missalis libellus" with what he calls "libelli sacratorii" and with "sacramentaria maiora" (see Mon. Germ. Hist. Epist., IV, 370); but the phrase was older than Aecul, for Archbishop Egbert of York in his "Dialogus" speaks of the dispositions made by him for the observance of the ember-days in "Antiphonarum cum missalisibus suis" which he had consulted at Rome (Haddan and Stubbs, "Councils", III, 421), where certainly the language used seems to suggest that the "Missalia" and "Antiphonaria" were companion volumes separately incomplete. Certainly it may be affirmed with confidence that what we now know as the "Missale plenum", a book like our present Missal, containing all the Epistles, Gospels, and the choral antiphons as well as the Mass prayers, did not come into existence before the year 900. Dr. Adalbert Ebner, who spent immense labour in examining the liturgical manuscripts of the libraries of Italy, reports that the oldest example he has known of this tenth century in the Ambrosian Library at Milan; but although such books are of more frequent occurrence from the eleventh century onwards, the majority of the Mass-books met with at this period have still only an imperfect claim to be regarded as "Missalia plena".

We find instead a great variety of transition forms belonging to the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries which may be referred in particular to two distinct types. In the first place the sacramentary, lectionary, and antiphonary were sometimes simply tied up together in one volume as a matter of convenience. Codex 101 in the library of Monza offers an example: the three component elements are all of the ninth or tenth but even earlier than this in an extant notice of the visitation of the Church of Vicus (Vie-St-Remy) in 859 by Bishop Hinemar of Reims we find mention of a "Missale cum evangelis et lectionibus seu antiphonario volumen 1". As a rule, however, the fusion between the original sacramentary and the books used by the readers and the choir was of a more tentative nature and the process of amalgamation was a very gradual one. Sometimes we find sacramentaries in which a later hand has added in the margin, or on any available blank space, the bare indication, consisting of a few initial words, of the Antiphons, the Epistles, and the Gospels belonging to the particular Mass. Sometimes the "Commune Sanctorum" and the votive Masses have from the beginning included the passages to be sung and read written out in full, though the "Proprium de Tempore" and "de Sanctis" show nothing but the Mass prayers. Sometimes again, as in the case of the celebrated Leodric Missal in the Bodleian, the original sacramentary has had extensive additions in the form of Masses which include the parts to be read and sung. In one remarkable example, the Canterbury Missal (MS. 270 of Corpus Christi, Cambridge), a number of the old prefaces of the Gregorian type have been erased throughout the volume and upon the blank spaces thus created the proper Antiphons from the Graduale, as sometimes also the Breviary lessons for each Mass, have been written entire. In not a few instances the Gospels may be found included in the Mass-book but not the Epistles, the reason probably being that the latter could be read by any clerk, whereas a properly ordained deacon was not always available, in which case the priest at the altar had himself to read the Gospel. Regarding however this development as a whole it may be said that nearly all the Mass-books written from the latter half of the thirteenth century onwards were in the strict sense Missal plenum conforming to our modern type. The determining influence which established the arrangement of parts, the selection of Masses, etc., with which we are familiar to-day, seems to have been the book produced during the latter half of the thirteenth century under Franciscan auspices and soon made popular in Italy under the name "Missale secundum conuuestudinum Romanse curis" (see Radulphus de Rivo, "De Canonum Observatione", in La Bigne, "Bib. Max. Pp.", XI, 455). The "ARIESSES OF MISSAL BOOKS through the "Missale secundum conuuestudinum Romanse curis" obtained great vogue and was destined eventually to be officially adopted and to supplant all others, throughout the Middle Ages every province, indeed almost every diocese, had its local use, and while the Canon of the Mass was everywhere the same, the prayers in the "Missale Romanse" and the "Commune Sanctorum" and the "Proprium de Tempore", were apt to differ widely in the service books. In England especially the Uses of Sarum and York showed many distinctive characteristics, and the Ordinary of the Mass in its external features resembled more the rites at present followed by the Dominicans than that of Rome. After the Reformation many of the rubric alterations introduced were produced both in England itself and especially at Paris and other French cities for use in England. Of the Sarum Missal alone nearly seventy different editions were issued between that of 1487 (printed for Caxton in Paris), and that of 1557 (London). After Elizabeth's accession no more Missals were published, but a little book entitled Missale parvum pro Sacerdoti-
FRAGMENTS OF AN EGYPTIAN LITURGY OF THE SEVENTH OR EIGHTH CENTURY
AFTER A COPY BY WALTER CRUM, WHO RECOGNIZED THEIR LITURGICAL CHARACTER
bus in Anglia, Scotia, et Ibernia itinerantibus" was printed two or three times towards the beginning of the seventeenth century for the use of missioners. Its size allowed it to be carried about easily without attracting observation, and as it contained relatively few Masses, only those for the Sundays and the principal feasts, it recalled in a measure the "libelli Missae" of the Anglo-Saxon and Irish missionaries nine centuries earlier. Even at this date the peculiarities of the Sarum Rite were not retained in the Canon and Missale of this "Missale parvum" were all Roman with the exception of one special Mass of the Holy Name of Jesus which is described in the 1616 edition as "taken from the Missal according to the Use of Sarum". Moreover, just as the Roman liturgy came in this way to prevail in England, so in France and throughout the rest of Europe the local use has for a century and more been superceded by degrees, two of the principal influences at work being no doubt the advantage of uniformity and the authority and relative purity of the Roman Missal, as authoritatively revised and improved after the Council of Trent.

The first printed edition of the "Missale Romanum" was republished by the Henry Bradshaw Society in two volumes (1899 and 1907), and was produced at Milan in 1474. Numerous editions followed, but nothing authoritative appeared until the Council of Trent left in the hands of the pope the charge of seeing to the revision of a Catechism, Breviary, and Missal. This first committed to the care of Cardinals Sede Vacante and Sede Vacante, respectively, the work of this revision was carried out by the sixteenth-century Bishops of St. Asaph, deprived of his see upon the accession of Elizabeth, and Julius Poggio, who was published in 1870. St. Pius V published a Bull on the occasion, still printed at the beginning of the Missal, in which he enjoined that all diocesan and religious orders of the Latin Rite should use the new revision and no other; especially in the view of the Council of Trent, made in the session of two hundred years. In this way the older orders like the Carthusians and the Dominicans were enabled to retain their ancient liturgical usages, but the new book was accepted throughout the greater part of Europe. A revised edition of the "Missale Romanum" appeared in 1694 accompanied by a brief of the same date on the constitution of the Society of Jesus and the use of the Missale Romanum, which were published in the antiphonal passages of the Pian Missal had been replaced, through the unauthorized action of certain printers, by the text of the newly edited Vulgate. Another revision bearing even more upon the rubrics followed, with the result that the text was rendered more understandable in the nineteenth century, owing largely to the exertions of Dom Guéranger, the Benedictine liturgist, a number of the dioceses of France which had up to this time persistently adhered to their own distinctive use upon a more or less valid plea of immemorial antiquity, made a sacrifice to uniformity and accepted the "Missale Romanum" ordered by the suffering Pope Clement X. The Archbishop of Paris gave his official approval a year later, 24 April, 1626, to the contract of foundation, and on 4 Sept., 1626, before two notaries of Châtelet in Paris, Vincent and his first companions declared that they had joined together "to live in a community or confraternity and to devote themselves to the salvation of the poor country people". Only three priests signed this declaration with Vincent de Paul: Du Coudray, Portail, and de la Salle. Very soon afterwards four other priests joined the little company: John Bégu, of the Diocese of Amiens; Anthony Lucas, of Paris; John Brunet, of the Diocese of Clermont; and John d'Hargny, of the Diocese of Noyon. The King of France, Louis XIII, added his seal on 11 July, and the act of foundation already approved by ecclesiastical authority the preceding year. In May, 1627, he issued letters patent, allowing the missionaries to form

---

**Mission, Congregation of Priests of the.** — A congregation of secular priests with religious vows founded by St. Vincent de Paul. The members add the letters C.M. to their name. As with many other communities, an appellation from the founder or the place they dwell in has superseded the original title. Thus in France and in almost all countries they are called Lazarists, because it was in the Priory of St. Lazare in Paris that St. Vincent de Paul dwelt and that he established his principal works. In the Irish province, which includes practically all English speaking countries except the United States, they are called Vincentians, and this name is gradually replacing that of Lazarists in the United States. In countries whose language is Spanish they are called Paules. This appellation, like the preceding, is obviously derived from the name of the founder. The name Congregation of the Mission indicates their first and chief object of activity.

**Origin of the Congregation.** — In the beginning of the year 1617, Vincent de Paul was at the Château de Folleville in Picardy with the family of M. de Gondy, Count de Joigny, General of the Galleys of France, and had charge of the education of M. de Gondy's sons, one of whom became the celebrated Cardinal de Retz, Coadjutor of Paris. Vincent had visited the families of objects for the building of the presbytery of the parish church of the locality in the neighbourhood. As the result of a sermon which he preached on the 25 Jan., 1617, in the church of Folleville, Vincent, with two Jesuit Fathers, began, at Mme de Gondy's request, to preach to and instruct the people of the neighbouring villages on her estates. Thus began the work which was to occupy Vincent de Paul for the next eight years. In 1624, the King of France, Louis XIII, gave his approval of the "Mise de Mme de Gondy wished to make a foundation that would secure a mission every five years for the rural population of her extensive estates. The Oratorians and Jesuits being unable to undertake this work, she urged Vincent to gather together some zealous priests and organise missions for the scattered country people. Only three priests signed this document: Vincent de Paul: Du Coudray, Portail, and de la Salle. Very soon afterwards four other priests joined the little company: John Bégu, of the Diocese of Amiens; Anthony Lucas, of Paris; John Brunet, of the Diocese of Clermont; and John d'Hargny, of the Diocese of Noyon. The King of France, Louis XIII, added his seal on 11 July, and the act of foundation already approved by ecclesiastical authority the preceding year. In May, 1627, he issued letters patent, allowing the missionaries to form
a congregation, to live in community, and to devote themselves with the consent of the bishops to works of charity. Community life being established, St. Vincent could no longer hold as his own property the Collège des Bons Enfants, which was annexed to the mission by a decree of the Archbishop of Paris granted 8 January, 1632. The court of Parishes ordered the registration of the letters patent of 1627 which the opposition of certain pastors of Paris had delayed, and pontifical authorization was granted by the Bull "Salvatoris Nostri" of Urban VIII, 12 Jan., 1632. In 1632 an important change took place in the installation of the new community. On 8 January, Vincent de Paul took the court of the house of St. Lazare, then in the outskirts of Paris. It was an immense priory where only eight regular canons of St. Victor remained and which Prior Adrian Le Bon, seeing the great good that Vincent de Paul and his missionaries were accomplishing, had resolved in concert with his religious to transfer to him. An agreement was entered into between Adrian Le Bon and his religious on one side, and Vincent de Paul acting in the name of his community on the other, on 7 Jan., 1632, and the next day the Archbishop of Paris granted the transfer of the house of St. Lazare, and came himself to introduce Vincent. Vincent left some of his priests at the Collège des Bons Enfants, which was destined to become the novitiate under the name of St. Vincent at Paris. The house of St. Lazare became the headquarters of the Congregation of the Mission.

The Congregation of the Mission, according to the desire of its founder and from a canonical standpoint, is a "congregation of secular clergymen"; this is the term the Sovereign Pontiffs use; for instance, Benedict X, in the Bull of the Beatification of St. Vincent de Paul calls him "Congregationis presbyterorum secularium Missionis fundator" (13 August, 1729). To ensure its permanency St. Vincent surrounded his work with safeguards including vows, but on the other hand, for many reasons, was careful to prevent its becoming a religious order: Meanwhile the missionaries extended their labours over France and in foreign lands. They undertook labours of various kinds. But the exact form of the congregation had not yet been determined. Vincent saw communities around him, which he used to say, people entered and left like a well conducted hotel. In 1642 and 1651 he held two assemblies of the priests who had been long engaged in the mission. The decision for the establishment of the Congregation of the Mission was made at the second assembly on 22 Sept., by the Brief "Ex commissio Nobis", the constitution of the community. The Brief declares that at the end of two years of probation, simple vows are to be taken, but that nevertheless the community belongs to the secular clergy. That there might be no question of changing the nature of his institute, Vincent did not establish a novitiate for the aspirants to his community, but a seminary, which is known as internal, to distinguish it from the diocesan or external seminaries. He also made it a rule that his missionaries wear the dress of secular priests; in a word that they should be distinguished, in the exercise of the apostolic functions, only by their organized effort to serve God (ed. Maurice, "St. Vincent", I, p. 253, ed. 1886). Such is the canonical status of the Congregation of the Mission.

II. Rule and Government.—There was, moreover, need of rules according to which the society he had just constituted should perform its functions. Vincent de Paul wished to test first, by experience, what circumstances might gradually require among the missionaries as to their manner of life and their work. Thus he was 82 years old when, 17 May, 1668, he distributed to the community the little book of "Common Rules or Constitutions". From these rules can be seen the elements of which the congregation is made up, the life it leads, its spirit, and the means it employs in its work with the poor. The constitutions of the congregation contain the constitutions of the British Congregation of the Mission, and also of all other congregations presented of the same name. The constitutions are divided into three parts: the general constitutions, those relative to the religious, and others relative to the laymen, the clergy, and the young people. The constitutions of the Congregation of the Mission are the expression of the "rule of life" of the life of the bishop and of the entire congregation. Each one shall be employed in preaching the Gospel to the poor, especially to poor country people, in helping ecclesiastics to the knowledge and virtues requisite for their state.

During the life of the founder, establishments were made not only in France but also in Poland and in Italy. The congregation undertook mission work in the North, in the Hebrides, in the Tropics, in Barbary and Madagascar. It was under Vincent (in 1642) that the houses of the congregation were grouped in provinces, each having at its head a provincial superior called viscount. The same year a rule was introduced for the holding of general assemblies, for the election of the superior general, for the nomination of his advisers under the name of assistants, and for other matters of importance. The following establishments were founded in St. Vincent's lifetime: in Paris: Bons Enfants (1625) and St. Lazare (1632); Toul: seminary and mission centre (1835); Notre
Dame de la Rose: missions (1637); Richelieu: parish and missions (1638); Annecy: seminary and mission (1639); Crécy: missions (1641); Cahors: seminary, parish, and missions (1643); Marseilles: mission (1643); Sédan: parish and mission (1643); Saumur: mission (1644); Toul: seminary and missions (1644); Le Mans: seminary and missions (1645); Saint-Méen: missions (1645); Paris: St. Charles Seminary (1645); Treguer: seminary and missions (1648); Montauban: seminary and missions (1652); also foundations in Rome (1642), Genoa (1645), Turin (1646), and Alger, Tlemcen (1646), Madagascar (1648). At the death of its founder the congregation numbered 500 members.

The government of the congregation is very simple. It consists of the superior general, and four assistants, aided by the procurator general and secretary general. Although these officials are chosen by a majority vote of a general assembly, which is composed of the superiors of the several provinces and two delegates from each province, elected by secret ballot in the provincial assemblies. Each house in domestic assembly selects also by secret ballot, a delegate to accompany the superior to the provincial assembly. The provincial government is made up of a visitor appointed by the superior general and of consultors approved by him. In the provinces the assistant superiors are selected by the provincial council, and presented to the superior general who chooses one to govern the province. Local superiors also are appointed by the superior general, with the advice of the visitor and his council. A general assembly is held every twelve years to legislate for the congregation. This is the only legal body in the congregation.

An assembly is held every six years made up of the general officers of the congregation, and of one delegate from each province. This body may elect to vacancies among the superior general's assistants and may also decide minor matters of discipline. Decrees of general assemblies are binding on the entire congregation. Their interpretation rests with the superior general and his council. The office of superior general is held for life, or until his resignation. Provision is however, made in the "Constitutions" for his removal from office for crime, or perpetual inability to govern. Visitors remain in office at the discretion of the superior general. In like manner local superiors are removable by the superior general, but however, must be approved by the superior general, who alone has the right to appoint and remove superiors.

III. HISTORY.—From St. Vincent until the Revolution.—From St. Vincent's death until the Revolution there were nine superiors general, whose part was to complete the organization of the new society and to forward the various works for which it was instituted. These superiors general were: René Alméras (1661), Edmund Jolly (1673), Nicolas Pierron (1697), Francis Watel (1703), John Bonnet (1711), John Couty (1726), Louis Debras (1747), Antoine Jacquier (1768-1789).

Félix Cayla was at the head of the congregation during the French Revolution. It was during the general assembly of 1786 that a "Constitution of Rules" was drawn up. They were discussed and accepted by the general assembly held that year from 15 July to 1 Sept., and were approved in October following by the Archbishops of Paris, Harduin de Pérez, with authority granted him by the Bull of Urban VIII, in 1693. The constitution of 1786, the "superior general and the government of the whole Congregation of the Mission," these are the general constitutions in force at the present day. Alméras is responsible for the compilation of an abridgment of these constitutions which has a still greater authority in the sense that this condensed edition under the name of "Summary," or, in Latin "Constitutiones selectae," discussed in the general assembly of 1668 and approved by it, has been submitted to the authority of the Holy See. The text was examined and changed in some points by the examiners appointed by the pope. In this form it has been cited in its entirety in the Bull of Urban VIII, 17 January, X of 2 June, 1670. This is the chief act of internal legislation for the Lazarists. It has been published in the "Acta apostolicae in gratiam Congregationis Missionis" (Paris, 1876). Alméras secured the drawing up of the rules for the offices, which were sent to all the houses in 1670. Edmund Jolly completed this work.

Bonnet, elected in 1711, had the longest and fullest generalship of all the superiors general before the Revolution. He had keen intelligence and great capacity for work. A brief sketch of his life and character is given in the preface to a collection of meditations which he composed and Collet published. He had to pass over his community through the difficult period of Jansenism. His congregation in charge of a great number of seminaries, and hence in close contact with a great number of bishops whose tendencies were very doubtful, was indeed in a delicate position. Rome condemned Jansenism, and Bonnet, regardless of the inconveniences his community might suffer, here and there, as a consequence, he firmly the congregation and expelled from the congregation men otherwise most distinguished such as Humbert and Philopold. After him, Couty and Debras showed themselves equally faithful and courageous in the doctrinal difficulties which still continued. The Congregation of the Lazarists had sometimes to suffer for this fidelity: for instance at Auxerre all the directors of the seminaries were placed under interdict by de Caylus, an imperious bishop, a friend of the Jansenists, but they were reinstated by de Condorcet, his successor (see Migne, "Dictionnaire des Ordres Religieux," II, 796). The Lazarists held firmly to the side of Rome. One of them, Saurdi, superior of the seminary of Avignon, published an important work "De Suprema Romani Pontificis auctoritate" (1747), which passed almost in its entirety into the work of Abbé, afterwards Cardinal, Vellécourt, on "The Rights of the Holy See." Another Lazarist, Peter Collet, produced among other works, a theology of merit, which made him the butt of various attacks. In 1764 appeared a "Denunciation" of the author's title. Collet addressed to the Bishop of Troyes by a great number of ecclesiastics of his diocese (120 pp. duodecimo, 1764). The clergymen who signed it numbered one hundred and nine says an anonymous note. They accuse Collet of inclining scandalously towards a lax morality. The period of the French Revolution was approaching. The superior general since 1788 was Félix Cayla, a man of great ability. Elected as the first alternate for the deputation of the clergy of the National Assembly, he had in fact to take part in it because of the departure of one of the ecclesiastical deputies, and he refused at the tribunal of the assembly the oath for the civil constitution in 1791.

When St. Vincent de Paul died in 1660 the secular clergy of Paris had a solemn service at which the preacher, Henry de Maupas du Tour, Bishop of Puy, who had been for many years in very close intimacy with Vincent did not hesitate to take as his text; "Whose praise is through all the churches" (II Cor., viii, 18). Abbe, in the history of Religion, four years later, declared that the work founded by this humble priest had already extended most widely and through his congregation would spread still more.

(1) Missions.—The end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century was for France a half century of political and religious anarchy. The clergy of the large cities, where there were universities,
were cultured, but the rural clergy were ignorant and neglected their flocks, who, in face of the disorders created by the conflict between the Protestant Reformation and the Catholic Church, were losing their faith. Vincent de Paul, deeply concerned about this situation, launched a campaign to train priests and religious to serve in the countryside. His goal was to restore faith and ensure the spiritual welfare of the people. He was supported by his brother, Louis de Paul, who became a priest and helped him in his mission.

The first mission of the Lazarists was in the suburbs of Paris and in Picardy and Champagne. The method and rule given by St. Vincent de Paul has been preserved for us by Abelly, a contemporary biographer, "and which he wished his spiritual sons to observe most faithfully; to give all the instructions and render all services gratuitously without being in any way subject to charges," and this the priests of the Mission have inviolably observed. It was for this reason that Vincent de Paul would not agree to the establishment of a mission house unless it had a sufficient foundation to allow the missions to be given gratuitously. In the missions, indeed, where there are no stipends it has been the custom of St. Vincent's missionaries to accept whatever offering might be made them, but this usage is confined to English speaking countries, elsewhere this most disinterested custom is in full vigour. The fruits of these missions were very marked and many bishops desired to procure this beneficial religious service for their dioceses. St. Vincent, therefore, was appointed Bishop of the Congregation, and, while he was at the Collège des Bons Enfants, that is to say from 1625 to 1632, St. Vincent himself gave one hundred and forty missions.

In 1638 Louis XIII wished Vincent to have his missionaries give a mission at St. Germain-en-Laye and Pau. St. Vincent, however, refused the request, and the following year offered many excuses but to no avail. He recommended his missionaries to preach as simply as at court as they did in the rural districts, having nothing in view but the good of souls. The mission was a complete success and Anne of Austria, a few years later, 1641, asked for another in the same place, and under the same conditions. At this time, every third year, a visitation of the Congregation of the Mission was made by St. Vincent himself.

"A mission was given among the banditti and these wretched people were converted by the grace of God." Elsewhere he generalizes: "Of all the means which the Almighty has left to mankind for the correcting of their lives there is none that has produced effects more striking, more multiplied and more marvelous than the establishment of missions. The missions founded by St. Vincent and his missionaries and the spiritual exercises of the Lazarists have done for religious and the clergy and for individuals among the laity, the missions as organized by the Lazarists have done for the people at large. Vincent fully appreciated the value of retreats and his house and the houses of his sons have always been open to laymen and clergy for retreats. From their foundation to the present time insurmountable obstacles have been given throughout the Catholic world and the pioneers in the field have done a goodly share of the work. It has been, however, earnestly pursued by almost all the active orders and, especially in recent years, by zealous members of the diocesan priesthood. St. Vincent always insisted that this is the chief work of his community and should be his only task and his only members.

From 1652 to 1660 more than seven hundred missions were given from the house of St. Lazare alone. The number of those given by the missionaries in various dioceses of France cannot be reckoned. (2) Parishes and Chapels.—It is only with regret that the reader is obliged to omit the mention of the chapels and parishes. For they wish to be free to go here and there on missions to give the help peculiar to their ministry, and by preaching and hearing confessions to revive if need be or maintain the good effects of the work of the parish priests. They accepted the charge of parishes and chapels only in two circumstances: when they could make of these parishes a residence for other missionaries who would go out preaching missions, or when circumstances made it impossible to refuse. An example of these circumstances is the parish of Richelieu founded by the Cardinal of that name, minister of Louis XIII, and the parish of Sedan. In 1638 Cardinal Richelieu wished to establish the Lazarists not only in the city of his cardinal title but also in the Diocese of Luçon of which he had been bishop. By an act of 4 Jan., passed at Ruel, he obtained of Vincent seven priests who were to be sent to Richelieu in the following February, and to whom three others should be added within two years. Four of these the act declares "shall remain at Richelieu to perform the ministrations of the faith dictated by the law of the Church, and shall attend every five years for the same purpose, to every town and village of the duchy, and while awaiting the time to begin their rounds again they shall give missions in the Diocese of Poitiers, or other places in the adjacent country as it shall please His Eminence to arrange. The three remaining priests shall be sent to the ordinaries of the said duchy for the execution of the same work in the country four times a year at the period most suited for this work, and labour there for six weeks each time. One of the four priests living at Richelieu shall act as pastor with as many assistants as shall be deemed expedient. In the house of Richelieu shall be received gratuitously and for twelve days those who wish to come to be instructed, who shall be assigned to the care of the said ordinaries for the four seasons of the year, and for fifteen days such priests of the diocese as the Bishop of Poitiers shall send to make the exercises of the spiritual retreat." On his part the cardinal agrees to have erected and to furnish a suitable house and to obtain the annexation of the parish to the Congregation of the Mission and to procure the necessary support and protection for the said priests.

Sometimes special spiritual needs have caused the Lazarists to accept a parish. Hardly was Louis XIII in possession of Sedan when he desired Vincent to send his priests there. The needs of religion were very pressing for, through their continual intercourse with the Huguenots, the number of Catholics was diminishing. St. Vincent's diocese was particularly exposed to this decay. The parish of Sedan was at first transferred to the Mission by the Archbishop with the consent of the Abbot Mouzon and the religious of the abbey, and Louis XIII gave an annual income of 2,500 livres for the administration of the parish and the support of the missions. Besides a priest to officiate at Baion, St. Vincent gave four to the Sedan diocese. The Lazarists have continued to be established there to the present time.
to the districts surrounding Sedan almost depopulated by war and they helped the people by exhortations and aims. Their charity thus helped their preaching and gained the hearts of those that were least disposed to listen for it. Protesting as well as the Catholics as Brother Sirven testifies whose eulogium Vincent wrote in a letter to Laudin in Mans, 7 Aug., 1660: "The whole city and surrounding country regret him, even the heretics who were edified by his modesty and aided by his charity."

(3) The Seminaries.—The Congregation of the Mission founded by St. Vincent has always as its chief object together with the missions devotion to the service of ecclesiastics. In France in his day there were in the cities a certain number of well educated and distinguished clergymen, but the great majority especially in the country places had no practical means of formation. Many zealous priests of this period, Coudren and Berulle of the Oratory, Bourdoise of St. Nicholas, above all Olier of St. Sulpice were preoccupied with the matter. Vincent used to say, as it is of the utmost importance for a military commander after he has conquered a country to leave behind him garrisons to maintain his conquest, so when apostolic men have led the people to God, or brought them to a knowledge of our religion, Vincent's time and labors had to preserve this conquest, by procuring worthy and zealous priests to labour among them. He arranged with the Bishop of Beauvais as early as 1628 for a retreat for those to be ordained in that city. During the days preceding ordination they were assembled for exercises of piety and for immediate preparations for the work for which they had been ordained. Then he placed at the house des Bons Enfants, afterwards dust it Lazare for the Diocese of Paris. The archbishop made them obligatory for all who received orders in Paris. At Rome, enjoined by the pope, they have been held at the house of the Lazarists at Montecitorio up to the present day. At Paris in the house des Bons Enfants, the Vincentians used to hold, under the direction of the Superior, an ecclesiastical seminary and gave it a rule for the exercise of piety and for the order of studies. It is no doubt the same that was put in practice by the Lazarists when they began the theological seminary at Annecy in 1641, and in the seminary at Alet. It was in substance which is in the vogue of the seminars of the Jesuits as director by Prieur (op. cit., II, 211), exhibits an excellent compromise between the secular and the cloistered life and a wise mingling of study, piety, and discipline. The object is to fit the cleric for his sacred functions. In the seminary as conceived and actually established by St. Vincent's students of classics were separated from students of theology. He withdrew the former pupils at Bons Enfants and placed them in a separate establishment at St. Lazare, in what constituted the preparatory seminary of St. Charles. The beneficial effect was immediately apparent.

As early as 1647, Vincent de Paul could write what he afterward embodied in his "Constitutions": "Our institute is, therefore, in the service of the poor country people and the seminaries." After the first successes of Vincent and Olier there was a rivalry among the bishops to endow their dioceses with these most useful establishments. In 1643 the Lazarists were entrusted by Alain de Solminiac, Bishop of Cahors, with a mission house and the direction of the seminary of that city. In 1644 the Bishop of Saintes placed them in charge of his seminary; in 1645 those of Mans, of St. Malo and St. Méné were confided to them; that of Agen in 1650, and of Montaubon in 1660. After the death of the saint until the time of the Revolution the following seminaries were directed by the Lazarists: Narbonne and Metz (1662); Vannes (1663; Nancy (1675); Lille (1684); Angoulême (1704); Avignon (1705); Nîmes (1706); Toulouse (1707); Poitiers (1710); Saint-Servan (1712); Pamiers and Tours (1715); Mornant (1717); Chartres (1719); Villefranche (1723); Figesac (1735); Ales (1762); Lurs (1763); La Rochelle and Metz (1763), Rodez (1767); Luçon (1771); Cambrai (1772); Albi (1789); most were visited, finally, in the years 1778, the last seminary that was given to the Congregation before the Revolution. In all 43 theological and 9 preparatory seminaries (Maynard, II, p. 234). The Lazarists soon spread outside of France. In Italy, in 1641, a papal Bull authorized an establishment in Rome, and the Duchesse of Aguirillon gave them a donation to devote their time to missions for the rural population, to labour for the clergy, the spiritual retreats for those to be ordained, etc. In 1697 the pope gave them the house and church of Sts. John and Paul on the Celian Hill, but this has been exchanged for St. Sylvestre's on the Quirinal. In 1645 they were called to Genoa, to Turin in 1655, to Naples in 1668. The Lazarists preached in Ireland and in the Hebrides; later Charles II called them to London for his chapel as Louis XIV had done in France for his chapel at Versailles. In Poland, in the time of John Casimir and his queen Louise Marie de Gonzaga, they were called to Warsaw in 1651, to Krakow in 1656, to Culm in 1677, to Vilna in 1687, to Warsaw in 1700, and so on. As before the Revolution Poland was one of the most fruitful fields in Spain they were established in Barcelona and from there settled in several other cities. They reached Portugal in 1718 though not recognized by the king, John V, who up to this time was opposed to their dependence upon the superior general in Paris, but the pope afterwards favored them and built them the magnificent house of Ribafolle in the suburbs of Lisbon, a house which was confiscated by the Revolution. At the Revolution of 1834 there were six establishments of the Portuguese tongue.

(4) Foreign Missions among the Infidels.—Foreign missions had a place in the schedule of apostolic works from the time of Vincent de Paul, and although this sort of labour did not develop among the Lazarists it was for the Revolution to so great an extent as it did in the nineteenth century, yet from the beginning they gave themselves to this work. In 1645 the missionaries set out for Barbary, as they then called it. The regencies of Tunis and Algiers in the power of the Turks were a den of pirates where a great number of Christians taken prisoners by Turkish Corsairs were held captives. The Lazarists did mission work there, and from time to time they even fulfilled the duties of consul, when it was too difficult to find a layman for this office. Some were imprisoned by the Deys of Algiers, some were put to death at the cannon's mouth at Meknes. William Le Vacher, of the Lazarists, kept the ships till, finally, in 1830, France disarmed that stronghold of pirates. The Lazarists of the seventeenth century also preached the Gospel in the Island of Madagascar, and in the eighteenth century in Bourbon Island and the Isle de France. They passed over into China, at first one by one, like Appiani and Pedrini during the nunciature of Cardinal de Tournon, and like Mullener who became Vicar Apostolic of Szechuan. They were called to Macao, a possession of the Portuguese, by the Portuguese Government in 1784, and directed many houses of education there. After the suppression of the Society of Jesus and despite the refusal of the superior general because of the inadequate number and because of a decision by the Congregation of Propaganda, Cardinal de Tournon, in the name of the Congregation of Propaganda, in the name of the Congregation of Propaganda, the Pope, with the agreement between the King of France and the Propaganda at Rome, the Lazarists were charged with the duty of
taking the places, so far as they could, which had been held by the Jesuits in the Levant and in China (1782–1789). Father Viguer, a Lazarist, took possession of Constantine and itsDependencies in 1788. Father Raux, another Lazarist, took possession of the mission of Pekin. At the outbreak of the French Revolution there were in France, Spain, Portugal, and the Palatinate along with the missions outside Europe about one hundred and fifty Lazarist establishments.

Under the Revolution.—Even before the Revolution in France many nations had been the prey of internal dissensions. In the first place must be mentioned Poland whose discords were leading it to dismemberment and ruin. In 1772, in the first partition of Poland, twelve houses of the Lazarists passed under foreign dominion, Austrian, Prussian, or Russian. The Polish houses which became Austrian disappeared before the exactions of Joseph II of Austria. The King of Prussia, who when taking his share of Poland had promised to respect religious institutions, soon began confiscating ecclesiastical property. Nevertheless, in 1789 the Polish province of the Lazarists still numbered twenty-two houses. A second and a third division took place in 1793 and in 1795, among Austria, Russia, and Prussia. In these threescore and ten things happened to the Polish and Polish establishments in Poland. In the part that fell to Russia the Polish Lazarists constituted a new province called the Lithuanian, remaining as far as possible in communication with the superior general in Paris. The Polish uprisings of 1830 and 1863 drew down upon the Catholics the rigours of the Russian and Austrian Governments. The houses in Russia, now much more numerous, were destroyed by the Government in 1842 and 1864. It was only later, under the Austrian dominion, that the Polish Lazarists could reorganise. They have establishments on Austrian territory in Galicia and Bukowina. In the dominions of Italy, where three princes of the house of Bourbon reigned, life was no longer an easy matter for religious communities. In the Kingdom of Naples they were forced under penalty of suppression to stop all intercourse with the houses of the community in foreign states and especially with the superior general. This state of affairs continued from 1790 till 1815. About 1816 the houses of the congregation were divided into two provinces: the province of Rome with twelve houses and the province of Lombardy with fifteen houses which included the foundations at Barcelona, Palma, and Barbastro in Spain. In Paris on the day after the taking of the Bastille the mob made an attack upon the house of St. Lazare which had been the refuge of the chief religious of the five houses of the Paris Congregation. The furniture was broken and thrown out of the windows, the priests and students were obliged to disperse. The missionaries returned and banded together there some days afterwards, but they had to separate again in 1792, and to abandon this house in which St. Vincent had lived and died, and which was the last house of the 18 houses of the Lazarists in Paris, the old Collège des Bons Enfants, became the scene of still more dramatic events in 1792. On the second and third of September of this year massacres occurred in different establishments in Paris in which the Revolutionists had locked in the priests. The Abbey, Carmel, and St. Firmin served as prisons. In the last house more than seventy were cruelly murdered, among others the Lazarist superior of the establishment, Father Louis Joseph Francois and his confère, Henry Gruyer. The superior general of St. Lazare, Cayla, at the Assembly, refused the oath of the Civil Constitution of the clergy. Among the members of his congregation several published learned protests against it and all were sent to France where they afterwards became Constitutional bishops. A goodly number died martyrs to their fidelity to the Church of Rome. Some of these martyrs were Francois and Gruyer, massacred at St. Firmin in Paris, Matthew Caron, John Colin and John Gallico at Versailles. They werefathered by the scaffold. Father Beugnon, Cahors, John Guibaud at Mans, Louis Haeyer at Niort, Francis Martlet at Besançon. In addition, several succumbed in prison: Nicholas Bailly, Paul Brochois, Victor Juliennne, and Angelus Bernard Lamourette, nephew of the Constitutional bishop, or on the prison-ships of Rochefort and at the Isle Madame, where John Janet and Nicholas Parisot; or at Simonari, as Claude Cunin.

Such is the tribute which the Congregation of the Mission paid during the bloody Revolution. As a result of the legislation concerning the Constitutional Church and the decrees of suppression of religious orders, all the establishments of the Lazarists in France were destroyed. At that time they had in France provinces comprising 78 houses with 624 members. Obliged to flee, the superior general, Cayla, took refuge in Rome, where he died 12 February, 1800. His death at a period when the scattered members of the congregation could not come together to elect his successor, began an interregnum which was full of calamities. With vicars-general governed simultaneously, one for the Lazarists in France and the foreign missions and as superior of the Daughters of Charity, the other had authority over the Lazarists of other countries. This provisional organisation lasted until 1827, when a superior general was finally named. During these long years of cession and restoration, Cayla and Parisot remained in Rome. On the death of the superior general, Felix Cayla, in 1800, Francis Brunet, his companion in exile at Rome and his assistant, was appointed vicar-general. Returning to France in 1804 Brunet lodged at the house of the Daughters of Charity and died there in 1806. Claude Placciard, his successor, who seemed destined to succeed to the see of the ecclesiastical centre, died of a violent illness of three days. He was succeeded by Dominique Launay. The zeal with which the latter strove to maintain the authority which the superior general used to exercise over the Daughters of Charity drew upon him the animosity of the imperial power and he was imprisoned in the fortress of Fenestrellle. He did not regain his liberty before the unification of the kingdom of Italy. The vicar general of the House in Rome was sent to Paris where he died in 1816. The next year he had an opportunity to visit his country. Charles Verbert, who lived till 1819. On his death Charles Boujard was invested with the vicar-generalship, like his four predecessors, and it was under his government, lasting about eight years, that the congregation succeeded in reorganizing, and noticeably improved. The various establishments in foreign countries were French, and resided in Paris. The Italian vicar general residing in Rome were Dominic Sicardi from 1804 to 1818 and Antony Baccari from 1819 to 1827. Even under the provisional régime of the vicars-general, the work of preaching, of the seminaries, and of the foreign mission was gradually re-established. In 1816 the house of Brussels was restored to Paris where it had been before the Revolution. There were six houses in Spain, six also in Portugal, containing the college at Madrid and the Jesuits of Portuguese possession. The province of Poland or of Warsaw numbered twelve houses. The Lithuanian province because of political circumstances had but little intercourse with the superior of the congregation. The foreign missions had to suffer too from the critical conditions brought about by the Revolution in those countries, the very existence of which was menaced by the disintegration of the empire. This period of expectation was followed by a period of expansion.
After the French Revolution.—After the sanguinary crisis of the Revolution, the way was gradually paved for the restoration of the congregation. It was not until 1827, however, that its abnormal situation ceased when the two vicars-general Bonjard in France and Bocchi in Rome having resigned, Pope Leo XII, by a Brief of 16 Jan., 1827, nominated Peter Dewavresse superior general. In 1834 an imperial decree dated 27 May re-established the congregation of the Lazarists; in 1816, under the Government of the Restoration a royal ordinance recognized it in the condition in which it had been placed by the Act of 1804. It was especially on the basis of these two decrees that the Council of State of 16 Jan., 1901, considered the Congregation of St. Lazare as legally recognized. The old house of St. Lazare, having been transferred by the State to the public service, the Government handed over to the use of the congregation a piece of property situated at Rue de Sèvres 95, the Hôtel des Lorges, and here Verbert, the vicar-general, entered with his community still small in number, 19 Nov., 1817. Some adjoining ground on the left bank of the Seine was purchased in 1841 by Charles X for the building of a chapel, which was blessed by Mgr. de Quènec, Archbishop of Paris, 1 Nov., 1827. The following is a list of the superiors general who have been elected by the general assemblies held in Paris down to 1910. After Peter Dewavresse died, 23 Oct., 1828, the general assembly of 15 May, 1835, elected as his successor John Baptist Nosco who was succeeded in 1835 by John Baptist Etienne. The general assembly of 1836 elected its successful generalship continued until his death in 1874. Then Eugene Boré was elected, a man well known in the world of literature and science. Death claimed him after four years, and in 1878 the general assembly made Anthony Flat his successor, and he is now, 1910, at the head of the congregation.

The work of the congregation has remained unchanged save for adaptations to new circumstances. Missions at home are no less necessary than formerly. A special consideration makes them more than ever the objects of solicitude. It is that the people of our democratic age have acquired an influence and an authority which they never exercised before. Besides mission work in cities, the Lazarists have their churches in parishes and in the colleges of the chief cities; clerics who did not study there unfortunately too but often did not study at all. In this state of affairs it sufficed to provide seminarians at least three courses for clerics who went out to follow the courses in the universities and colleges of the city. In the seminary there was a course in liturgy; the students were helped to make for themselves a practical abridgment of moral theology and when the time came they were aided by the exercises of the retreat to prepare for ordinations. Two or three priests at most sufficed for such establishments. To-day all is changed in this regard. Seminarians ordinarily spend all their time within the walls of the seminary. The seminary gives them ecclesiastical instruction in philosophy, history, exegesis, canon law, and theology, teaching that they could not find outside save in a few universities. Seminarians of this century are as it usually did in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but for several years, so that the faculty required for a seminary, whether it be composed of members of a community or of the secular clergy, must be much more numerous and specially equipped for scientific training. The Congregation of the Mission had then to adapt itself to the new order of things. Finally, as to the foreign missions, new facilities of travel and communication, and new means of influence and of intercourse with pagan or savage peoples have given a new character to the work of evangelization, requiring missionary bodies to change their methods to meet these changed conditions.

IV. LITTERARY AND SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITY.—Teaching.

The method of teaching which prevails in Lazarist colleges and seminaries, is that of explaining a well chosen text of some approved author from whose opinions even the professor is not allowed to depart, except by the express permission of his superiors. Such a text is placed in the hands of the pupils, who learn a portion of it, and receive explanations from the comments from the professor. Individual research is encouraged but within limits suggested by the practical character of Lazarist college and seminary training. Conformably to the commands and recommendations of Leo XIII and Pius X, philosophy and theology are taught in accord with the doctrines of these popes. Novelties in doctrine are distinctly discouraged, while professors are bidden to make themselves acquainted with modern errors, for refutation. Writings.—The life of Lazarists is above all, an active life, in college, in the seminary, and on the missions, hence their writings have been called forth for some practical utility, or as a result of their journeys as missionaries. The following are noteworthy as writers: (1) Theology.—Collet, Peter, a Frenchman (b. 1693; d. 1770), professed theology with success in Paris. When Tournel died (1729) leaving unfinished a course of theology which the university and the seminaries held in high esteem, Cardinal Fleury, gave the task to Collet, whose talents he knew, to continue and complete the work, which Collet did with much success, publishing “Continuatio Praelectionum Theologicarum Horatii Tournely” in 8 volumes (Paris, 1733–1790). He made an abridgment of this work as a class book of theology for seminaries. “Institutiones theologice quas a fuisboebus suis editae et ineditae ad usum Seminariorum contraxit Petrus Collet” (Paris, 1744, 5 vols.). Whilst engaged in this great work, Collet composed more than forty volumes on different theological, canonical, liturgical, and devotional subjects. Brunet, Francis Florentin (b. in France, 1751; d. 1806), wrote a “Parallèle des Religions” in 5 volumes (Paris, 1782), which paved the way for the comparative histories of religion now so much in vogue. Morino, John, visitor of the Neapolitan province, issued in 1910 the seventh edition of his Moral Theology. MacGuiness, John, a native of Ireland and professor in the Irish College in Paris, has recently published a second edition of a complete course of the moral theology, a pioneer Irish Vincentian, published many books of great utility to the clergy, the best known of these is “Programme de Sermons et Instructions”, which is still much used. (2) Works on Canon Law and Liturgy.—De Martinis (b. in Italy, 1829; d. 1900), Archbishop of Laodicea, published “Juris Pontificii de Propaganda Fide, Pars Prima continens Bullas, Brevia, Acta S.S. a Congregationis institutione ad presens, juxta temporis serio disposita” (Rome, 1888–1897, 7 vols., in quarto), a collection of documents emanating from the Propaganda in every respect superior to any preceding collection. Baldeschi, Joseph (b. in Italy, 1849; d. 1900), published “Esposizione delle Sacre Cerimonie” (Rome, 1830, 4 vols., 24mto.), which has been translated into various tongues. Mancini, Calcedonio (d. 1910) began at the Lazarist house of Montecitorio, Rome, in 1887, the publication of a monthly review,
"Ephemeredes Liturgicae", which is still issued. Buroni, Joseph (b. in Piedmont, 1821), besides theological and liturgical writings, has published several sermons in or concerning the languages. Cauil-Non, Philip Albert (b. in France, 1723; d. 1793), composed an abridged catechism in the language of Madagascar, and wrote a Malagasy grammar for the Antanony dialect. Gonsalves, Joachim Alphonson, published among other works in the Chinese language, "Lexicon Magnum Latino-Sinicum ostendens eundem nomenclaturam," the "Ostitutionem vocabulorum" (Macao, 1841, in folio). Viguier, Peter Francis (b. France, 1745; d. 1821), published "Elements of the Turkish Language, or Analytical Tables of the ordinary Turkish Language with developments" (Constantinople, Printing Press of the Palais de France, 1790, 4v). Couleau, John Baptist (b. in France, 1785), translated the Ethiopian language or primitive Ethiopian tongue, the "Missal of the Ethiopian Rite" (Kerew, Printing Press of the Catholic Mission, 1890) and other works. He also published other books in Armarigna, the present kiom of Abyssinia, for example "Dialogues on the Things of Faith" (Kerew, Printing Press of the Catholic Mission, 1893). Buergi, Johann, the manual of the Tiglri language spoken in Central and Northern Abyssinia (Vienna, 1887) and Gren, John (b. in Germany, 1842; d. 1907), "La Lengua Quichua," a dialect of the Republic of Ecuador (Freiburg, 1896, in 12mo). More than half a million Indians in Ecuador, says the author, understand no language but their own and the majority of the priests in the mission districts are unable to understand the language of this Indian. Bivdeng, John, a Persian Lazarist, has written and published many works for the use of his fellow countrymen. During twenty years he printed more than forty volumes in the Syriac and Neo-Aramaic, reproducing almost all the ancient MSS. hitherto unpublished in the various MSS. of the Syriac and Neo-Aramaic. The latest is the most curious and important, the hitherto unpublished autobiography of Nestorius, "Nestorius, Le Livre d'Heracleide de Damas edite par Paul Bedjan, Lazariste" (Leipzig, 1910, in 8v).

(4) Travels and Scientific Explorations.—Huc, (q. v.) Evariste-Régis (b. in France, 1813; d. 1844), the missionary in China, wrote "Notes sur la mission en Chine" (Paris, 1850, 2 vols. in 8v), which was immediately translated into many languages. Later he published a sequel, "The Chinese Empire" (Paris, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo), and finally "Christianity in Tibet, Tartary, and China." (Paris, 1854, 4 vols. 18mo). David, Armand (b. in France, 1826; d. 1900), corresponded for many years with the French scholars in the East and Far East. Commissioned by the Museum of Natural History of Paris to make explorations, he enriched the collection by numerous discoveries. He wrote "Journal of Travel in Central China and in Eastern Tibet" which appeared in "Nouvelles Archives du Muséum," VII, IX, and XI. "Journal of my Third Tour of Exploration in the Chinese Empire." (Paris, 1875, 2 vols. 8v). Besides numerous studies edited by him, there are several works published at the expense of the French Government describing the scientific discoveries of David: "The Birds of China with Atlas of 124 plates" (Paris, 1877). "Plaute Davidiexane Sinarum Imperii prope Memel" (Paris, 1881). Bordaci, John Baptist, has published astronomical studies of observations made at the Vatican Observatory and at Catania. He is the director of the Royal Observatory of Turin (1910). Many of his studies have appeared in the "Bulletin Astronomique de l'Observatoire de Paris," 1898, 1899. See Notices from "Collaboration de la Mission" (Angoulême, 1878, 8v). The English edition of the "Annales of the Cong. of the Miss.," Nos. 38 and 39 (1903), contains in thirty closely printed pages a list of books published by the Lazarists in various languages.

V. PRESENT STATUS.—The Lazarists in Europe.—The mother-house, the residence of the superior general of the whole congregation, is at Paris, 95 Rue de Sèvres. This central residence is also a house of formation with its internal seminary, or it is often less accurately called, its novitiate and scholasticate. A second house of formation is established at Dax, a city a little south of Bordeaux. In 1900 there were about fifty establishments in France, missions, seminaries, and colleges. Since 1902 and 1903 the greater number of these establishments had to be abandoned when a large number of the establishments of communities were closed, and when congregations not authorized by the State were suppressed. France has hitherto supplied almost exclusively subjects for the Lazarists. There are communities in Russia, China, and Japan, and the different countries of South America. In Germany, where the Lazarists had been established since 1832, they were expelled by the Kulturkampf (1873), and since then they have establishments on the frontier of their country in Belgium and Holland. There are establishments in Syria, and in Central America at Ica, Casma, Lima, and other centres of activity for the Lazarists, one at Grata for the houses of Austria and Hungary, the other, Polish in language, at Krakow for the establishments of Galicia and Bukowina, and for the colonies of Polish emigrants to America. Spain, where the works of the Lazarists are in a flourishing condition, has two centers of activity, one at Barcelona. The Spanish Lazarists furnish to a great extent labourers for several of the old Spanish colonies, Cuba and Porto Rico, Mexico, and the Philippine Islands. They were twice expelled from their country by the revolutions of 1835 and 1868. They have been recognized by the Governments since the Concordat of 1851. In France and Britain the Congregation has been established since the political and religious revolution of 1835, they have gradually been restored both on the mainland and in the Madeira Islands, where they are engaged in their former works. The Congregation of the Mission in Italy has felt the political vicissitudes of that country in the nineteenth century, the Napoleonic wars terminated their activity. Thibault, a French missionary obtained the confirmation of ecclesiastical property by the Italian princes in 1848, 1860, and 1873. At the present time there are 38 houses divided into three provinces, Turin, Rome, and Naples. As to Belgium and Holland, it is chiefly since the difficulties in France that the Lazarists have secured in these countries houses for the reception of their young men. The congregation has taken up again work in Northern Africa, in Algiers. There is a vicariate Apostolic in southern Madagascar and another in Abyssinia, and there are establishments at Alexandria in Egypt. They have also founded schools in the Levant, Turkey in Europe, and Turkey in Asia. There are prominent colleges in Constantinople, Smyrna, and Antouma near Beirut. They have also founded schools in the Levant, Turkey in Europe, and Turkey in Asia. There are prominent colleges in Constantinople, Smyrna, and Antouma near Beirut. They have also founded schools in the Levant, Turkey in Europe, and Turkey in Asia. There are prominent colleges in Constantinople, Smyrna, and Antouma near Beirut.
the Holy See selected from their number the prefects Apostolic and the Apostolic delegate for that country, the missions then were under the care of the Prefect of charity. One of the Lazarist missionaries in Persia said forty years ago: "No mission is so militant and perhaps also so difficult as this."

In China, which is one of the widest fields for apostolic labour, the Lazarists are in charge of the important missions of Peking and of several vicariates Apostolic. Sent to China towards the close of the eighteenth century, during the early part of the nineteenth century they passed through most trying times. Persecutions burst forth sometimes in certain localities, sometimes everywhere. In 1820 Francis Régis Clét (q.v.), a Lazarist, died a martyr, and in 1840 Jean-Gabriel Perboyre (q.v.) had a like fate and like honour. But the missionary work had advanced, and the spreading the Gospel was not interrupted, however. Apostolic work has been prosperous. Instead of the old residence of Petang at Peking a new and much more commodious residence has been erected on a large tract of land given by the Chinese Government and a new cathedral was begun in December 1888. This immense cathedral, with its towers and its spires, is the work of Mgr Tagliahue, and Rev. A. Favier who after becoming Bishop of Peking. Around the cathedral of Peking are grouped the theological and preparatory seminaries, a printing office, schools, and charitable institutions. Apostolic zeal has not grown lax. In 1908 the Lazarists of the Vicariate of Peking had the joy of numbers, and other Chinese-Lazarists were being formed. The total for the last five years was fully, if not beyond, one hundred thousand conversions. The Lazarists in China have six other vicariates Apostolic with their centres at Young-Ping-Fou and Ching-Ting-Fou in Tche-Ly; Ning-Po in the Province of Tche-Kiang; Kiu-Kiang, Fou-Tseou-Fou and Chi-Ning in the South, Shensi. Many large evangelising missions entrusted to the Lazarists in China there are at present one hundred and forty-five European Lazarists and thirty-five Chinese Lazarists, eleven secular priests from Europe and eighty-nine native secular clergy. The Lazarists in China have two internal seminaries or novitiates. The procurator of these missions resides at Shanghai.

Such are the works of the Congregation of the Mission carried on by its 3249 members (1909), priests, students, lay brothers, and novices. It may be added that wherever they are, there is commonly to be found the other congregation founded by St. Vincent, the Daughters of Charity (Cornettes). Such is the result of the apostolic zeal of the Congregation of the Mission, which has sent out more than thirty-two foreign missions as in Madagascar, Persia, Syria, China. They number (1910) more than 30,000 and labour also in places where the Congregation of the Mission is not established.

The English Speaking Lazarists.—(1) The Irish Province.—During St. Vincent’s lifetime his priests were instructed by the Prefect of the Congregation to help the persecuted Catholics. Eight priests went to Limerick and Cashel. In Cashel and the surrounding towns they gave missions and heard eighty thousand general confessions. In Limerick too their success was most marked and its memory is not yet dead. But new and terrible persecutions under Cromwell, forced the missionaries to go into hiding and ultimately to fly the country. A lay brother who had accompanied them died a martyr’s death. When Maynooth College was founded in 1798, Father Edward Ferris, an assistant of the superior general, was allowed by his superiors to come to the aid of the new college. Archbishop Troy of Dublin had asked for him and made him a lay brother. Later he took the chair of moral theology which he held until his death, 26 November, 1809. There is a tradition that his copy of the “Rules” of the congregation, found at Maynooth after his death, gave the first impulse to what resulted in the establishment of the community in Ireland. Early in the last century, on account of the lack of Catechists, the demand for them partially supplied, the desire of establishing Lazarists or some kindred institute for missions in Ireland was expressed by Dr. Doyle who had known them in Coimbra, by Dr. Maher who had been with them at Montecitorio and by Father Fitzgerald, O.P., of Carlow College, but nothing was done. In 1832 four young men at Maynooth approached the Congregation, impressed by the dangers surrounding the ministry, and the importance of working for God and the salvation of souls, agreed that a community life was desirable for them. They were James Lynch, Peter Richard Kenrick, Anthony Reynolds, and Michael Burke, all of the Diocese of Dublin. On consulting with the Congregation, they were received into the Order. They had been ordained into the Order of the Mission. The dean, Father Philip Dowley, soon after became their leader. He had just been made vice-president of the college but resigned. About this time they were joined by Father Thomas McNamara, a valuable recruit, as his powers of organization contributed greatly to the success of the Order. An apostolic life was established in Ireland. With the approval of Archbishop Murray a small college was opened in Dublin to serve as a preparatory seminary. Another newly-ordained priest, Rev. John McCann, supplied the funds for the purchase of Castleknock. In 1838 the little church in Phibsborough, a suburb of Dublin, was placed in the hands of Dr. Maher of the Lazarists, who had added a foundation for two annual missions. It was for missions they had banded together, but though they gave three in their neighbourhood, other works took up all their energies. By this time they had lost Father Anthony Reynolds by death. Father Peter Richard Kenrick joined his brother, then Bishop of Philadelphia and subsequently became Archbishop of St. Louis. Overtures were made to the congregation in Paris for the aggregation of the Irish community and this was soon accomplished; two of the Fathers beginning their internal seminary course or novitiate in Paris and finishing it in Ireland under Father Girard were delegated by the superior to form these postulants.

Father Hand who had early joined the community left before this time to found All Hallows College at Drumcondra for the foreign missions. The first mission of these Lazarists was given in Athy in Dublin Diocese. It was the introduction of the modern mission into Ireland. At this and the following missions the people attended in thousands and the confessors were more than thirty. The congregation at Phibsborough has given place to a fine Gothic structure. Here the devotion to the Sacred Heart was promoted most vigorously after the consecration of Ireland to the Sacred Heart by the bishops in 1873. Here too the care of the poor led Father John Gowan, C.M., to found a flourishing community of sisters called Sisters of the Holy Heart (q.v.), recently approved by Rome. The beginnings in Cork were similar to those of Dublin. A priest of high standing desired to open a house for missionaries, on the model of the congregation but with some modifications. He began by opening a day college. He was the Rev. Michael O’Sullivan, vicar-general of the diocese. For some years the college succeeded; but afterwards did not get on so well. He then offered the college to the superior at Castletown and entered as a member of the community. Two who as superiors had a large share in the development of the Cork foundation afterwards became bishops, Dr. Lawrence Gillooly (1819–1895), Bishop of Elphin, and Dr. Neil McSweeney, Bishop of Lismore. In 1845 a new college was opened. There was plenty of work among the poor was confided to the congregation.

St. Vincent himself had sent a member of his community to the French consul in London in the hope of
getting some foothold for his community in England where they might aid the persecuted Catholics, but in vain. Sheffield was the first foundation in England and it was a purely private one partly supported by the Duke of Norfolk. A house was established in Mill Hill, London, in 1889, and it is now a parish, and has the direction of the provincial house of the Sisters of Charity. A normal college at Hammersmith was entrusted to the Lazarists in 1899. In Scotland, Fathers Duggan and White laboured in St. Vincent's time, sent thither by him. Father Duggan worked zealously in the Hebrides travelling from place to place until his labours were cut short by death. Father White's busy life of missionary travel on the mainland of Scotland was interrupted by his imprisonment in Cromwell's time; on his release with the condition that if he be caught preaching or baptising he would be hanged without trial, he resumed his work undaunted in the mountain districts. But it was not until 1859 that the first Scotch house was established at Lanark. The magnificent church destroyed by fire in 1907 has been rebuilt and the work of giving missions has gone on uninterruptedly.

In 1840, the houses of Ireland were formed into a Province, with Père Dufet (1798-1854) as appointed visitor. He was succeeded in 1864 by Father Thomas MacNamara (1809-1892), a man of great zeal and learning, who did much for the spiritual welfare of the deaf-mutes in Ireland and was head of the Irish College from 1888 to 1889. Father Duff (1818-1890) became visitor in 1867. He was followed, in 1868, by Father O'Reilly who resided in Dublin after a most successful career and was succeeded by Rev. Joseph Walsh. The novitiate was started in 1844 at Castleknock. Prior to that, and even to some extent afterwards, the novices were 'trained at the mother-house in Paris. In 1873, a new site was secured and the novitiate transferred thither. It is known as the Jesuit Novitiate, Mount St. Michael, a lovely spot on the hill by the same name as that by Dr. Dixon in 1861. About 1888, the Irish Lazarists were made spiritual fathers at Maynooth, then according to Cardinal Newman the most important ecclesiastical seminary in Catholic Christendom. In 1875, a training school was begun at Drumcondra, Dublin, of which it was the policy of the provincial, and founded normal college entrusted to the Irish Lazarists by the Government. In the space of twenty-six years it has sent out over 2300 Catholic teachers. All Hallows College (q.v.) was placed under the care of the Lazarists in 1892. The Australian mission of the Irish Province was begun in 1855 with a most successful series of missions from their new mission house in New South Wales. At the urgent request of Bishop Patrick Joseph Byrne they assumed charge of St. Stanislaus College, Bathurst, New South Wales, which had been founded some years previously. A mission centre and parish were established at Malvern near Melbourne in 1892. The Irish Province numbers (1910) 125 priests, 30 brothers, and 20 scholastics. (3) The United States Province. The Congregation of the Mission was brought to the United States in 1816 by Bishop Dubourg (q.v.) of New Orleans. His diocese comprised both upper and lower Louisiana as it was then called. Upper Louisiana to which he sent the Lazarists included what became afterwards the States of Texas, Missouri and Illinois. He also sent the territory north and west of these states. There were but four priests there at this time and three of them died soon afterwards. He succeeded after some difficulty

in getting three Lazarist priests, with a brother, to head a band of twelve apostolic workers for his vast territory. They were Rev. Felix de Andreis (q.v.), Rev. Rosati, Rev. V. Alzani, and Father Blanko. Bishop Ryan of Buffalo wrote of them as coming "to do for religion and the Church in the distant and still undeveloped West what a Carroll, a Cheverus, a Flaget, and other great and holy men had done and were doing in other parts of the country" (Early Lazarist Missions and Missionaries, 1857).

In 1816, on an American brig bound for Baltimore, reaching there 26 July, they were welcomed at St. Mary's Seminary by Father Bruté. On their way to St. Louis, they stopped all winter at Bardstown, where Father de Andreis taught theology in St. Thomas's Seminary. He had already taught it with great success at the College of the Propaganda in Rome. He was, however, eager to go and preach the Gospel to the poor savages and studied the Indian language with this design. On 8 Jan., 1818, Father de Andreis settled down as pastor of St. Louis and vicar-general of the diocese; an appointment he had received on leaving Rome. He writes: "It will not be easy to establish our missionaries on the American footing as in Italy. Here we must be like a regiment of cavalry orflying about killing the restrictions of the Indians and the salvation of souls may require our presence." Several of those who came from Europe at Bishop Dubourg's invitation joined the little community. Father Joseph Cosetti died on the eve of his reception into the internal seminary. Father Andrew Ferrari, P. X. Dahmen, a subdeacon, and Joseph Tschitti, a subdeacon, were admitted to the novitiate on 3 Dec., 1818, in St. Louis.

Early in 1818 the beginnings of an establishment were made at the Barrens, Perry Co., Missouri, and thither the novitiate was transferred and placed under Father Rosati. In 1820, a small log house twenty-five by eighteen feet was occupied by three priests, seminarians, and brothers. After writing to Father Rosati of his joy at the near prospect of going to work among the Indians, Father de Andreis died in the odour of sanctity. The process of his beatification has been begun (1910). In a few years a large brick building arose and gradually the splendid group of buildings, church, mother-house of the Lazarists, and the semi-collegiate seminary were added. The early days were full of missionary activity for the new community. They gave the first real impetus to the progress of the Church in Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, Indiana, Mississippi, and Texas were the scenes of missionary journeys. Here and there the churches established but these were generally relinquished, as too many priests were sent there to take them. Father Rosati, who had been appointed superior by Father de Andreis, wrote in 1822: "We are, 19 March, ten priests, three clerics, and six brothers." He refused the post of Vicar Apostolic of Florida and only the peremptory command of the pope made him accept the conyclicdorship of New Orleans. Though over men, he continued still to hold the office of superior of the Lazarists until 1830 when Father Tornatore arrived from Rome.

In the year 1835 the province of the United States was formed. Rev. John Timon, born at Connaway, Penn., in 1707, was appointed visitor. He became first Bishop of Buffalo, dying in 1828. He was followed by Rev. Father Orin (q.v.), afterwards Archbishop of New Orleans, who had done great work in Texas where the Lazarists succeeded in having the State restore to the Church the property it had taken when Texas separated from Mexico. The parish of La Salle, Illinois, a centre for the missionary work of the Lazarists, was established in 1838 and they still minister to the faithful there. The same year, 1838, a school was begun at Cape Girardeau, Missouri, by Father Odin who
a church had been opened two years before. This was the commencement of St. Vincent's College, Cape Girardeau. In 1893, the theological department of the Cape was transferred to the Kenrick Seminary in St. Louis, directed by the L.A. of St. Louis, but the fewness of the candidates for the priesthood did not justify a separate institution and it was closed again in 1907. Since 1849 St. Stephen's Church in New Orleans with its schools, hospitals, and orphan asylum has been cared for by the Lazarists. They also have charge of St. Joseph's, established in 1858 and St. Catherine's, for the coloured people of the whole city.

Between the years 1842 and 1847 the Bishops of Cincinnati, Louisville, Philadelphia, and New York urged the visitor to take charge of their respective seminaries, to which by the advice of his council he consented. These seminaries remained in the charge of the Lazarists for a few years, but most of the dioceses soon owned them. The European Lazarists to their own land where religious disturbances had ceased, and the promotion of members to the episcopacy. The New York seminary, after its removal from La Fargeville to Fordham was accepted by the Lazarists at the request of Bishop Hughes. Father Anthony Fenco, who was made superior, did not approve of the seminarians teaching in the college, so the community retired from the work. For eleven years the Lazarists had charge of the diocesan seminary at Philadelphia. They had been invited there by Bishop Francis Patrick Kenrick. His former professor at the Propaganda, Father Tornatore, presided for a time over the seminary. The community was then invited to the Sisters of Charity in the care of Father Thaddeus Amat (q. v.) the superior was made Bishop of Monterey, Cal. The College or Seminary of Our Lady of the Angels was founded in 1856 by Rev. John Joseph Lynch, who left it when called to become Bishop and Archbishop of Toronto. It became the Niagara University in 1883. Its deceased presidents have been: Rev. J. J. Reilly (b. 1802; d. 1850); Rev. Thomas J. Smith, afterwards visitor, Rev. Rev. R. E. V. Rice (b. 1837; d. 1878), and Rev. P. V. Kavanaugh (b. 1842; d. 1899). The Immaculate Conception parish in Baltimore was founded by the Rev. Mark Anthony in 1859. He was succeeded by the saintly Father Joseph Giustiniani (b. 1811; d. 1866) who built the church and the school. The parish at Emmittsburg, Md., was placed in charge of the Lazarists and there resided the Rev. Mariano Maller, first director from St. Vincent's priests of the Sisters of Charity when Mother Seton's Sisters were affiliated to the central house in Paris. Father Maller's successors in the office of director of the Daughters of Charity were Rev. Francis Burlando (b. 1814; d. 1873), 1853-1873; Rev. Felix Guery (b. 1833; d. 1893), 1873-1877; Rev. Alexis Mandine (b. 1832; d. 1892), 1877-1892; Rev. Sylvester V. Haire, 1892-1894; Rev. Robert A. Lennon, 1894-1907; Rev. James J. Sullivan, 1907. This province was divided in 1910, Rev. JJ. Sullivan becoming director of the eastern with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo., and the Rev. John P. Cribbins director of the eastern and residing at Emmittsburg, Md. St. Vincent's Church, Germantown, was established in 1851 by Father Domenec, who was consecrated Bishop of Pittsburg in 1880. The first church for the United States was transferred for St. Louis to Germantown in 1858. Three magnificent buildings on Chelten Avenue have been erected, including a house of studies, an internal seminary, and an apostolic school, as well as a beautiful church.

Father Philip Borgna laboured in Brooklyn at St. Mary's Church, Williamsburg, during the years 1881-44. A later day: 1875. The Bishop of St. Vincent's College, now De Paul University. In 1888 the province of the United States was divided; the western, with the mother-house at the old St. Mary's Seminary, Perryville, Missouri; the eastern retaining as the newer mother-house, St. Vincent's Seminary, Germantown. In 1903 Holy Trinity College, with an especially fine equipment for engineering, was built at Dallas, Texas, and St. Thomas's Seminary at Denver, Col., in 1907. A mission house was opened at Springfield, Mass., in 1903 and another at Opelika, Alabama, 1910. Mission bands are also stationed at Germantown, Pa., and at Niagara, N. Y., in the East, and at St. Louis and Perryville, Mo., in the West.

Since Father Philip Borgna's successors have been Rev. Mariano Maller (b. 1817; d. 1892), 1847-1850; Rev. Anthony Fenco (b. 1813; d. 1875), 1850-1855; Rev. John Mannau [pro-visitor] (b. 1813; d. 1893), 1855-1856, recalled to Spain and made visitor there; Rev. Stephen V. Ryan (b. 1825; d. 1896), 1857-1867, when he was made Bishop of Buffalo; Rev. John Hayden (b. 1831; d. 1884), 1867-1872; Rev. John O'Sullivan (b. 1816; d. 1883), 1872-1879; Rev. Thomas J. Smith (b. 1832; d. 1905), 1879-1905. In 1888 the Rev. James McMillan became head of the eastern province; at his resignation (1909), the Rev. P. McIvor became visitor. In the West Father Smith's successors have been Rev. William Barnwell (b. 1839; d. 1906) in 1872. At the present moment and the present visitor the Rev. Thomas Finney. The two provinces number over two hundred priests who have charge of sixty colleges, one preparatory seminary, two apostolic schools for students aspiring to become Lazarists, four theological seminaries, about fifteen churches, and about eighty schools. In eight of these states the Polish province have churches for their fellow countrymen, at Consobinck and Philadelphia, Penn., at Derby and New Haven, Conn., whence also they go to preach Polish missions. The Polish Lazarists are also preparing to build a college at Erie, Penn., 1910. Two Lazarists from Barcelona province in 1908 began work for the faithful in the Philippines, and they have a church and conduct night classes, and an employment agency. The establishments of the Lazarists at Ponce and San Juan, Porto Rico, as well as those at Manila, Calbayog, Cebu, Jaro, and Nueva Caceres in the Philippine Islands may also be mentioned in connexion with the Lazarists of the United States.

B. RANDOLPH.
MISSIONARIES of St. Charles Borromeo, Congregation of, founded by John Baptist Scalabrini, Bishop of Piacenza, Italy (d. 1 June, 1805); approved in principle by Leo XIII in a Brief dated 25 November, 1887; constitution definitively approved by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, 3 October, 1892. The expediency of providing for the spiritual needs of a number of such immigrants waiting in the great railway station of Milan, acting upon this inspiration, and encouraged by Cardinal Simeoni, then Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation, the Bishop purchased a residence which he converted into "The Christopher Columbus Apostolic Institution", forming there a community of priests which was to be the nucleus of a new congregation.

This congregation, which was henceforth to be known as the "Missionaries of St. Charles Borromeo", was to be governed by a superior-general, dependent upon the Congregation of Propaganda: its aim was to maintain Catholic faith and practice among Italian emigrants in the New World, and "to ensure as far as possible their moral, civil, and economical welfare". It was to provide priests for the emigrants, as well as committees of persons who should give the good advice and direction needed by poor immigrants newly arrived in foreign ports; to establish churches, schools, and missionary homes in the various Italian colonies in North and South America, and to train youths for the priesthood. The members of the congregation promise obedience to their superiors in the congregation and the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Seven priests and three lay brothers of Bishop Scalabrini's institute left Italy, on 12 July, 1888, of whom two priests and one lay brother were bound for New York, five priests and two lay brothers for various parts of Brazil. On this occasion, Cesare Cantù, the famous Italian historian, addressed to the Bishop of Piacenza some memorable words of congratulation, asking leave to add to the bishop's blessing on the departing missionaries, "the prayers of an old man who admires a courage and an abnegation so full of humility". A welcome had already been assured these first missionaries of the congregation by a commendatory letter (1 June, 1888) of Leo XIII addressed to the American bishops.

The first arrivals in New York the new missionaries were enabled to secure a favourable site in Centre Street, where there was a colony of Italians, and in a short time a chapel was opened; soon after this the church of the Resurrection was opened in Mulberry Street; lastly, a building in Roosevelt Street, which had been a Protestant place of worship, became the church of the mission fathers who transformed it into the church of St. Joachim, the first specially Italian church in the Diocese of New York. The society was established on Ellis Island. The good work thereafter spread rapidly through the continent. The United States and Canada now contain 21 parish churches, besides several chapels, served by the congregation; in Brazil the fathers have charge of 13 parish churches, mostly with schools attached, and 2 important orphanages. The two provinces (Eastern and Western) of the congregation in the United States number 45 priests and 3 lay brothers, while the single province of Brazil numbers 35 priests and 5 lay brothers.

VICTOR CANGIANO.

MISSIONARIES of St. Francis de Sales of Annecy. —Amid the many activities to which St. Francis devoted himself, he long had the desire to found a society of missionary priests. This wish, however, was not to find its realization until nearly two centuries after his death. At that time Monseigneur Riele, a successor of the Saint in the See of Annecy, broached the subject of such a society to Father Mermier, who had been considering the same idea. Accordingly, Father Mermier put the design into execution. In 1830 the institute was formed with La Feuillette as the site for the mission. It was solemnly blessed by the bishop on 8 August, 1837, and the congregation canonically instituted by him on 8 October, 1838. The society was not to be a mere association of priests, but a new religious congregation, bound by simple vows. Hence Father Mermier, the first superior-general, offered himself and his companion to the sister of the mission. In 1835 his offer was accepted by the Propaganda, and the first missionaries of St. Francis de Sales set out for India. The work has prospered and since that time more than 100 priests and seminarians have been sent out by the congregation, besides many lay brothers. More than 200 nuns of different orders have gone out at the call of the missionaries to help them. The dioceses of Nagpur and Visagapatam have always been governed by prelates belonging to this institute. At Visagapatam the first vicar Apostolic was Mgr Neyret (1850); he was succeeded by Mgr Tissot, first bishop of the diocese. The present occupant of the see is Mgr Clerc. The first Bishop of Nagpur was Mgr Aubertin, the first Bishop of Berar was Mgr Carpentier, and of Ceylon, Mgr Vayson. In England the fathers have three missions in the Diocese of Clifton. Since the persecution of 1903, the congregation has been obliged to leave Savoy for England, where the novitiate, and the house of studies are successfully carried on. The superior-general since the foundation are: the Very Rev. Fathers Mermier, Gaidon, Clavel, Tissot, Gojon, and Bouvard.

Echos Salesiens. Revue mensuelle (Fribourg, 1908-10); Almanach de St. François de Sales (Lyons, 1900).

LOUIS VULLIET.

MISSIONARY RECTOR. See RECTOR.

MISSIONARY Society of St. Paul the Apostle, otherwise known as the PAULIST FATHERS, a community of priests for giving missions and doing other Apostolic works, especially for making converts to the Catholic Faith. It was founded, in Rome and in New York, in 1858, by Father Isaac Thomas Hecker, with whom were associated Augustine F. Hewitt, George Deshon, Francis A. Baker, and Clarence A. Walworth. All of these had been missionaries to Japan. Hecker was named the first superior-general, the Most Holy Redeemer, and owing to certain misunderstandings had been subjected to disloyalty to their order and accused of disobedience.

In order to set matters right and to explain their case to the superior general, Father Hecker went to Rome, and on 29 August, 1857, three days after his arrival, was expelled from the Romanist priests. This action was appealed to the Holy See and was not approved. Father Hecker and the Holy See named priests were then at their own request dispensed from their vows, and proceeded to form the new community. Hecker received letters from Propaganda, strongly recommending him and his associates to the bishops of the United States. This is the official origin of the Paulists.

But long before this, however, the Holy Spirit gave Father Hecker distinct and unmistakable intimations—to use his own words—that he was "set apart to undertake in some leading and conspicuous way the conversion of this country". He added that he "made an explicit statement of these supernatural visitations, to various persons, singly and in common, always under compulsion of obedience or necessity". These advisers included Cardinal Barnabo, the Prefect of Propaganda at this time, and several of the most approved directors of souls in Rome. They unanimously decided that he acted wisely in following this interior supernatural guidance.
During the summer of 1858 a practical beginning of their apostolate was made by the Paulists in New York, to which diocese they were then hearty welcome. John H. Hughes, then Bishop of New York, was the parish in what was then a suburb and is now the heart of the city. As they had given missions as Redemptorists in all parts of the country, they were well and favourably known to the bishops and clergy and were very popular with the people. They were all men of ability, quite above the ordinary intellectual standard, powerful preachers, and of mature spirituality. Father Hecker especially was known as a remarkable man, a leader in Catholic thought, of profoundly interior spirit of prayer, joined to such a zeal for souls as characterizes only the saints. They were all Americans and all converts, and under their founder's inspiration, they soon developed their high gifts of preaching, of writing, and of the guidance of souls. To provide a home and church the new community, having but a handful of parishioners, appealed to their friends everywhere for financial help. The response was generous, and they built in West 59th Street, a convent and church combined, which in later years, when the present church was erected, was used wholly for their dwelling. Thus the Apostolic Missions in California and the Pacific Mission House were founded. Missions were made in San Francisco and Berkeley, California; Chicago, Illinois; Winchester, Tennessee; and Austin, Texas. The novitiate and house of studies is in Washington, D.C., the scholastic training being affiliated to the courses of the Catholic University. 

A programme of rule was drawn up at the time of the foundation of the institution and approved by Archbishop Hughes. This served all needful purposes for twenty years, when it was much enlarged. It is still in process of experiment before being presented to the Holy See for canonical approbation. Its spiritual features are substantially the same routine of devout exercises, in private and in common, observed by the priests of the Congregation. Though the Paulists do not make vows of religion, they undertake to observe the evangelical counsels as fervently as if canonically bound to do so. This is expressed in the formula of profession as a "whole-hearted determination to obey the rules, to aspire after Christian and religious perfection, to devote oneself to the service of Christ and the Church, and to persevere in the same vocation to the end of life". The training of the members is provided for in the exercises of the novitiate and house of studies. Permanency in the community is secured by this original training, and the act of profession witnesses to a well-matured purpose of striving after perfection and to a determination to persevere in it. The mission union is that of seal for souls actuating the members of the institute individually and in common. Father Hecker's estimate of the fundamental principle of the Paulist life is as follows: "The desire for personal perfection is the foundation stone of a religious community when this fails, it crumbles to pieces. And the desire for personal perfection can exist only in the attainment of personal perfection by the practice of those virtues without which it cannot be secured—interior fidelity to grace, prayer, detachment and the like."

In the external order, the Paulist vocation is primarily, as was the original vocation of Father Hecker, the conversion of non-Catholics. It embraces all branches of the Catholic apostolate, lecturing and preaching, printing and distribution of missionary literature, and private conference with earnest inquirers. The spread of Catholicism holds the first place both in their prayers and in their active life; it outranks in importance all other external labours. It is said that Paulists are most largely known both in and out of the Church as convert makers. Missions for non-Catholics are systematically given, being very often joined to Catholic missions, though not seldom given separately. The effects of this apostolate have justified Father Hecker's lifelong contention that America is a ripe field for the seal of Catholic missioners. Many thousands of converts have been made, some immediately, more after prolonged examination of the claims of the Church, and multitudes of half-hearted and indifferent Catholics have been restored to the practice of their religion, a result which so invariably follows these lectures as to give them a very high place in the work of "stopping the leaks".

In the year 1894, the Paulists introduced missions to non-Catholics among the diocesan clergy, beginning with the Diocese of Cleveland. This work has now been extended into over twenty-five American dioceses, and also into England and Australia. The number of secular priests actively engaged in these mission apostolates is very considerable. For the training, and in many cases for the support, of these bands of convert-makers, members of the Paulist community brought about the establishment of the Catholic Missionary Union, a corporation whose board of directors is controlled by members of the hierarchy. Under its direction, but administered wholly by Paulists, the Catholic Mission House was opened on the Catholic University grounds, Washington, D.C., in 1903, and from its classes most of the diocesan missionaries have been recruited. The present sovereign pontiff wrote to Cardinal Gibbons a letter of approval of this institution in September, 1908.

With the same end in view the Paulists have vigorously engaged in the apostolate of missions, the first fathers printed and circulated their sermons in the earliest years of the community, and in 1865 Father Hecker started the "Catholic World Magazine", then the only Catholic monthly in the country; and this was immediately followed by an organized propaganda of missionary books, pamphlets, and periodicals, most of which were given to Protestants gratis or disposed of at nominal prices. A work highly praised by the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, and still energetically carried on. The Paulist Fathers also consider it part of their vocation to influence the secular press in the interests of Catholic truth. The preaching of missions to Catholics also has engaged much attention of the Paulists. The first fathers printed and circulated their sermons in the earliest years of the community, and in 1865 Father Hecker started the "Catholic World Magazine", then the only Catholic monthly in the country; and this was immediately followed by an organized propaganda of missionary books, pamphlets, and periodicals, most of which were given to Protestants gratis or disposed of at nominal prices.

No innovation on traditional Catholic methods, least of all on the Catholic spirit, has ever been observed in their public utterances or ministrations, though the personal tone and character of the Paulists has imparted to their discourses and writings a peculiar zest. Parish work has occupied many members of the institute, characterised by speaking and preaching sermons, the training of children, the relief of the poor, the beauty and dignity of ceremonial, and the proper rendering of the official music of the Church. The making of converts is a prominent feature of their parish activities. Constant endeavours are made to attract non-Catholics to the missions and the public exercises of the Church, as well as to private conferences, and converts are always under instruction.

The number of Paulists is now 67, of those not yet ordained, 23. The increase, though not numerically great, has been continuous, the largest number of the novices being attracted by the non-Catholic missions.

WALTER ELLIOTT.

Mission Helpers of the Sacred Heart. See Institute of the Mission Helpers of the Sacred Heart.

Mission Indians (of California).—A name of no real ethnic significance, but used as a convenient popular and official term to designate the modern descendants of those tribes of California, of various stocks and languages, evangelized by the Franciscans.
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in the latter part of the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth centuries, beginning in 1769. The historic California missions were twenty-one in number, excluding branch foundations, extending along the coast or at a short distance inland from San Diego in the south, to Sonoma, beyond San Francisco Bay, in the north. Besides these, two others, established in 1780 in the extreme south-eastern corner of the present state, had a brief existence of less than a year when they were destroyed by the Indians. As their period was so short, and as they had no connexion with the coast missions, they will be treated in another place (see YUMA INDIANS).

I. MISSION SITES.—The following are the twenty-one missions in order from south to north, with name of founder, location, and date of founding. In several cases the mission was removed from the original site to another more suitable at no great distance. It will be noticed that the northward advance does not entirely accord with the chronological succession:


II. TRIBES AND LANGUAGES.—Nowhere in North or South America was there a greater diversity of languages and dialects than in California. Of forty-six native linguistic stocks recognized within the limits of the United States by philologists, twenty-two, or practically one-half, were represented in California, of which only six extended beyond its borders. Seven distinct linguistic stocks were found within the territory of actual mission colonisation, from San Diego to Sonoma, while in the border territory north and east from which recruits were later drawn, at least four more were represented. As most of the dialects have perished without record, it is impossible to say how many there may have been originally, or to differentiate or locate them closely. As tribal organization such as existed among the Eastern Indians was almost unknown in California, where the ranchoeria, or village hamlet, was usually the largest political unit, the tribes can conveniently be regarded as groups which are generally merely arbitrary terms of convenience. For the linguistic classification the principal authorities are Kroeber, Barrett, and other experts of the University of California.

1. Pomo, or Kulapanok, Stock.—The Indians of this stock bordered on the northern frontier of the mission area, and although no missions were established in their territory in the earlier period, numbers of them were brought into the missions of San Rafael and San Francisco Solano. Broadly speaking, the Pomo territory included the Russian River and adjacent coast region with all but a small portion of the Clear Lake basin. Barrett has classified their numerically largest and most linguistically distinct divisions, but all probably mutually intelligible. Of their southern bands, some of the Gallinomero (or Kainomero), of lower Russian River, were brought into San Rafael mission and the Gualala also were represented either there or at Sonoma. The so-called "Diggers" of the present mission schools at Ukiah and Kelseyville also chieftains.

2. Yukian Stock.—The Yuki tribes were in four divisions, two of which were north of the Pomo territory and therefore beyond the sphere of mission influence. The two southern bodies, originally one, speaking one language with slight dialectic variations, and commonly known as Wappo (from Spanish wuppo), occupied much of the region west of a line from the present Kelseyville; (b) a larger territory including upper Napa River and a portion of Russian River, and extending approximately from Geyserville to Napa. They were probably represented at Sonoma mission, as they probably are also under the name of "Diggers" in the present mission school at Kelseyville.
4. Moquelumna, or Miwok, Stock.—The numerous bands of this stock occupied three distinct areas, viz.,
(a) Northern: A very small territory south-east of Clear Lake and about the heads of Putah Creek, in
Lake Co., occupied by a band known as Oleomi, or Guenock (?), speaking a language apparently distinct
from the others of the stock. They seem mostly to have been gathered into Sonoma mission. (b) Western: A larger territory lying north of San Francisco
Bay to beyond Bodega Bay, and extending from the coast eastwards to beyond Sonoma, included within the
present Marin and lower Sonoma Counties. The various bands of this area spoke the same language in two
slightly different dialects (three, according to Merriam) and were gathered into the two missions of San
Rafael and Sonoma, both of which were established within their territory. In 1824 nearly 500 Indians of
this group were brought back from San Francisco and San José to reside in the new mission of Sonoma.
The whole group was known as Olamentke by the Russians. Among the principal bands or villages
were Bolina, Tamal, Chokuyem, Licatuit, Petaluma, Sonoma, Soclan, Olompali, Cotati, Guymen, with
others of less note. The celebrated fighting chief, Marin, was of the Licatuit band. (c) Eastern: The
main area, occupying nearly the whole region east of San Joaquin River to the heads of the tributary
streams, from Coosumee River on the north to Fresno River on the south. Their numerous bands, collect-
ively known usually as Miwok, spoke four different
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dialects, of which that of the north-western plains section may be considered a distinct language. Although no missions were established in the territory of the Miwok, large numbers of them were brought into San Juan Bautista, Santa Clara, and San José.

5. Costanoan Stock.—The territory of this linguistic division extended from the San Joaquin River, and from San Francisco and Suisun Bays on the north southwards to about the line of Point Sur, including the seven missions of San Francisco (Dolores), San José, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, San Juan Bautista, San Carlos, and Soledad. Although there was no true tribal organization, a number of divisions are recognized, probably corresponding approximately to dialectic distinctions. On the peninsula, and later gathered into San Francisco mission were the Romonan (at present San Francisco), Awhaste, Altahmo, Tulomo, and Olhorne, or Costano proper, all apparently of one language in different dialects. The Saclan, about Oakland, were in the same mission. The Karkin along Carquinez strait, and the Polye further south were gathered into San José. Santa Clara had two native dialects, while Santa Cruz apparently had another. About San Juan Bautista was spoken the Mutsun dialect, known through a grammar and phrase book written by the resident missionary, Father Arroyo de la Cuesta, in 1815, and published by the American Antiquarian Society in 1834. Eastward were the Ansaima and about the mouth of the Salinas were the Kalindaruk. At San Carlos the principal band was the Runsen, of which a remnant still exists, and at Soledad were Chalone, besides others of Esselen, Salinan, and Yokuts lineage.

6. Esselen Stock.—The Esselen, or Eccemach, constituting a stock in the coastal region or small territory on Carmel and Sur rivers, south of Monterey Bay, until gathered into San Carlos, and perhaps into Soledad mission.

7. Salinan Stock.—This stock centred upon the waters of the Salinas, chiefly in Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties, from the seacoast to the Coast Range divide, and from the head streams of the Salinas south (north) nearly to Soledad. San Antonio and San Miguel missions were within their territory. Nothing definite is known of their divisions, excepting that there seem to have been at least three principal dialects or languages, viz., of San Miguel, of San Antonio, and of the Playanos, or coast people. Besides their principal tongue, the Salinan, they spoke at least two other, one from the east and Chumash from the south in the same missions.

8. Yokuts, or Mariposan, Stock.—The Indians of this stock had true tribal divisions, numbering about forty tribes, and holding a compact territory from the Coast Range divide to the foothills of the Sierras, including the upper San Joaquin, Kings River Tulare Lake, and most of Kern River, besides a detached tribe, the Cholo, about the present Stockton. Together with the Miwok and eastern Costanoan tribes, they were known to the Spaniards under the collective name of Tuleefnos, from their habitat about Tulare lake and along San Joaquin River, formerly Rio de los Tulares. Their numerous dialects have been all mutually intelligible, the principal difference being between those of the river plains and of the Sierra foothills. Although outside of the mission territory proper, the Yokuts area was a principal recruiting ground for the missions in the later period, hundreds of Indians, and even whole tribes, being carried as neophytes and as prisoners of war, to San José, San Juan Bautista, Soledad, San Antonio, San Miguel, San Luis Obispo (?), and probably other neighbouring missions. One Spanish expedition, about 1820, carried off three hundred men, women, and children from a single ranchería to San Juan Bautista, where their language was afterwards recorded by Father La Cuesta. The Tachi and Telamini from Tulare lake and eastward were brought into San Antonio. A few are now gathered upon Tule River reservation, while a few others still remain in their old homes.

9. Chumashan Stock.—The Indians of this stock held approximately the territory from San Luis Obispo Bay south to Point Reyes, including the Gualda Maria, Santa Inés, and Santa Clara Rivers, the adjacent eastern slope of the Coast Range divide and the islands of Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, and San Miguel. The missions San Luis Obispo, Purisima, Santa Inés, Santa Barbara, and San Buenaventura were all within this area. They seem to have been represented also at San Miguel, San Diego, and San Antonio, at each mission, on Santa Cruz, and on Santa Rosa. That of San Luis Obispo was sufficiently distinct to be considered a language by itself.

10. Shoshonean Stock.—This is the first stock within the mission area which extended beyond the limits of California, the cognate tribes within the state being an outpost of the same great linguistic group which includes the Piute, Ute, Comanche, and Pima of the United States, the Yaqui, Tarumari, and famous Apache of Mexico. The five missions of San Fernando, San Gabriel, San Juan Capistrano, San Luis Rey, and its branch mission of San Antonio de Pala, were all in Shoshonean territory, and the great majority of the Indian inhabitants of the area, excepting only those within the mission sphere were of five languages, each with minor dialectic differences, nearly equivalent to as many tribes, as follows:—(a) Gabrielleno: from about Santa Monica southward nearly to San Juan Capistrano, and from the coast back to the foothills of the San Bernardino range, together with Santa Catalina island, it was spoken in slightly different dialects at San Fernando (Femandeto) and San Gabriel. The names Kij, Kish, and Topibcar have been used to designate the same group. (b) Luiseño: from the Gabriellenos border about Alisos creek southwards along the coast to the Yuman frontier beyond Escondido, including lower San Luis Rey River, Temecula, Santa Rosa, San Jacinto, and probably the islands of San Nicolas and San Clemente. Spoken in slightly different dialects at missions of San Luis Rey (Luiseño, Kechi) and San Juan Capistrano (Juaneno, Gaitichem, Netela, Acagehemem). (c) Panakhil, or Agua Caliante, occupied a limited territory on the heads of San Luis Rey River, and now at Pala and Los Coyotes reserve. They were also spoken probably from the San Jacinto Range from about Salton northwards to Banning, together with the head waters of Santa Margarita River. First visited by Father Francisco Garcés in 1776. (e) Serranos: in San Bernardino mountains and valley on Mohave River and northwards to Tejon and Paso Creeks of San Joaquin Valley; the Belenme of Father Garces in 1770 and the Takan of Gatchet. Some of them were gathered into San Gabriel. Three dialects.

11. Yuman Stock.—This stock also has its main home beyond the eastern boundaries of the state, and includes the Mohave, Walapai, and others. San Diego mission was within its territory, as also the two short-lives slightly varied in the Colorado. Nearly all the present Mission Indians not of Shoshonean stock are Yuman. Those within the mission sphere were of two languages, viz., Yuma in the east, about the junction of the Gila and Colorado rivers; and Diegueño in the west, in two main dialect groups: (a) Diegueno proper, along the coast, including San Diego, and (b) Coyote, or as others call it Chumash.

Very little is in print concerning the languages of the mission territory. For vocabularies and grammatical analysis the reader may consult Bancroft's volume on "Myths and Languages," Power's "Tribes of California," Gatesch in "Wheeler's Rept.," and above, all Barrett and Kroeber in the University of California publications (see bibliography), with other works
and collections therein noted. Among the important single studies are a "Grammar of the Mutsun Language" by Fr. Arroyo de la Cuesta, published in Shea's "American Linguistics", IV (1861); a Chumashan (?) catechism and prayer manual by Fr. Mariano Payner of Púrsima, about 1810, noted by Bancroft; and a MS. grammar of the Luiseno language, by Sparkman, now awaiting publication by the University of California. The missionaries were more than once urged in prefectoral letters to acquire the native languages in order better to reach the Indians, and in 1815 the official report states that religious instruction was given both in Indian and Spanish.

The Indians of California constituted a culture body essentially distinct from all the tribes east of the Sierras. The most obvious characteristic of this culture was its negative quality, the absence of those features which dominated tribal life elsewhere. There was practically no tribal organization and in most cases not even a tribal name, the rancheria, or village settlement, usually merely a larger family group, being the ordinary social and governmental unit, whose people had no common designation for themselves, and none for their neighbours excepting directional names having no reference to linguistic or other affiliation. Chiefs were almost without authority, except as messengers of the will of the god of war, and their living was held by most investigators to have been entirely wanting, although Merriam claims to have found evidence of it among the Miwok and Yokuts. Excepting basketry, all their arts were of the cruder development, pottery being found only in the extreme south, while agriculture was entirely unknown. Both men- tally and physically they represented the lowest types on the continent. The ordinary house structure throughout the mission area was a conical framework of poles thatched with rushes and covered with earth, built over a circular excavation of about two feet deep. The fire was built in the centre, and the occupants sat or lay about it, upon skins or sage bushes, without beds or other furniture. The Gallinómero, north of San Francisco Bay, built a communal house of L shape, with a row of fires down the centre, one for each family. The "sweat-house", for hot baths and winter ceremonies, was like the circular lodge, but much larger. The dance place or medicine lodge was a simple circular inclosure of brushwood covered over with the sacrifice poles and other ceremonial objects.

Agriculture being unknown, the food supply was obtained in part by hunting and fishing, but mostly by the gathering of wild seeds, nuts, and berries. The islanders lived almost entirely by sea-fishing, while about San Francisco they depended mainly on the salmon. The Chumash coast tribes fished from large dugout canoes. Hunting was usually confined to small game, particularly rabbits and jackrabbits, the larger animals being generally protected by some religious taboo. On account of a prevalent ritual idea which forbade the hunter to eat game of his own killing, men generally hunted in pairs and exchanged the results. Crabs and abalone were driven into nets and baked as a dainty. Among vegetable foods the acorn was first in importance, being gathered and stored in large quantities, pounded into meal in stone mortars or ground on metates, leached with water to remove the bitterness, and cooked as mush (porridge) or bread. Wild rice was also a staple in places, while in the blooming season whole communities roasted flour to use as bread. The men went nearly or entirely naked, excepting for a skin robe over the shoulders in cold weather. Women usually wore a short skirt with fringes of woven or twisted bark fibre. Both sexes commonly kept their hair at full length, but bunched up behind. Some bands shaved one side of the head. Tattooing was practised by both sexes to some extent. Shell beads were used for necklace purposes, and eagle and other feathers for head adornments. Dance-leaders and priests at ceremonial functions wore feather crowns and short skirts trimmed with feathers. Light sandals were sometimes worn. Musical instruments were the rattle, flute, and bone whistle. The dance was unknown, excepting the ceremonial round dance of the Pueblo Indians; the bow and arrow, wooden club, stone knife, and a curved throwing stick for hunting rabbits. Cremonation was universal, excepting in the Chumashan. Marriage and divorce were simple, and polygamy was frequent.

Of the mythology and ceremonial of the coast tribes of the mission area northwards from Los Angeles we know almost nothing. The Indians of California, without investigation, but the indications are that they resembled those of the known interior and southern tribes. For these our best authorities are the missionary Boscana, Powers, Merriam, and especially the ethnologists of the University of California. The southern tribes—Juanito, Luiseno, Diegueno, etc.—base their ritual and ceremonial upon a creation myth in which Ouiot, or Wiyot, figures as the culture hero of an earlier creation in which mankind is not yet entirely differentiated from the animals, while Chungichinich (Chinigchinich of Boscana) appears as the lord and ruler of the second and perfected creation, which, however, is a direct evolution from the first. The original creators are Eepee and Eepee, the brother and sister. The rattlesnake, the tarantula, and more particularly the lightning and the eagle, are the messengers and avengers of Chungichinich. In the Diegueno myth the whole living creation issues from the body of a great serpent.

The principal ceremonies, still enacted within recent memory, were the boys' puberty ceremony, the boys' initiation, and the annual mourning rite. In the puberty ceremony the several girls of the village who had attained the menstrual age at about the same time were stretched upon a bed of fresh and fragrant herbs in a pit previously heated by means of a large fire, and, after being covered with blankets and other herbs, were subjected to a sweating and starving process for several days and nights while the elders of the band danced around the pit singing the songs for the occasion. The ordeal ended with a procession, or a race, to a prominent cliff, while each girl inscribed symbolic painted designs upon the rock. The boys' initiation ceremony was a preliminary to admission to the alleged secret society, which was perhaps the priesthood. A principal feature was the drinking of a decoction of the root of the poisonous *toloache*, or jimson-weed (*datura meteloides*), to produce unconsciousness, in which the initiate was supposed to have communication with his future protecting spirit. Rigid food taboos were prescribed for a long period, and a common ordeal test was the lowering of the naked initiate into a pit of vicious stinging ants. A symbolic "sand painting", with figures in vari-coloured sand, was a part of the ritual.

The corpse was burned upon a funeral pile immediately after death, together with the personal property, by a man specially appointed to that duty, the bones being afterwards gathered up and buried or otherwise preserved. Once a year a great tribal mourning ceremony was held, to which the people of all the neighbouring rancherías were invited. On this occasion large quantities of property were burned as sacrifice to the spirits of the dead, or given away to the visitors, an effigy of the deceased was burned upon the pyre, and the performance went on for several days and nights, concluded with a weird night dance around the blazing pile, during which an eagle or other great bird, passed from one to another of the circling dance priests, was slowly pressed to death in their arms, while in songs they implored its spirit to carry their messages to their friends in the other world. The souls of priests and chiefs were supposed to ascend
to the sky as stars, while those of the common people went to an underworld, where there was continual feasting and dancing, the idea of future punishment or reward being foreign to the Indian mind. The dead were never named, and the sum of insult to another was to say "Your father is dead." In connexion with childbirth most of the tribes practised the couvade, the father keeping his bed for some days, subjected to rigid diet and other taboos, until released by a ceremonial exorcism. Besides the great ceremonies already noted, they had numerous other dances, including some of dramatic or sleight-of-hand character, and, among the southern tribes, a grossly obscene dance which gave the missionaries much trouble to suppress. Among the Galinomero, and perhaps others, aged parents were sometimes choked to death by their own children by crushing the neck with a stick. Ordinary morality could hardly be said to exist even in theory. Infanticide and abortion were so prevalent that even the most strenuous efforts of the missionaries hardly succeeded in checking the evil. In this and certain other detestable customs the coast tribes were like the California Indians generally, whom Powers characterizes, in their heathen condition, as perhaps the most licentious race existing. Even before the arrival of the missionaries, their blood, like that of all the coast tribes as far north as Alaska, had been so poisoned by direct or transmitted contact with dissolute sealing and trading crews, that the race was already in swift decline. The confiscation of the missions and the subsequent influx of the gold-hunters doomed the race to extinction.

IV. VITAL STATISTICS.—By the confiscation of the missions (1834-38) the Indians lost their protectors together with their stock and other movable property, and by the transfer of California to the United States in 1848 they were left without legal title to their lands, and sank into a condition of homeless misery under which they died by thousands and were fast approaching extinction. With the exception of occasional ministrations by secular priests or some of the few remaining missionaries, they were left entirely without spiritual or educational attention, notwithstanding which the Christian Indians continued to keep the Faith and transmitted the tradition to their children.

At last, as the result of a governmental investigation in 1873, a number of village reservations were assigned by executive proclamation in 1875 to the southern remnant, the northern bands being already extinct. By subsequent legislation there are now established some thirty small "Mission Indian" reservations, all in western and central San Diego and Imperial Counties, California, with a total population, in 1909, of 2775 souls, representing five tribes and languages, viz., Luiseño, Serrano, Cahuilla, Agua Caliente, and Diegueno. The largest groupings are at Morongo adjoining Banning (chiefly Cahuilla) 238; Pala (Luiseño and Agua Caliente) 226; Pechanga (Luiseño) 170; and Santa Ysabel No. 3 (Diegueno) 185. They are practically all Catholics and besides twelve government day-schools with a total enrolment of 286 there are 17 Catholic schools served by secular priests under the diocese of Los Angeles, with a total enrolment in 1909 of 1894 pupils. Of these the largest are at Pala (280), La Jolla (195), Pauma (180), Soboba, San Jacinto (163), Canyon Pecos (126), and San Felipe (125). All are day-schools, excepting St. Boniface boarding-school at Banning with 100 pupils. About the same time Catholic mission work was begun among the remnant tribes on the northern border of the original mission territory. In 1870 the mission of St. Turibius was founded by Father Luciano Oceas, north of Kelseyville in Lake County. In 1873 Father Labadie established the mission of Ukiah in Mendocino County. The Indians of both stations are locally called "Diggers," but are properly Pomo and Yuki, and some of the older ones still have recollection of the early mission fathers. They are in charge of the Friars Minor and Capuchins. All these northern missions are in the Archdiocese of San Francisco.

According to a careful estimate made by Merriam, the original Indian population of the mission territory, eastwards to the San Joaquin and lower Sacramento rivers, was approximately 50,000 souls. About 30,000 were domiciled in the missions at the time of confiscation. Following the ruin of the missions and the invasion of the Americans, they died in such thousands and that of all those California Indians, comprising perhaps four-fifths of the whole, not 300 are believed to survive to-day. The southern tribes, being of manlier stock and in some degree protected by their desert environment, have held themselves better, and number to-day on the "Mission Indian" reservations, as already stated, 2,775 souls, a decrease, however, of 152 in nine years. The Mission Indians of California have dwindled to fewer than one-sixteenth of their original number, and indications point to their extinction. (See California.)
MISSIONS

Missions, Catholic.—The history of Catholic missions would necessarily begin with the missionary labours of Christ, and would cover a very considerable portion of the history of the Catholic Church. The principal chapters of missions will be found elsewhere in the Catholic Encyclopedia, in the articles devoted to the various countries, provinces, dioceses, vicariates, religious orders, and congregations, notable missionaries, etc. The present article will be confined to a short general survey of the missionary activity of the Catholic Church at the present day. The subject, as thus limited, is conveniently be considered under the following heads: I. Organization of Catholic Missions; II. Receipts and Expenditure; III. Utility and Object of Mission Statistics; IV. Statistics.

I. Organization.—The main direction of the Catholic missions is vested in the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide, which contributed to the development of the missions of the Catholic world (see Propaganda, Congregation of). This congregation determines the ecclesiastical rank of each mission (prefecture, vicariate, diocese), assigning to it a superior according to this rank, and undertakes the duty of supplying missionaries wherever their services are necessary. For the training of Catholic missionaries numerous secular seminaries have been instituted; the most important are: the Urban (so called after its founder, Urban VIII), English, Irish, Scotch, American, and Canadian Colleges at Rome; Pontifical Seminary of Kandy; Leonine Seminary of Athens; the seminaries at Milan, Lyons, and Paris (the nascent states of the Catholic Association of Foreign Missions); Josephinum College, Columbus, Ohio, U. S. A.; American College, Louvain; English Colleges at Valladolid and Lisbon; Scotch College at Valladolid; Irish College, Paris; All Hallows, Dublin; St. Joseph's Seminary, Mill Hill, London; St. Joseph's, Rosendal, Holland; St. Joseph's, Brixin, Tyrol; Generalate of the Propaganda, Rome; the religious orders — Benedictines, Discalced Carmelites, Franciscans, Jesuits, Augustinians, etc.—which continue with unceasing zeal to labour for the propagation of the Gospel, are assisted by a series of new orders and congregations. It will be sufficient to cite here the names of the societies most widely engaged in foreign missions, and to refer the reader to the special articles for particulars. Congregations of the holy Ghost, Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary; Congregation of the Mission (Lazarists); Oblates of Mary Immaculate; Society of Mary; Oratorians and Oblates of St. Francis de Sales; Redemptorists; Paulists; Congregation of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary; Priests of the Foreign Missions (Missions Etrangéres). For further information see Missionaries, Foreign, missions, etc.

Among the colleges of the regular orders specially devoted to the training of missionaries may be mentioned: the College of St. Fidelia (Capuchin), College of St. Anthony (Franciscan), College of St. Isidore (Irish Franciscan), and the College of the Irish Augustinians, at Rome; Seminary of Schent, near Brussels (Congregation of the Missions of the Immaculate Heart of Mary); colleges of the Society of African Missions (White Fathers); the Veronese Institute and the colleges of the Society of the Divine Word.

II. Receipts and Expenditure.—Of late years the support formerly lent by various European states to missionary enterprises has been considerably diminished, and the Church has had to rely more and more on the voluntary contributions of the faithful. For the collection of these offerings mission-
aries themselves. A report of comparative failure does not prejudice their cause: the more numerous the difficulties with which they have to contend, the more conspicuous is their self-sacrifice. As, however, statistics now receive the attention of all denominations, words of explanation should be added concerning local difficulties, and in cases where a non-Catholic might be misled. Thus, e.g., a non-Catholic might not know that a Catholic priest may not, in general, baptize a pagan child without its parents’ consent, nor an adult without proper instruction.

The object of mission statistics is to supply the reader with such information as will enable him to judge how far the work of the mission has been successful. The special points on which exact information is most desirable may be grouped under four heads: (1) Number of Christians; (2) Personnel of the Mission; (3) Mission Establishments; (4) Administrative Statistics.

The Number of Christians.—In recording the number of Christians, a distinction should always be drawn between converted heathens and Christian settlers. While, in most missionary countries, the latter class may constitute so small a proportion of the totals as to be negligible, there are many countries in which the number is sufficiently large to create a false idea of the progress of the mission, if this distinction be not observed in the statistics. A distinction between Christians and catechumens is equally necessary, and under the former head none but the baptized should ever be included. By catechumens are to be understood only such heathens as are actually being instructed for baptism: as they constitute the harvest of the mission, they should never be excluded (as is now too often the case) from the statistics.

(2) Personnel of the Mission.—The statistics concerning the personnel of the mission should state how many are priests, the term missionary being used exclusively of such. How many of the missionaries are natives should also be indicated, since this information reveals the progress made towards the ideal of all missionary work, the establishment of a native priesthood. Besides the number of missionaries, exact information should be given concerning the male and female auxiliaries, who are engaged as catechists, as teachers, or to care for the sick; likewise concerning all the lay brothers and sisters (not, however, mere servants) who are employed directly or indirectly in the work of evangelization.

(3) Mission Establishments.—In this category may be classified the mission-stations, churches, chapels, schools of every kind, hospitals, and charitable establishments. Chief stations are most simply distinguished from sub-stations by confining the former term to stations which have at least one resident missionary, and the latter to stations where Divine service is periodically or constantly held by a non-resident missionary. To attempt to restrict the term chief station to centres of unusual missionary activity must lead to great uncertainty, as it would be hopeless to expect that any uniform dividing-line could be universally observed. Again, the name sub-station should never be applied to places where instruction alone is given: the number of such might easily assume proportions which would almost necessarily lead to misapprehension of the exact position of Christianity in the country. Outposts, such as those here indicated, should (if given) be kept separate from the stations. The schools and educational establishments possess a peculiar interest, since in many lands the task of reclaiming adults of a low cultural level, whose minds are obsessed with superstitions and brutalized by crime, is a well-nigh impossible one. The statistics should always distinguish between male and female, elementary and secondary, Catholic and non-Catholic pupils, and also between ordinary pupils
and orphans. It is also advisable to specify the teaching staff (European and native) and the number of pupils receiving instruction in handicrafts and agriculture. A seminary, if such exists, should receive special mention, since it has an important bearing on the formation of a native priesthood. Other institutions may be given under one head, as in many cases one building serves for various purposes.

(4) Administrative Statistics.—The figures dealing with the actual ministry of the missionaries are of course the surest indication of the progress of Christianity. In giving the number of baptisms, adults should always be distinguished from children, the ever, the word mission is confined to the work of bringing pagans into the Church. In view of this difference in the use of the term mission, our statistics do not contain a statement of the present condition of (1) the Catholic missions in lands prevalently or exclusively pagan, and (2) the Catholic missions in lands which have been won to Christianity since the Reformation. As the negroes of the United States are admitted into the statistics of Protestant missions, the inclusion of this second class is necessary to supply a uniform basis of comparison between Catholic and non-Catholic missionary activity.

With reference to the accompanying table it may be
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th>Baptisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Women</td>
<td>Catechists</td>
<td>Church and Substations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>214*</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,846*</td>
<td>6,992*</td>
<td>13,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,169*</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>5,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95*</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,933</td>
<td>4,877</td>
<td>4,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,224*</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,909*</td>
<td>25,136</td>
<td>17,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531*</td>
<td>592*</td>
<td>547*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>1,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660*</td>
<td>130*</td>
<td>130*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409*</td>
<td>1,329*</td>
<td>1,287*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,605*</td>
<td>4,232*</td>
<td>3,702*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435*</td>
<td>418*</td>
<td>340*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265*</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,069*</td>
<td>1,009*</td>
<td>894*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,284*</td>
<td>30,393*</td>
<td>22,657*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

number baptized in articulo mortis being given in both cases. The number of Easter and of devotional communications (given separately) are of special importance as indicating approximately the number of Christians who have reached the use of reason and the fervour of religious life. Such concrete figures give a better idea of the spirituality of the newly-converted than long dissertations on their zeal. Naturally, explanations of local conditions are attached to the figures, which might otherwise lead to misconception.

IV. Statistics of the Catholic Missions.—In dealing with mission statistics, it is a matter of the utmost importance to make clear from the first in what precise sense the word mission is to be understood. In canon law the term signifies all districts which are subject to the Congregation of Propaganda, and it might thus include territories (e. g., until November, 1908, England and the United States) with which the idea of mission is never associated in ordinary speech. We also find two clearly defined meanings commonly assigned to the word by popular usage. By missionary activity is often understood all efforts directed towards the propagation of the Faith, whether among heathens or among non-Catholics; more usually, how stated that the imperfect state of the figures available and considerations of space render it impossible to include all the particulars above advocated. An asterisk denotes that the returns are incomplete. No figures have been given where returns for a very small percentage of the missions are available. For fuller information the reader is referred to the works cited in the bibliography and to the articles on the various countries in the Catholic Encyclopedia.

HÜNDER, Der einheimische Klerus in den Heidenländern (Freiburg, 1909); IDEM, Deutsche Jesuitenvisionströde des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts (Freiburg, 1909); IDEM, Kathol. u. protestant. Missionarimelosen (Freiburg, 1910); KROM, Katholische Missions-statistik (Freiburg, 1908); Stocklin, Der neue Welt-Bot mit allerhand Nachrichten der Missionaren S. J. (Augsburg, 1728); KAL- XAN, Den kathol. Missionen-Historie (Copenhagen, 1826); HABERT, Kerkelijke Historie van de geheele wereld (4 vols., Antwerp, 1667-71); HABIN, Geschichte der kathol. Missionen (5 vols., Cologne, 1857-65); MULLBAUR, Geschichte der kathol. Missions in Ostindien (Freiburg, 1853); LOUVET, Les Missions Catholiques au XIXe Siècle (Lyon, 1894); DELPLACE, Les Missions de la Compagnie de Jésus (2 vols., Brussels, 1909-10); SOUAT, La France à Madagascar (Paris, 1910); PLOQUET, Les Missions Catholiques Françaises au XIXe Siècle (6 vols., Paris, 1906); LE BLAN'T, Les montagnes de l’Estremé-Orient et les persécutions antiques (Paris, 1877); LECLAIR, Histoire générale de la Société des Missions Etrangères (2 vols., Paris, 1894); HAM- NON, Histoire des Missions Catholiques (Paris, 1847); LOUVET, La Cochin-Chine religieuses (2 vols., Paris, 1885); DEVERIE, Situation du Catholisme au Cochin-Viêtnam à la fin du XIXe Siècle (Stuttgart, 1900); Missions Dominicaines dans l’Estremé Orient (2 vols.,
Paris, 1865); Duvourey, Dictionnaire des Missions Catholiques (2 vol., 1866); Le Chretien Catholique aux Indiens de l'Ouest (Paris, 1867); Poirier, Les Missions Catholiques aux Indiens du Canada (Paris, 1868); Coste, L'eglise a la Culture (Paris, 1873); and several others. The missions continued to flourish, and the Church's influence grew.

Yet the results of the Recollects' labours were but indifferent. So these religious generously yielded their places to the Jesuits, who reached Quebec on 19 June, 1625, the first to arrive being Fathers Jérôme LeLemant, E. Massé, and Jean de Brébeuf. Father Massé had already laboured among the Micmacs of what is now Nova Scotia. He renewed his exertions in their midst, while Brébeuf succeeded. Le Caron at the head of the Huron mission, whither he was accompanied by three other priests from France (1626). One of these, a zealous Franciscan, Father de la Roche Dallion, directed his steps towards the Neutral nation, on which he could make no impression. He finally left (1627), while Brébeuf's Jesuit companion also returned to Canada. Brébeuf, who had laboured heroically amidst the most discouraging apathy, if not hostility, of the Hurons. In 1633, after a temporary absence from his post, he returned West with Fathers Antoine Daniel and Ambroise Devoet. Incredible hardships led them to the village of Ixonatiria, where they met a pleasant reception. Then the two fathers set to work to teach and exhort the Indians, at first with no very great success. In the East Fathers Dolbeau and Jamay, with Brother Dupplessis, were displaying their zeal on behalf of the roving Montagnais and Algonquins of the Saguenay, Ottawa, and Lower St. Lawrence. In 1636 Father Dolbeau had even established his residence among the Labrador Eskimos. Thus were missions established at Tadoussac for the Montagnais; at Gaspé for that tribe and the Micmacs; for the latter alone at Miscou, New Brunswick, and at Three Rivers for the Montagnais and the Algonquins. As a rule, those Indians, though lower than the Hurons in the social scale, appeared to be more in earnest in their attentions to the teachings of the missionaries. To the west of these, missionary operations were thenceforth to be concentrated chiefly with a view towards the conversion of tribes of the Huron confederacy. By the end of 1635 Fathers Daniel and Devost, going to Quebec, met two priests proceeding to the north, and at Three Rivers Father Jean Jacques, nearest to the Neutral nation, heard the Jesuit's mission soon after left with a party of Hurons with whom he was to make his apprenticeship of the hardships in store for him. From the central mission of St. Joseph, or Ixonatiria, some twenty-eight towns were visited, the inhabitants of which proved as fickle as they were superstitious. Hence continual dangers forced the missionaries to remain always at the hands of those for whose salvation they were devoting themselves. In 1638 there were nine priests working zealously in thirty-two towns of some twelve thousand souls. Gradually they established the residences of the Conception, St. Mary's, and St. Joseph's, named after the one at Ixonatiria. Then they visited the Petuns (1639), and in 1641 Fathers Charles Raymbault and Isaac Jogues went among the Ottawas. Then, smallpox having made its appearance among the Hurons, fresh dangers ensued for the missionaries, ever considered the cause of such visitations. They now turned their attention to the Neutrals, a powerful nation settled on the peninsula between the Lakes Ontario and Erie; many of them experienced new insults, and met with few consolations (1640-41). Though they thus visited eighteen villages, trying to win over the people by
theirs gentleness and their devotion to their interests, they were everywhere greeted with maledictions and ran the risk of death. It seemed as if their patience and fortitude must have at length taught those uncouth savages, for in 1645 they invited them to their country, promising a better reception for the tireless apostles. The days of the Neutrals, however, were numbered; the Iroquois were to be the unconscious executors of the justice of God upon them.

To the north of the Huronians lay the territory of the Algonquins who counted at that time no less than one hundred and four distinct groups. One of these, the Nipissings, was visited by Fathers Claude Pijart and Raymbault (1640), who were cordially received. Though they soon made a number of baptisms, their success was scarcely commensurate with their exertions. The latter lost the Nipissings, tired of the missionaries, and, as if by way of punishment, they were in 1650 exterminated by the Iroquois. Unfortunately good and bad alike had too often to suffer by the invasions of these warlike aborigines.

In the summer of 1652 Father Jogues and Brother René Goupil were surprised by a party of that nation near a small mission on the Grand Huron. The former was murdered, the latter tortured, and put the latter to death (see GOUFIL and JOUGUES). In common with practically all the missionaries of the time, Father Jogues was a native of France; an Italian, Father Francis Joseph Bressani, was soon to walk in his footsteps (see BRESSANI). Nothing daunted by torments which, however, would have broken a weaker spirit, in 1653 Bressani returned to Canada (1645) and consecrated his unflagging energies to the welfare of the Hurons, who could not help regarding him as a hero. Meantime, constantly harassed by the Iroquois, who had burnt several of their villages, the Hurons were rapidly marching to their doom. Father Bressani, who had given to the Hurons a series of unusual guides, mission work grew apace among them. Indeed about 1648 Father Bressani felt warranted to write that "whereas at the date of their arrival they found not a single soul possessing a knowledge of the true God, at the present day, in spite of persecution, want, famine, war, and pestilence, there is not a single family which does not count some Christians." Better still, the converts were living up to the Christian standard of morality, and the general tone of the nation's society was gradually undergoing a decided change for the better. But the imitable Iroquois would not allow them to profit peacefully by the missions of their priests. One by one their villages were burned, and the missionaries were replaced by the Iroquois. In 1648 St. Joseph's was annihilated and its missionary, Father Daniel, killed while comforting his flock. Next came the turn of the fortified town of St. Louis where the lion-hearted Brébeuf and his companion, Father Lallemant, were martyred (see BREBEUF). St. Ignatius village suffered a similar attack, and most of the inhabitants were butchered. Then St. Mary's was assailed by the enemy; but, warned in time, it succeeded in repulsing the attack. Numerous Huron villages were successively razed, and many of their people massacred, while others were led off to the land of the invaders, there to undergo torture, perpetual captivity, or death.

No wonder, then, if the Hurons lost heart and sought safety in flight and dispersion. Their devoted pastors followed them in their exile. They at first gathered remnants of their once powerful nation on an island in Lake Huron, called to-day Christian Island, while the Petun village of Echiveria succumbed under the blows of the southern aborigines, and with it Father Charles Garnier. Though in the grasp of death, dragged himself to minister to the spiritual needs of his afflicted flock. His companion, Father Noel Chabanell, was at the same time the victim of an apostate Huron who flung his body into the river. The one consolation in the midst of these ruins was the constancy with which the converts stuck to their faith, even when in the land of their executioners. Some of the Iroquois, in the fortitude of their pastors, that many of them not only confessed their faith in Christ at the peril of their lives but even exhorted their persecutors to embrace it themselves. Some of the fugitives went west, while others found a temporary refuge on the desert shores of Lake Huron, or among the Neutrals who had soon themselves to flee for their lives. Meanwhile the exiles of Christian Island, after untold sufferings, retired in the spring of 1650 to the neighbourhood of Quebec, finally settling at the Lorette Mission (see HURON INDIANS). Their chief occupation having ceased with the practical extinction of the Hurons as a people, the Jesuit missionaries now turned their attention to the series of paupers among the prodigies of self-denial with which their victims had been favoured. Against their tenacious perseverance and devotion to duty no bigotry can stand. To Protestants as well as to Catholics they are nothing short of heroes of Christian fortitude. To the west of the Huron nation, the mission of the Petuns who boasted nine or ten villages with a population perhaps ten thousand in 1646. Two missions, that of St. John's and that of St. Mathias, had been established among them. These Indians were commencing to yield to the influence of grace when they, too, had to retire before the victorious march of the ruthless Iroquois. They found them at Michilimackinac, whence they set out on a series of paupers which landed them among tribes of the United States, by whom they were ultimately absorbed. The other remnant of the Huron nation fared better. About 1665 they enjoyed the ministrations of an able and pious priest, Father Joseph M. Chaumontot, a pioneer-missionary who had given to the Hurons more than three years of his life to the ill-fated Hurons (d. 1692).

Considered as a nation, the Hurons had been wiped off the face of the earth. Such of the priests as were not required for missionary work within what is now the American Union then turned their attention toward the more peaceful tribes nearer home. The Micmacs had from the first accepted Christianity (see MICMACS). On 29 July, 1657, Gabriel De Queylus, Gabriel Souaret, and Dominique Galinier, members of a newly founded ecclesiastical society, the Sulpicians, accompanied by M. d'Allet, a dean of the same institute, arriving at Quebec, immediately proceeded to the village of Ville-Marie, now Montreal, where the new fathers were replaced by the spiritual guide of the parish. Though more especially destined for work among the whites, the Sulpicians did not overlook the salvation of the native tribes. Thus, ten years after their arrival in Canada (1667), they ministered to the Ottawas and other Algonquin groups. Bishop De Montmorency-Leval, the first prelate in the colony, entrusted to them the care of a mission established at Quinté Bay on Lake Ontario, for the benefit of the Cayugas, an Iroquois tribe, and many adopted Hurons settled in their midst. Their success with the adult population was not complete; but their very presence paved the way towards establishing missionary stations all along the western shore of Lake Ontario (1669). Soon after, the Sulpicians were succeeded in that field by the Recollects who had just returned to Canada. Father Louis Hennepin and others laboured with energy, but harvested only tares, and the natives gradually returned south; all traces of a mission on the Canadian side of the lake disappeared.

It was then that, quite a number of Iroquois of the American Union bethought themselves of the Faith, a step was taken by their spiritual advisers of which the results were to last to our day. To withdraw them from the dangers of their pagan environment, the Jesuits induced them (1668) to settle at La Prairie.
near Montreal, whence they moved (1678) to Sault-St. Louis, and thence to Caughnawaga. One of the chief reasons for this migration was the prevailing exaction, principally owing to the intoxicants dealt out by the Dutch. The French colony itself was not free from that greatest of curses for the American aborigine. But, in addition to the solemn promise to abstain therefrom which was exacted of all the newcomers into the model settlement, the stopping of the evil was more easy to home than the Los Angeles (as it was then, English) soil. As a matter of fact, the missionaries of New France, and especially their valiant head, Bishop Laval, fought it with unflagging perseverance, appealing to the French authorities whenever their representatives on the St. Lawrence proved unwilling to stay the spread of this scourge. In time, the home of the Sault of the American (or, as it was then, French) Christians gave great consolations. Thus one of the former torturers of Father de Brevé, Garonhiagué by name, became one of the most zealous catechists of the new mission, and the war-chief Kryn shone by his virtues as much as by his courage. But the best known example of Christian efflorescence in that sector of the Lateran Province was the former surnamed the "Lily of the Mohawks", who died in 1678 after a short life passed in the practice of heroic virtues. About that time events shaped themselves in such a way as to further increase the extent of the missionary field in the East. The Abenakis, an Algonquin nation, over a staunch ally of the French, the Iroquois of the Mohawk Valley, who were known to the English, were attracting the attention of Father Gabriel Druillettes, who visited them repeatedly in their original homes. These natives were soon to swell the ranks of the Canadian Indians under the care of the Jesuits. After a series of hostilities in the course of which the English had at one time gained a foothold, the French were defeated on 3 Dec., 1679. Rather than remain neighbours to the victors, most of them immediately made their way to Canada and Acadia, where they have since remained.

The following year (1680) two Jesuits, the brothers Vincent and Jacques Bigot, were appointed to watch over the spiritual interests of the newcomers. They first gathered at the village of Sillery, joined St. Joseph's Mission which in 1681 counted already some five or six hundred inhabitants, as yet unbaptized, but animated by excellent dispositions. Their congers in Acadia, having heard of the welcome extended to them, asked for, and were granted, 150 more. On their way to the Iroquois, they were defeated on 3 Dec., 1679. Rather than remain neighbours to the victors, most of them immediately made their way to Canada and Acadia, where they have since remained.

The following year (1680) two Jesuits, brothers Vincent and Jacques Bigot, were appointed to watch over the spiritual interests of the newcomers. They first gathered at the village of Sillery, joined St. Joseph's Mission which in 1681 counted already some five hundred inhabitants, as yet unbaptized, but animated by excellent dispositions. Their congers in Acadia, having heard of the welcome extended to them, asked for, and were granted, 150 more. On their way to the Iroquois, they were defeated on 3 Dec., 1679. Rather than remain neighbours to the victors, most of them immediately made their way to Canada and Acadia, where they have since remained.

The following year (1680) two Jesuits, brothers Vincent and Jacques Bigot, were appointed to watch over the spiritual interests of the newcomers. They first gathered at the village of Sillery, joined St. Joseph's Mission which in 1681 counted already some five hundred inhabitants, as yet unbaptized, but animated by excellent dispositions. Their congers in Acadia, having heard of the welcome extended to them, asked for, and were granted, 150 more. On their way to the Iroquois, they were defeated on 3 Dec., 1679. Rather than remain neighbours to the victors, most of them immediately made their way to Canada and Acadia, where they have since remained.
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The following year (1680) two Jesuits, brothers Vincent and Jacques Bigot, were appointed to watch over the spiritual interests of the newcomers. They first gathered at the village of Sillery, joined St. Joseph's Mission which in 1681 counted already some five hundred inhabitants, as yet unbaptized, but animated by excellent dispositions. Their congers in Acadia, having heard of the welcome extended to them, asked for, and were granted, 150 more. On their way to the Iroquois, they were defeated on 3 Dec., 1679. Rather than remain neighbours to the victors, most of them immediately made their way to Canada and Acadia, where they have since remained.
had preceded him in that distant region. Then Thibault journeyed even farther west, and founded the mission of St. Ann at Finn Slough, which priests therebefore attended, with some measure of success, to the spiritual wants of the surrounding tribes. He next went (1844) as far as Cold Lake, Lac la Biche and even Île à la Crosse, where the Déné Indians received him with open arms.

A short time before (1842) another Canadian missionary, Father Moriée, from the Missionary Oblates of the Foreign Missions of British Columbia, or New Caledonia, as that country was then called, going as far as Stuart Lake, where he accomplished wonders. As early as 1838, after having crossed the entire continent from Quebec, Father Demers had reached the Columbia valley, where he was everywhere received as the special envoy of the Almighty, and produced among the populous tribes of the Pacific an impression which he fully worked for unity when, later on, the ministers of various sects made their appearance. In the spring of the following year, Father Jean Baptiste Z. Bolduc reintroduced Christianity on Vancouver Island, where it had been planted at the time of the occupation of Nootka by the Spaniards (1789-95). In 1842-47 Father John Nobili, assisted by Father Demers' itinerary, and finally went even so far as Babine Lake in the course of his missionary excursion. Meantime a new worker, Father Jean É. Darveau, was in a fair way towards materially improving the spiritual condition of the hardened Saulteaux of what is to-day Northern Manitoba, whose land was warded, 1844 by Jean Baptiste Lavigerie, with a Protestant catechist stationed at Le Pas, Lower Saskatchewan, where the priest intended to start a permanent mission. East of the Manitoban lakes, Father Dominique Du Ranquet, S.J., inaugurated in April of the same year the missionary station of Waspole Island, on Lake Superior, where he visited various posts, and in the following July another Jesuit, Father Choné, took up his residence at Wikwemikong, on Manitoulin Island, where a secular priest had preceded him. No less than twenty-one posts on the island, Georgian Bay from Mississaugu to Owen Sound, as well as Lake Nipissing and Beausoleil Island, were attended from that mission. Great was the opposition of the Protestants, but thanks to James Evans, the inventor of the Cree syllabics; but the Jesuits held their own, and managed to organize the flourishing Christian settlements of Garden River and Pigeon River (1848). The latter station was transferred in 1849 to Fort William by Fathers Choné and Frémiot. There the missionaries remained devoted to the Indians of Fort Arthur, Prince of Wales, Royal Island, and Lake Nepigon. Still further east, in the very land of the Abenakis, less consoling events had taken place some time previously. An Indian known by the name of Masta had been educated in the United States, where he returned in 1835 to St. Francis Mission with the title and attributes of a Protestant minister. After much opposition at the hands of his fellow Abenaki he succeeded, by dint of skilful intrigue and with the connivance of the Canadian authorities, in putting up a Protestant chapel in the very midst of the Indian village (1837). Three years later Father J. A. Maurault was sent thither by Bishop Signay to learn the language of the natives, and in 1847 he actually became their missionary. Thenceforth the Abenaki preacher saw whatever influence he had gained wane until he had to leave the scene of his exploits. At the same time a still better known priest was commencing his apostolic career at Oka, Father J. A. Cucq, an able Sylvester, who was in his youth an attendant at the chapel for over half a century to the welfare of the Mohawks and Algonquins, whose languages he eventually mastered.

A new era dawned for the Indian missions of
Canada. At the request of Mgr Bourget, Bishop of Montreal, four Oblates of Mary Immaculate reached the St. Lawrence from France (1841) and immediately began preaching missions, not only to the whites, but also to the Indians of Lower Canada. Several missionaries of the new order, Fathers Louis Deléage, Flavien Durocher, and Jean-N. Lavrelouchère, soon distinguished themselves. Bishop Provancher begged for the cooperation of their brethren in religion. On 25 Aug., 1845, Father Pierre Aubert and Brother Antonin-Alexandre Taché arrived at St. Boniface, and, while the older missionary was sent to Wabassimong, Brother Taché left after his ordination (22 Oct., 1845) for the distant post of the Mobile, where he had for a time been Father Louis Lafleche, who had established that mission in the course of the preceding year. Both priests did a vast amount of good to the native population.

In 1846 two other Oblates, Father Henri Faraud and a companion, reached the Canadian West. In the north Father Taché gradually extended his field of action. He visited (1847), first of all missionaries, the shores of Lake Athabasca, where Father Faraud was to inaugurate the Nativity Mission on 8 September, 1849. On 24 June of the following year Father Taché was appointed coadjutor to Bishop Provancher, and temporarily left the Ile à la Crosse mission in the hands of newcomers, Fathers Maisonnave and Taché, and the experience was of great service to the Indians. Hence Bishop Taché had to return to them after his consecration (23 Nov., 1851), and for several years the young prelate continued among them the labours which pertain more to the province of a simple priest than to that of a bishop. Father Henri Grollier, a young Oblate who was to become the Apostle of the Arctic Circle, came to support the ranks of the missionaries (June, 1852), while Father Albert Lacombe started on his long career as an itinerant missionary over the Saskatchewan plains. Father Grollier soon went to Lake Athabasca, where he was for some time Father Faraud's companion. Then he founded the mission of Fond du Lac, on the same body of water (1852), while Father René Rémés established that of Lac la Biche. The principal event of 1854 was the arrival in the Canadian Northwest of Father Vital J. Grandin, a young Oblate who was to do yeoman service in the cause of the missions there. The new recruit was sent to Lake Athabasca, to relieve Father Faraud, who established (1856) St. Joseph's Mission on Great Slave Lake. In the result of the Oblates' exertions in the north, we may say that, by the end of 1856, there remained of the seven hundred and thirty-five natives who formed the population of Ile à la Crosse, only one hundred and forty-eight heathens.

In the far East other Oblates were emulating those of the Canadian Northwest; in addition to those already mentioned there were Fathers André Garin and Charles Arnaud, then Fathers Louis Babel and Jean-Pierre Guéguen. These missionaries repeatedly visited in succession Tadousac, Les Escoumins, Maskawu, Mingan, Portneuf, and Les Ilets. As a rule their efforts were crowned with success. Not only did they teach their neophytes the rudiments of the Christian doctrine, but they even imparted to them some knowledge of the secular sciences, and enhanced the attractiveness of the Catholic worship by solemn processions and other pious devices. As early as 30 Sept., 1850, one of them, Father Arnaud, at this writing (1910) still actively engaged in the eastern field, tells us that: 'we have in the native of Jeanne d'Arc the best instructed on the coast; they all know how to read and write. It is inspiring to see them in the church, the men on one side and the women on the other, prayer-book in hand, vying with each other, as it were, in modesty and fervour. Another spectacle scarcely less striking is that of the little children in prayer after the evening service, when every mother teaches the members of her family how to pray to the Great Spirit' (Rapport sur les Missions de Québec, March, 1851, p. 36).

A regular house of the Oblates was established (1851) at Rivière au Désert, now Maniwaki, and later on (1862) others were erected at Bethammita and Ville-Marie (Pontiac), whence, as well as from the Hearing of the St. Lawrence, not only the laity, but the bands of the interior, Montagnais, Naskapi, and Nascapé, but even such as resorted to the trading-posts of Abitibi, Albany, and Moose Factory, on Hudson Bay, were visited by the "Black-Robes". In spite of their precarious circumstances, those aborigines often enough repaid by a faithful discharge of religious duties. The missionaries could not keep their spiritual guides. The same may be said of the Inuits of the inhospitable steppe of the Far North, where the Tachés, Farauds, Grandins, Grolliers, and a host of others were glad to undergo the pangs of hunger, and setting at defiance the rigours of Arctic winters and the fatigues of endless marches on snowshoes, for the sake of the souls entrusted to their care. Their courage and devotion to duty were so great, and their successes so striking, that they often elicited flattering encomiums from Protestant traders and explorers. On 30 November, 1859, Father Grandin was consecrated Bishop of Satala and coadjutor to Bishop Taché; yet he remained in the north, spending most of his episcopal time among the natives. Hence the presence there was all the more necessary as the preceding years had witnessed the arrival in the Mackenzie district of the first Protestant clergyman, the forerunner of numerous Anglican missionaries in the north. Father Grollier was immediately dispatched to Fort Simpson, the headquarters of the enemy, where, in spite of the inherent danger, he continued to work as a constant trader. He had the consolation of seeing the great natural boundary of the natives side with the representative of Catholicism. He then founded (1858) the missionary post of Our Lady of Good Hope, likewise on the Mackenzie and just within the Arctic Circle. Then he even went down as far as the first Eskimo village (Sept., 1860), while Father Gascon, a new recruit, was protecting the savages of the Liard River against the wiles of the preacher. Simultaneously the difficult station of Lake Caribou, just southwest of the Barren Grounds, was established under Father Véorgville.

The year 1862 saw the beginning of what was to become a most important establishment under the sign of Our Lady of the Divine Shepherdess, where Fathers Gascon and Petitot made the very first clearings. That same year a Protestant minister, Mr. Kirkby, despairing of success east of the Rocky Mountains, crossed that range into the Yukon. Hearing of this, an intrepid missionary, Father Séguin, immediately followed, but the conflict was unequal; the preacher having the powerful influence of the traders, had resources of which the priest could not dispose. Above all, he had the advantage of priority, and, despite two other visits of the Catholic missionaries, that of Father Petitot (1870) and that of Bishop Clout with Father Lecoré (1872), the Loucheux of the Far Northwest were, to a great extent, lost to the Church. Things were brighter on the Saskatchewan and in the adjoining region, where new posts, denoting constant progress, were being established on all sides. Even martyred Darveau's old mission of Duck Bay had been in a sense revived, though transferred to the northern extremity of Lake Manitoba under the name of St.-Laurent. A still more important event was the division of the entire Mackenzie districts into a separate vicarate Apostolic, with Father Faraud (consecrated 30 Nov., 1861) as first titular. The new prelate was (1866) given a coadjutor in the person of Bishop Isidore Clout. With this perfected organization the northern missions, served by such sterling missionaries as Fathers
Séguin, Grouard, and the learned explorer, linguist, and ethnographer, Father Petitot, managed, in the teeth of opposition and extreme poverty, not only to hold their own, but to increase the number of their stations and converts. In the course of 1866 Father Petitot continued his visits to the Indians north of the visit of the first minister of the Gospel they had ever seen in their dreary wastes. In the south Fathers Lacombe, Gasté, Leduc, Fourmond, Bonnal, and others were neither less active nor less successful. While in the far East secular priests were looking after the spiritual interests of the Abenakis, the Oblates continued their visits to the Indians north of the St. Lawrence, and the Jesuits to the natives of the Lake Superior basin.

On the Pacific Coast, the work of evangelization inaugurated by Father Demers likewise advanced. That missionary, having been made Bishop of Vancouver Island (1847), called to his aid the Oblates lately established in Oregon. The stations of Esquimalt, Sanish, and Cowichan, and the conversion of hosts of aborigines were the immediate results. From the island missionary work spread to the adjacent mainland. On 8 Oct., 1859, Father Charles M. Pandosy founded the Okanagan mission, and Fathers Casimir Chirouze, Léon Fouquet, Poulin, and others, but even then under their superior, Father Louis-Joseph D’Herbomez, in regenerating the Indians of the Lower Fraser. Most consoling were the results of their zeal, and it is doubtful if a more thorough change from habitual intemperance and other vices was ever effected in North America than that which rejoiced the hearts of the Oblates in British Columbia.

On 20 Dec., 1863, Father d’Herbomez became the first bishop of the mainland, and this circumstance gave a new impetus to the evangelization of that immense country. Shuswap and Chilcotins were then granted the same spiritual advantages as had been so for some time enjoyed by the natives of the Lower Fraser. It was the beginning of the mission of St. Mary’s that had been established (1861). In the course of 1868 Bishop d’Herbomez himself visited the whole of the northern interior of British Columbia, as far as Babine Lake, doing much good to the Dénes and other Indians he met. Fathers Le Jaoq and McQuicken walked in his footsteps until the former founded the mission of Athabasca and the latter went as far as the present site of Fort Providence, which was to become the great centre of missionary activities in the north of the Pacific province. In June, 1875, Father Pierre-P. Durieu was named coadjutor to Bishop d’Herbomez. On Vancouver Island a devoted secular priest, Father August Brabant, had long been battling at his own personal risk against the apathy of the less religiously inclined Indians of the west coast. He was finally successful, while secular priests, Fathers J. N. Lemmens, Joseph Nicolaye, and others, were gradually taking the places of the Oblates who had been the pioneers of the island diocese. In 1871 the Holy See formed the Province of St. Boniface with Archbishop MacDonald as its first Bishop. Bishop Grdin, now titular of St. Albert, and the vicars Apostolic of Athabasca-Mackenzie (Mgr. Farquh) and of British Columbia (Mgr. d’Herbomez). The archdiocese lost importance as a missionary country in proportion as it saw the wave of white immigration roll over the soil tilled by so many devoted workers. The districts of the Saskatchewan, the Mackenzie, and the Mackenzie were long to remain rich fields for apostolic men zealous for the lowest in the social scale. That the difficulties and even dangers attending the evangelization of the Indians had not disappeared from those territories was made evident by the drowning in Lake Athabasca (1873) of a veteran of the northern missions, Father Emile Eynard, an ex-official of the French government, the freezing (1874) of Louis Dasté, a lay missionary of the St. Albert diocese, and the fate which befell Brother Alexis (July, 1875), killed and eaten by an Iroquois companion.

Yet there is no denying that local conditions were, by little undergoing some alterations. On the plains of what is now southern Alberta and southern Saskatchewan white immigration had commenced. At that time treaties were made with the Indians, entailing the establishment of new missionary posts and of industrial schools. While some of these were assigned to Protestant sects, the Church could not be content with a second place in a country where she had done most of the pioneer work. In spite of occasional ill-will on the part of those in power, she readily adapted herself to the new circumstances. Thus were founded the important Indian schools of (1) Dunbow, Alberta (1864); (2) Qu’Appelle, Saskatchewan (1864); (3) St. Boniface (1890); (4) Duck Lake, in Saskatchewan (1897), and other similar institutions for the benefit of the Indian youth. British Columbia already possessed the Indian industrial schools of St. Mary’s, William’s Lake, Kamloops, and Kootenay, all in the hands of the Catholic missionaries and nuns. Then came the Saskatchewan Rebellion (1885), which resulted not only in the destruction of seven Catholic missions but in large numbers of deaths at the hands of the Cree (2 April) of Fathers Fafard and Marchand, young Oblates then in charge of the posts of Frog Lake and Onion Lake respectively. Quite a few of the misguided Indians, however, eventually profited by these troubles, since their condemnation to death or confinement led them to join the Church they had so grievously injured.

Thereupon the roving life of the pioneers became more or less a thing of the past for the missionaries of the western prairies, who, penned up with their charge in well-defined reservations, continued their ministrations without that element of romance which breaks the monotony of the daily round and contributes to the making of history. It may now suffice for us to mention the labours of Fathers Gasté at Lake Caribou; Bonnal at Cumberland; Grouard (who replaced Bishop Fafard, d. Oct., 1892), at Lac la Biche and Athabasca; of Father Pascal (appointed vicar Apostolic of the newly created district of the Saskatchewan, 19 April, 1891), as well as those of Fathers Laviolette and Delisle of the Lower Mackenzie, and of many other equally deserving missionaries. Even the lonely missions of the great northern stream and tributaries have had a share in the material progress so noticeable in the south. Thanks to the initiative of Bishop Grouard, a steamer has been built which annually saves to those poor missions large sums of money formerly paid to the Hudson Bay Company for their periodical outfitting. In the far East a new impetus was imparted to the missions of the faithful Miames by the arrival of the Capuchin Fathers in October, 1894, at Ste-Anne de Restigouche. In British Columbia material circumstances were never so quite so precarious as those of the Paraguayans. The spirit and zeal of Fathers Le Jacq, Fouquet, Chirouze junior, and others, the wonders of the Paraguayan Reductions have been reproduced, if not surpassed, among the Indians of the Peace. Other working there were Rev. A. G. Morice, who directed Stuart’s Lake mission during nineteen years and invented an Indian syllabary now widely known in the North; N. Coccola, who did wonders in the Kootenay; Fr. Thomas, and V. Rohr.

Of a native population of 111,043, Canada officially counts to-day 40,820 Catholic Indians thus distributed: Prince Edward Island, 274; New Brunswick.
was celebrated by the noted Dominican Antonio de Montesinos, the earliest opponent of Indian slavery, at Aylion’s temporary colony of San Miguel de Guadalupe in 1526, eighty years before the founding of Jamestown.

I. SOUTH-EASTERN STATES (VIRGINIA TO ALABAMA, INCLUSIVE).—The whole south-eastern portion of the United States, extending westwards to or beyond the Mississippi, was known in the early Spanish period under the general name of Florida. Although at least fifteen priests had lost their lives in this region with the expeditions of Narváez and De Soto in 1528–29 and 1539–42, an attempt to evangelize the native tribes was made in 1549 by the Dominican Luis Cancer, the apostle of Guatemala, under a royal commission granted at his own request for the conversion of Florida. Forced by the obstinacy of the ship-captain to land at Tampa Bay among the fierce Calusa, instead of being given an opportunity to search out a friendly tribe, Father Cancer and his two companions had hardly touched the shore when they were killed by the assembled savages in sight of the ship, being thus the first missionary martyrs of the eastern United States. St. Augustine, Florida, the first permanent settlement in the eastern United States, was founded by Menéndez in 1565. In the next year, at the request of the King of Spain, three Jesuits were sent out, one of whom, Father Pedro Martínez, having landed with a small party on Cumberland Island on the Georgia coast, was attacked and murdered by the savages. The other two Jesuits, Father Juan Rogel and Father Francisco de Escalante, after spending a winter studying the language, proceeded to work among the Calusa tribe in southern Florida. Reinforced by ten more Jesuits in 1568, they went over to Havana to establish there a school for Indian boys from Florida. Father Juan Bautista Segura, as Jesuit vice-provincial, then took charge of the Florida missions, establishing missions at Yucatán, Teogaste, and Tocoába tribes of the south and west coasts, while Father Antonio Sedeño and Brother Domingo Báez began the first Georgia mission on the Island of Yamacoo, in whose language Brother Báez prepared a grammar and a catechism. In 1569 Father Rogel with several Jesuits began work among the Orista or Edisto and others in the neighbourhood of the Spanish post of Santa Elena. After about a year, the results proving unsatisfactory, both the Orista and the Guale missions were abandoned, the missionaries returning to Havana with a number of boys for the Indian school. In 1572 Father Segura, accompanied by Father Luis de Quiros and seven (? ) novices and lay brothers, all Jesuits, together with four instructed Indian youths, undertook a mission among the Powhatan Indians in what is now Virginia. The guide and interpreter on whom they depended to bring them into touch with the natives was a young Indian of the region. That is what religion and civilisation Goya, brought off by a Spanish expedition nine years before, educated under the Dominicans in Mexico and Spain, and baptised under the name and title of Don Luis de Velasco. Their destination was Azacán (Oshacon)—supposed by Shea to have been on the Rappahannock—but more probably situated farther south. They met with friendly reception, and a log chapel was erected (September, 1570), but, before the winter was over, Don Luis proved treacherous, and under his leadership the Indians attacked the mission (February, 1571) and massacred the entire party with the exception of one Indian boy, who was spared, and finally escaped to tell the tale. The massacre cast a gloom on the previously promising mission, and the log chapel was later pulled down. In consequence of the small result in Florida the Jesuits were shortly afterwards transferred to the more promising field of Mexico. Years afterward;
the establishment of the Catholic colony of Maryland, some attention was given to the neighbouring Indians of Virginia (see below). In 1577 several Franciscans, from Carolina and converted the Timucua Indians near the city, of whom a number were soon regular attendants at the parish church. Fifteen years later four Franciscan priests and two lay brothers were at work in the towns of the Timucua and Yamasee from St. Augustine northwards into Georgia. In 1605 twelve more were sent out in charge of Father Juan de Silva, including the noted Father Francisco Pareja, to whom we are indebted for our most complete account of the Timucua people and language and for several devotional works, the first books printed in any Indian language of the United States. In 1597 a chief of the Yamasee organized a conspiracy which seems to have included also a part of the Timucua tribe about St. Augustine. Five missions, stretching from St. Augustine to Ossabaw island in Georgia, were attacked and five of the six missionaries murdered, Father De Avila (or Dávila), although badly wounded, being rescued. The advanced party was killed, and the Spanish troops, after all the Yamasee missions had been destroyed. The missions among the more peaceful Timucua about the lower Saint John's River, Florida, continued to flourish, being in 1602 four in number, besides temporary stations, with 1200 Christian Indians. Other Franciscans arriving, the Yamasee missions were re-established in 1605, the Potana tribe on the Suwanee river almost entirely Christianized two years later, and a beginning made among the lower Creek bands. In 1633 missionaries were sent to the powerful Apalachee of western Florida in response to repeated requests from that tribe. In 1655 there were 35 Franciscan missions in Florida and Georgia, and the Jesuits of Father Angélico de Rey, a convert of Bishop Calderón, the Apalachee mission was restored, and several new foundations established. In 1684 the Diocesan Synod of Havana promulgated regulations for the government and protection of the mission Indians. In the same year the Governor of Florida, alarmed at the growing strength of the English on the other side of the continent, all the native locations of the northern missions to more southern settlements with the result that the Yamasee again revolted and, being supplied with guns by the English, attacked and destroyed the mission on Saint Catherine island, Georgia, and carried off a troop of Christian Indians prisoners to sell as slaves in Carolina. In 1686 an attempt was made by the rival Spanish city of Saint Augustine to force the Indians to the missions. This resulted in the killing of a religious and six companions, a like attempt in the next year among the fierce Calusa south of Tampa Bay also proved abortive.

For years the English slave-traders of Carolina had made a business of arming certain tribes with guns and sending them out to make raids upon other tribes to procure slaves for Carolina and the Barbadoes. The Spanish Government, on the contrary, refused guns even to the Christian Indians. The War of the Spanish Succession gave an opportunity for an attack upon the Florida missions. In May, 1702, the heathen Lower Creeks, armed and instigated by Governor Moore of Carolina, attacked Santa Fé, occupied by the Jesuits, the only Indian town in the colony. The same year a combined English and Indian land expedition, co-operating with a naval force, attacked the mission towns north of St. Augustine, burned three of them with their churches, made prisoner the missionaries, and then, proceeding farther southward, burned the town of St. Augustine with the Franciscan convent and the Red Indians in retribution for the attack in America. The fortress held out until relieved by a Spanish fleet. In January, 1704, Moore, at the head of about fifty Carolina men and a thousand or more well-armed Creek, Catawba, and other savages, ravaged the Apalachee country, destroyed ten of the eleven missions towns, slaughtered hundreds of the people, including a number of warriors who made a stand under the Spanish lieutenant Mexía, and carried off nearly 1400 Christian Indians to be sold as slaves in Carolina or distributed for torture or adoption among the savages. The missions, with their churches, gardens, and orange groves, were utterly demolished, the vestments and sacred vessels destroyed or carried off, and numbers of the neophytes burned at the stake. Four of the mission fathers were also killed (two being tortured and burned at the stake), and their bodies hacked to pieces by deliberate permission of Moore himself, who gave up Lieutenant Mexía and four Spanish soldiers to the same fate.

This was practically the end of the Florida missions, and although a temporary expedition was made, with some temporary success, to gather together again the remnants of the Apalachee, Timucua, and other Christian tribes, and in 1726 there were still counted more than 1000 Christian Indians. With the establishment of the English Georgia colony and the ensuing war of 1740 the attempt was abandoned, and the mission towns were left in a condition of pestilence. In 1753 only 136 Indians remained in four mission stations close to St. Augustine. In 1743 the Jesuit Fathers José María Monaco and José Xavier de Alana began a mission near Cape Florida among the utterly savage Ais and Jogó with such success that a community of Christian Indians was built up, which continued until the abandonment of Florida in 1762.

II. MARYLAND.—The English Catholic colony of Maryland, founded in 1634, was served in its first years by the Jesuits, who made the Indians their special care. Under the superior, Father Andrew White, and his companions, several missions were established among the Piscataway (Conoy) and Patuxent of lower Maryland. The diocese established in 1789 was also given to the Potomac tribe in Virginia. The principal mission was begun in 1639 at Kittamaqundi, or Piscataway, near the mouth of the creek of that name. Other stations were Mattapony on the Patuxent, Annason on (Anacostia) adjoining the present Washington, and Potopac (Port Tobacco), where Father Gola, in 1656, remained for four years giving an extended visit among the Potomac, on the Virginia side, Father White baptized the chief and principal men, with a number of others. The work was much hampered by the inroads of the hostile Susquehanna from the head of the bay, and was brought to a sudden and premature close in 1645 by the Indians and their Protestant brethren and with the advantage of the Civil War in England, repaid the generosity which had given them asylum in Maryland by seizing the Government, plundering the churches and missions and the houses of the principal Catholics, and sending Fathers White and Copley to England to be tried for their lives, while Father Martwell, the new superior, and two other missionaries escaped to Virginia. Later efforts to revive the mission had only temporary success owing to the hostility of the Protestant Government and the rapid wasting of the native tribes. Before 1700 the remnant of the Piscataway removed bodily from Maryland and sought refuge in the north with the Delawares and Iroquois, where they were received with hospitable kindness. To Father White's anonymous "Relatio itineris ad Marylandiam" (translation published in 1833 and again in 1874) we are indebted for the best account.
of the western Maryland tribes. He also composed an Indian catechism, still extant, and a manuscript grammar of the Piscataway language, now unfortunately lost, the first attempt at an Indian grammar by an Englishman and anedating Eliot's Bible by at least a dozen years. (See Piscataway Indians.)

New England.—The earliest Christian mission on the soil of New England was that of Saint-Sauveur begun among the Abenakis in connexion with a French post on Mount Desert Island, Maine, by Father Pierre Biard and three other Jesuits in 1613. Both post and mission were destroyed a few months later by the English captain Argall, Brother Du Thet being killed in the attack and Father Biard and Quentien carried prisoners to Virginia. In 1619 the Recollects arrived to make a second mission. In 1623, Father Biard, returning to the coast, and gave attention also to the Indians, chiefly in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In 1633 they were succeeded by the Capuchins, who made their headquarters at Fort Royal (Annapolis), Nova Scotia, and had stations as far south as the Kennebec, the principal one being among the Penobscot near the French Fort Pentagouet (Castine), at the mouth of the Penobscot. In 1655 the post was seized by the English, and the resident missionary, Father Despresy, carried off. Although restored to France by treaty in 1667, the mission languished, and in 1693 was consigned to the Jesuits, who made the new mission of Sainte Anne (established by Father Louis Thibault) near the mouth of the Penobscot river. Father Despresy, near the French fort at Oldtown) their chief residence among the Penobscot. The Capuchins had laboured also among the Etchemin (see Maliseet Indians) on the northern frontier of Maine, their chief station being at Medoctee on the Saint John, established by Father Simeon in 1688 and revived by the Jesuits in 1701. In 1646 the noted Jesuit Father Jacques Bigot, whose mission was established at Norridgewock (Indian Old Point) on the Kennebec the Assumption mission, which for nearly eighty years thereafter held its place as the principal of the Abenaki missions. The most noted worker at this post was Sebastian Rasle (Rile, Rasler), who laboured with the utmost zeal from 1695 until his heroic death in 1724 at the age of sixty-six.

The chronic warfare throughout all this period between the rival French and English colonies, in which the native tribes almost solidly took the side of the French, exposed the Indian missions to the constant attacks of the English and made the missionaries marked men, both as Catholic priests and as supposed agents of their Government. They had many fugitives from the Abenaki bands retired to Canada, where they were joined by refugees from the Pennacook and other southern New England tribes, driven out by King Philip's War of 1675- 76. In 1683 these were gathered by the Jesuit Father Jacques Bigot, into the new mission of Saint Francois de Sales (St. Francis) on the Chemagenip (Fenelon) near Quebec. In 1700 the mission was removed to its present location. In spite of repeated demands by the New England Government (1698, 1701, 1712), the Abenaki refused either to send their missionaries away or to accept Protestant teachers. Realizing the danger, the Jesuits urged that the Abenaki Indians and missions be removed to a safer location in Canada, but the project was not favourably by the Canadian Government. In 1704-5 two New England expeditions ravaged the Abenaki, burning Norridgewock, with its church, and looting the sacred vessels. In 1713 some Indians removed to the St. Lawrence and settled at Bécanour, where their descendants still remain. Norridgewock was given up in 1722 and was another New England men. As part of the plunder the raiders carried off the manuscript Abenaki dictionary (preserved at Harvard and published in 1833), to which Father Rasle had devoted thirty years of labour, and which ranks as one of the greatest monuments of our aborigi- nal languages. Earlier in the year the mission village and fine church on the Penobscot, placed under Father Lauverjet, had been destroyed by another party, following which event Massachusetts had summoned the Indians to deliver up every priest among them and had set a price on Rasle's head. Although repeatedly urged to seek safety in Canada, he refused to desert his flock. At last the blow fell. On 23 August, 1724, the New England men men with a party of Mohawk Indians surprised Norridgewock while most of the warriors were away, killed several of the defenders, plundered and burned the church and village. The devoted missionary, now old and crippled, was shot down at the foot of the cross, scalped, his skull crushed and his body almost hacked in pieces. A monument was erected on the spot in 1833, the year in which the greater monument, his Abenaki dictionary, was published.

Mission work was continued in some measure, although under difficulties, among the Indians of the Penobscot and the St. John, but most of the Norridgewock band retired to Saint Francis, which thus became one of the most flourishing missions in Canada. In 1759 it was attacked by a strong New England force under Colonel Rogers and completely destroyed, with its church and records, two hundred Indians being killed. The mission was re-established near the present Pineville, Quebec, and still exists, numbering about 350 mixed bloods, while Bécanour has about 50. In 1763 Father Rasle entered into a treaty with the Abenaki of Maine espoused the cause of the Americans in the Revolution, and in 1775 made application to the new Government for the return of their French priests. The Massachusetts commissioners, although willing, were unable to supply them, but a later application to Bishop Carroll resulted in the appointment of the Sulphur Pater from Quebec as missionary at Oldtown about 1785. For nearly ten years he ministered to them and the Passamaquoddy, when he was transferred to the Maliseet on the Saint John. After various changes the Maine missions reverted again to the Jesuits in the person of Father John Bapst, who arrived at Oldtown in 1848. The most distinguished of the later missionaries is Eugene Vetromile, S. J. (d. 1881), author of several works on the Abenaki tribe and language. The two tribes are entirely Catholic.

III. NEW YORK AND PENNSYLVANIA.—A large part of what is now New York State was held by the five confederated tribes of the fierce and powerful Iroquois (7 of 16), numerically the strongest. Throughout the unfortunate circumstances of Champlain's plea, they formed a party of their enemies in 1640, they conceived a bitter hostility to the French which they gratified with deadly effect after procuring guns from the Dutch thirty years later. For this reason, and from the additional fact that their territory was within the sphere of English influence, the permanent Catholic mission was ever established within their limits, although several attempts were made, and large numbers were drawn off from the confederacy and formed into mission settlements under French control. So far as is known, the first missionary to enter this region was the Recollect father, Joseph de la Roche de Dalion, of the Huron mission in Ontario, who in 1629 made a perilous exploration of the country of the Neutr Nation, adjoining the Iroquois in western New York. In 1642 the heroic Jesuit, Isaac Jogues, was captured with two white companions and several Hurons by an Iroquois war party and taken to the Mohawk town of Caughnawaga (alias Ossernenon). Here they were driven out of the settlement, which had been laid waste by the Iroquois. Jogues was then burned at the stake, and the three Frenchmen cruelly tortured and mutilated, though not put to death. Father Jogues had his nails torn out, two fingers crushed by the teeth of the savages, and one thumb sawn off. One of his companions, the novice Répe
Coupil, was killed shortly afterwards for making the sign of the cross over a sick child. The third Frenchman, Couture, was finally adopted. After a terrible capture at the grave of La Prade the dyeing of the Mohawks, besides acquiring a knowledge of the language, Father Jogues was rescued by the Dutch and finally found his way to France. In the meantime another Huron missionary, Father Joseph Bressani, had been captured by the same Mohawks, tortured in even more terrible fashion at the same town, and likewise ransomed through the kindness of the Dutch (1644). In the summer of 1644 Father Jogues was back again in Canada, assisting in negotiating an uncertain peace with the Mohawks. In May, 1646, he was sent with a single white companion to the Mohawk country to consummate the agreement. This done, he returned to Canada to make his report, and then, with another Frenchman and a Huron guide, set out once more for the Mohawk to establish a mission. They were intercepted on the way by a war party of the same perfidious Mohawks, and carried to Caughnawaga, where, after various cruelties, all three were put to death on 18 October, 1646, the head of Father Jogues being sent up the river, and then thrown into the Mohawk River. The site of the Indian town is now the property of the Society of Jesus, and a memorial chapel marks the spot of their martyrdom.

In August, 1653, Father Joseph Ponet, S.J., was captured near Montreal by a Mohawk war party, carried to their towns, and there terribly tortured, but finally released. It was not until 1654 that the confederated Iroquois tribes, the Onondaga, Oneida, and Cayuga were now for peace with the French, and only the Seneca (who, however, nearly equalled all the others together) held back. Father Ponet reached Montreal late in the year, and peace was made. Father Simon Le Moyne, S.J., volunteered to go to the Iroquois, and Father Francis Xavier arrived in the summer of 1654 at Onondaga, their capital, where he successfully effected his purpose and was invited to select a spot for a French settlement. As a result the Jesuit Fathers Joseph Chaumonot and Claude Dabolon established the first Iroquois mission at Onondaga in November, 1654. In all the Iroquois tribes were numbered about 6,000, of whom 3,000 were Onondaga and 1,500 Cayuga, and it was thought proper to have a mission at each of them (see Huron Indians), who gave the missionaries a warm welcome. In 1656 Father Le Moyne was again with the Mohawks. In July, 1655, a party of fifty French colonists with several more Jesuits arrived at Onondaga to found a settlement there, as requested by the Iroquois, although it was strongly felt that the latter had been led into the enterprise by the specious promises of those who remaining joining with others from the Caughnawaga mission (Canada) in 1756 to establish a new settlement under Jesuit auspices at Aquasnne, alias St. François Régis, which still exists under the name of St. Regis, on both sides of the New York—Canadian boundary where it strikes the St. Lawrence. The mission at Oswegatchie lasted about 200 years, until 1807. The Catholic Iroquois now number about 40,000 out of a total 18,725, Caughnawaga itself with 2,175 souls being the largest Indian settlement north of Mexico.

About 1755 the first mission in western Pennsylvania was started among the Delawares at Sawunk, on Beaver River, where also were some Shawnee and other Iroquois...
response to urgent requests from the Chippewas and Ottawas. The next year a call came from some fugitive Hurons, who had fled to Green Bay in Wisconsin, to escape the Iroquois. To the remonstrance of those who knew the change of the times, the"God calls me, I must go, if it cost me my life." In making a danger portage he became separated from his guides and was never seen again, but as the searchers came upon a hostile trail, and their Breviation and casko were afterwards found with the Sioux, it is believed that he was killed by a lurking enemy. His place was filled by Father Claude Allouez, who, as vicar-general in the West, established the second Chippewa mission in 1665, under the name of Saint-Esprit at La Pointe Chegoimennon, now Bayfield, Wisconsin, on the south shore of Lake Superior. Other missions soon followed at Sault Sainte Marie (Sainte Marie) and Mackinaw (St. Ignace) in Upper Michigan; Green Bay (St. Francois Xavier), St. Mary, and St. Jacques in Wisconsin, among the Chippewas, Ottawas, Hurons, Mascoutens, Kickapoos, Foxes, and Miami. Among the noted Jesuit workers were Fathers Claude Dablon, Gabriel Drul-Jettes, and the explorer Jacques Marquette. In 1668 the mission of St. Joseph was founded by Allouez among the Potawatomis in northern Indiana. The mission at the mouth of the present Mississippi river was abandoned almost hostile Siouxs, but most of the others continued, with interruption, down to the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1764. In 1727 the Jesuit-father, Louis Guignez, founded the mission of St. Michael among the Siouxs, on Lake Pepin in Minnesota, which continued until some time after 1730, being abandoned probably on account of the disasters of the preacher.

The first mission among the Illinois was that of the Incramulate Conformation, founded by Marquette in 1674 near the present Rockford, Illinois, and known later as the Raskaaskia mission. Others were established later at Peoria Lake and at Cahokia, opposite St. Louis, until by 1725 the entire Illinois nation was evangelized or at least nominally connected with the Illinois missions are those of Marquette, Rasle, and Jacques Gravier, author of the great manuscript Illinois dictionary.

Missions were also established later among the various branches of the Miami in Indiana as well as among the Potawatomis, which continued to flourish under the care of the missions. The property was confiscated, although the Jesuits generally remained as secular priests until their death. Their successors continued to minister to Indians and whites alike till the removal of the tribes, 1820–40.

The majority of the Indians of Michigan and Wisconsin remained in their own homes, with missions maintained either as regular establishments or as visiting stations served by secular priests. Of the later missionaries one of the distinguished names is that of the author and philologist Bishop Frederick Baraga (d. 1865), best known for his grammar and dictionary of the Chippewa language. (See for more recent work, CHIPPEWA INDIANS; CHEROKEE INDIANS; ILLINOIS INDIANS; MASCOUTEN INDIANS; MENOMINEE INDIANS; MIAMI INDIANS; OTTAWA INDIANS; POTAWATOMI INDIANS; SIOUX INDIANS; WINNEBAGO INDIANS; BARAGA; GRAVIER; MARQUETTE, DIOSCESE OF; MARQUETTE, JACQUES.)

V. Lower Mississippi Region: THE LOUISIANA Mission. The "Louisiana Mission" of the French colonial period included the present states of Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, with the Tamaro foundation near Cahokia in Illinois, but excluding the Caddo establishments on the disputed Spanish frontier of Texas. For several reasons, rivalries and changes among the religious orders, intrigues of English traders, and general neglect or open hostility toward the Jesuits, the southern missions never attained any large measure of prosperity or permanent success. In 1673 the Jesuit Marquette had descended the Mississippi as far as the villages of the Arkansas, later known as Quapaw, at the mouth of the river of the same name, making the earliest map of the region and indicating the position of various tribes, but without undertaking a foundation.

In 1682 the Recollect Franciscan Father Zenon Membré, with the party of the commander La Salle, descended the Mississippi to its mouth and returned, planting a cross among the Arkansas, and preaching to them and to the Taensa, Natches, and others farther down. In 1686 a French fort was built at the Arkansas, and the commander Tonty set apart a mission site and made formal request for a Jesuit missionary, but apparently without result.

In 1698, under authority of the Bishop of Quebec, the priests of the seminary of Quebec, an offshoot of the Paris Congregation of Foreign Missions, undertook the lower Mississippi field despite the protests of the Jesuits, who considered it partly at least, within their own sphere. Early in 1699, three missionary priests having arrived, as many missions were established, viz., among the Tamaroa (Tamaroa), a tribe of the Illinois confederacy, at Cahokia, Illinois, by Father Jean-François de St-Côme; among the Taensa, above the Mississippi rapids, by Father Louis-Benoît de Montigny; and among the Toncas, at the present Fort Adams, Mississippi, by Father Antoine Davion. Father de Montigny shortly afterwards transferred his mission to the kindred and more important Natches tribe, about the present city of that name, ministering thus to both tribes. Father Davion laboured also with the Taensa and minor tribes, as well as the same society arrived later. In the meantime Iberville, the father of the Louisiana colony, had brought out from France (1700) the Jesuit father, Paul du Ru, who, first at Biloxi, Mississippi, and later at Mobile, Alabama, ministered to the small tribes gathered about the French post, including a band of fugitive Chickasaws from the Carolina. In the same year another Jesuit, Father Joseph de Limoges, from Canada, planted a mission among the Huma and Bayagula, Choctaw bands about the mouth of Red River, Louisiana.

In 1702 Father Nicholas Foucault, of the Seminaries, who had established a mission among the Arkansas, was expelled, and two years later the mission property was confiscated, although the Jesuits generally remained as secular priests until their death. Their successors continued to minister to Indians and whites alike till the removal of the tribes, 1820–40.

The Toncas station was abandoned in 1708, being threatened by the Chickasaw in the English interest. The whole southern work languished, the Indians themselves being either indifferent or openly hostile to Christianity, and when Father Charlevoix made his western tour in 1721 he found but one priest on the lower Mississippi, Father Joff, among the Yassou. Father Fargues founded a mission at the present site of the Louisiana Company, which had taken over control of the colony, gave permission to the Jesuits to undertake the Indian work, while the French posts and settlements were assigned to other priests. In 1726, therefore, Father Paul du Poisson restored the Arkansas mission, which had been vacant since 1702; Father Alexis de Guyenne undertook the Alabam, a tribe of the Creek nation, above Mobile, and Father Mathurin le Petit began work among the Choctaw in southern Mississippi. The Ursuline convent foundation at New Orleans in 1727 is due to Jesuit labour. In the next year the Jesuit father, Michel Baudouin, undertook a mission among the warlike Chickasaw.
these, successful mission schools have been established within the past thirty years, and are now in operation, among the Northern Cheyenne (secular), Assiniboine (Jesuit), Crow (Jesuit), Grosventre (Jesuit), and Piegan Blackfeet (Jesuit) in Montana; the Arapaho and Shoshoni (Jesuit) in Wyoming; and the Southern Ute (Theatine) in Colorado (see Ute Indians).

VII. TERRITORY AND CLIMATE. - Texas, etc. - Texas as a Spanish colony was connected with Mexico, and was ruled in missionary affairs from Querétaro and Zacatecas, instead of from Havana, as was Florida. Its immense area, four times as great as that of all New England, contained hundreds of petty tribes or bands — so many, in fact, that they have never been counted — speaking scores of languages or dialects, belonging to no known confederacies, based upon linguistic affiliation, of which the principal within the mission sphere may be designated as the Caddo, Hasinai, Karankawa, Tonkawa, Wichita, and Pakawá. Of these, the Caddo group extended into western Louisiana, while the tribes of the Wichita connection ranged north into Kansas. The total Indian population within the present state limits was probably originally close to 40,000. The beginning of mission work in Texas was made by the Franciscan Father Andrés de Olmos, who in 1544 crossed the Rio Grande and, after gathering a large body of converts, led them back into Tamaulipas, where they were organized into a migration town, Olives. In 1565 the French Frontière erected a fort on Matagorda Bay, and two years later, after a succession of misfortunes, started to make his way overland to Illinois, leaving behind about twenty men, including the Recollect missionaries, Fathers Zenobius Membré and Maximus Le Cercq, and the Sulpician Father Chevedelle. A Spanish expedition which arrived later found the French Frontière and his converts dead and unburied bones. All but two men had been killed by the Indians, among whom the chalices and Breviaries of the murdered priests were afterwards recovered.

In 1890 a company of Spanish Franciscans from the Querétaro College, headed by Father Damian Mazzaretz, established a mission among the friendly Hasinai (Ainaias, Cenis), in north-east Texas, and projected others, but the work was abandoned three years later. In 1899 the Franciscans of the Zacatecas College began a series of missions along the south bank of the Rio Grande, to which they gathered in a number of Indians of the Pakawá group in southern Texas. These were kept up until 1718, when the chief mission was transferred to San Antonio.

In 1715 the two colleges combined to restore the Texas missions, urged by the zeal of the venerable founder of the Zacatecas college, Father Antonio Margil. The Hasinai mission (San Francisco) was restored and another, La Purisima, established among the cognate Hainai (Aynaias) in the neighbourhood of the present Nacogdoches band (N. S. de Guadalupe) was founded by Margil himself among the Ncogdoches band of the Caddo in 1716, and others in 1717 among the Ais (N. S. de Dolores) and Adai or Adayes (San Miguel de Linares), the last being within the limits of Louisiana. In 1719, war having been declared between France and Spain, a French expedition under St. Denis plundered the mission at the Adai. In consequence the missions were abandoned until peace was declared two years later.

In 1718 the mission of San Francisco Solano was transferred to San Antonio de Valero. Other missions were established in the vicinity, making a total of four in 1731, including San Antonio de Fadus, the celebration of the Dedication of the missions of Caddo and Hasinai from the East; Xarame from the Rio Grande; Pakawá (Pacoa) and a few Tofkawá of the immediate neighbourhood. In the meantime a lay brother had perished in a prairie fire, and another, Brother Jose Pita, in 1721, with a small party, had been massacred by the Lipan while on his way to his
station. In 1722 the mission of Guadalupe was established at Bahia, on Lavaca (Matagorda) Bay among the Karankawa. Nine years later it was moved to the Guadalupe River. In 1752 the Candelaria mission was attacked by the Caco, a Karankawa band, and Father José Guadalupe, its director, was killed. In 1757 the mission of San Sábal was established by Father Alonso Terreros for the conversion of the wild and nomadic Lipan Apache, but they refused to settle in it; the following year the tribes destroyed the mission, killing Father Terreros and two other priests. Another attempted Lipan mission, in 1761, was broken up in 1769 by the Comanche. At this period the Texas missions had reached their highest point, with an Indian population of about 15,000. In 1760 Father Bartolomé García published his religious manual for the use of the San Antonio missions, which remains almost our only linguistic monument of the Paháwa tribes of central Texas. In 1791 another mission was established among the Karankawa.

Although constantly hampered by the Spanish authorities, the missions continued to exist until 1812, when they were suppressed by the revolutionary Government, and the Indians scattered (see PAPÁWA INDIANS; TONKAWA INDIANS; WICHITA).

VIII. New Mexico and Arizona. The earliest European occupation of New Mexico was by the Franciscan Marco de Niza (Marcos de Nixna) in 1539, and the first missions were undertaken in 1542 by the Franciscans who accompanied Coronado. (For the missions among the Pueblo and Hopi see PUEBLO INDIANS.) The most important event in this connexion is the great Pueblo revolt of 1680 in which twenty-one missionaries and 400 others were massacred.

The missions among the Pima and Papago of Arizona are of later foundation, beginning about 1732, and originated with the Jesuit, with whom they continued until the expulsion of the order in 1767, when they were taken over by the Franciscans (see PAPAGO INDIANS; PIMA INDIANS).

To secure the powerful tribe of the Navajo in northern Arizona and New Mexico were made by the Franciscans as early as 1746, but without result. Lately the work has been again taken up successfully by German Franciscans. To their scholarship and scientific interest we owe also a monumental "Ethnological Dictionary of the Navaho Language." (See NAVAJO INDIANS.) Some mission work is also now conducted in the Mescalero tribe of about 450 souls at Tularosa, New Mexico.

IX. The Columbia Region. The first knowledge of Christianity among the tribes of this region came through the Catholic Iroquois and Canadien French employees of the Hudson Bay Company, by whose influence and teaching many of the Indians, particularly among the Flatheads and Nez Perce, were induced to embrace the principles and practices of Catholicism as early as 1820, leading some years later to a request for missionaries, in response to which the Flathead mission in Montana was founded by the Jesuit Father Peter de Smet in 1841, followed shortly afterwards by another among the Nez Perce in Idaho, established by the Jesuit Father Nicholas Point. In 1839 Father Francis Blanchet, secular, who had come out to attend the Indian residents, established St. Francis Xavier mission on the Cowlitz, in western Washington, and another on the lower Willamet at Champoeq, Oregon, while about the same time Father J. B. Bolyue began work among the tribes of Puget Sound. In 1844 three Jesuit missions were established among the Pend d'Oreille and Colville tribes of the Upper Columbia, besides three others across the British line. In 1847 the Oblates arrived, and missions were established by Father Pandoey among the Yakima and by Father Ricardo near the present Olympia. In 1848 the secular Fathers Rousseau and Mesplef founded a station among the Wasco, at the Dalles of the Columbia, in Oregon. Work was also attempted among the degenerate Chinooks, with little result. The noted Oblate missionary, Father Casimir Chirouze (d. 1892), best known for his later work at Tulalip, reached Oregon in 1847 and began his labours among the tribes of Puget Sound and the lower Columbia about the same period. With the exception of the Wasco and the Chinooks, these missions or their successors are still in successful operation, numbering among their adherents the majority of the Christian Indians of Washington and southern Idaho. To Fathers Saintonge and Pandosy we are indebted for important contributions to Yakima linguistics. (See CHINOOKANS; KALLEPSCH INDIANS; KUTENN INDIANS; LAKE INDIANS; LUMMI INDIANS; PUYALLUP INDIANS; SPOKAN INDIANS; TULALIP INDIANS; YAKIMA INDIANS.)

Besides these there are Jesuit missions of more recent establishment among the Nez Percés of Idaho; and among the Umatlans, Klamath, Warspring, and Siletz Indians in Oregon, besides another among the remnant tribes of Grand Ronde reservation, Oregon, served by a priest of the Society of the Divine Saviour. (See SILETZ INDIANS; UMATILLA INDIANS; WARSPRING INDIANS; YAMHILL INDIANS.)

X. California. For the mission history see CALIFORNIA; and Mission Indians.

For a statement of the present organisation of Indian mission work and the sources and methods of financial support, see article Indian Missions, Bureau of Catholic.

XI. The Missionary Martyrs. The following incomplete and tentative list of missionaries who died by violence or other untimely death in direct connexion with their work will show that even before the establishment of the republic the soil of the United States had been baptized in the blood of Catholic missionaries from ocean to ocean. A few other names are included for special reasons. Those who perished with the exploring expeditions under Narváez, De Soto, and others are not noted.

1542 Padilla, Juan de, Franciscan, killed in Kansas(?).

1543 Escalona, Brother Luis de, Franciscan, killed by Pecos, New Mexico.

1549 La Cruz, Juan de, Franciscan, killed by Tiguas, New Mexico.

1549(?) Tolosa, Diego de, Dominican, killed by Calusa, Florida.

1556 Fuentes, Brother, killed by Calusa, Florida.

1566 Martínez, Pedro, Jesuit, killed by Yamasee, Georgia.

1569(?) Béz, Brother Domingo, Agustín, Jesuit, died of fever, with Yamasee, Florida.

1571 Segura, Juan Bautista Quiros, Luis de Gómez, Brother Gabriel (novice) de (novice) Jesús, killed by Solís, Brother Powhatan, Virginia.

1571 Zerallos, Brother Sancho Redondo, Brother Linares, Brother (novice)

1581 López, Francisco, Franciscan, killed at Tiguas, New Mexico.

1581 Santa María, Juan de Rodríguez (or Ruiz), Brother Agustín (novice) Francisco, Franciscans, killed at Tiguas, New Mexico.

1597 Corpa, Pedro de Rodriguez (or Ruiz), Brother Agustín Francisca, Francisca, Francisca, killed at Tiguas, New Mexico.

1613 Du Thet, Brother Gilbert, Jesuit, killed by the English, Maine.
1631 Miranda de Ávila, Pedro, Franciscan, killed by Taos, New Mexico.

1632 Lebrado, Francisco, Franciscans, killed by Arville, Martin de, "Ziaquis", New Mexico.

1633 Torres, Francisco, Franciscan, poisoned by Hopi, Arizona.

1642 Goupil, René (novice), Jesuit, killed by Mohawks, New York.

1644 Bressani, Joseph, Jesuit, tortured by Mohawks, but rescued, New York.

1646 Joques, Isaac, Jesuit, killed by Mohawks, New York.

1653 Poncelet, Joseph, Jesuit, tortured by Mohawks, but rescued, New York.

1657 Eight Franciscans drowned, en route Florida missions to Havana.

1661 Menard, René, Jesuit, lost, supposed killed by Sioux, Wisconsin.

1675 "Several missionaries", Franciscans (record incomplete), killed by Pueblo, New Mexico.

1675 Marquette, Jacques, Jesuit, died in woods, Michigan.

1680 La Ribourde, Gabriel de, Recollect, killed by Kickapoos, Illinois.

1680 Twenty-two Franciscans killed in general massacre, and revolted Pueblo, New Mexico, and Arizona, viz.

- Talaban, Juan Lorezana, Francisco Antonio de Montes de Oca, (Juan?) Santo Domingo Pueblo, New Mexico.
- José de Pio, Juan Bautista de, Tesuque Pueblo, New Mexico.
- Torres, Tomas, Nambe Pueblo, New Mexico.
- Morales, Luis de Pro, Antonio Sánchez de Baeza, Luis de Rendon, Matías de, Picuris Pueblo, New Mexico.
- Mora, Antonio Pedraza, Juan de, Taos Pueblo, New Mexico.
- Maldonado, Lucas, Acoma Pueblo, New Mexico.
- Bal, Juan de, Alona (Zufi) Pueblo, New Mexico.
- Figuera, José de Trujillo, José Espeleta, José de Santa María, Agustín de Bernal, Juan (cuzco) Galisteo (Tano) Pueblo Vera, Juan Domingo, San Ildefonso Pueblo, New Mexico.
- Velasco, Francisco (Fernando), de, Pecos Pueblo, New Mexico.
- Tinoco, Manuel, San Marcos Pueblo, New Mexico.
- Jesus, Simon (Juan?) de, Jemes Pueblo, New Mexico.

1683 (circa) Beltran, Manuel, Franciscan, killed by Tanos (?), New Mexico.

1687 Membré, Zenobius, Recollect, Le Clerc, Maximus, Recollect, Chetdeville, —, Sulpician, killed by Karankawa (?), Texas.

1696 —, Franciscan, by Ais (?), (Tororo), Florida.

1696 Arbizu, José de Franciscans, killed by Taos, Carbonel, Antonio New Mexico.

1697 Corvera, Francisco Franciscans, killed by Tejano, Antonio hua, New Mexico.

1698 Casañes, Francisco, Franciscan, killed by Jemes, New Mexico.

1702 Foucault, Nicholas, Sem. For. Missions, killed, by Kora, Mississippi.

1704 Farge, Juan de Menendez, Manuel de Delgado, Marcos Miranda, Angel Franciscans, tortured and killed by English and Indian allies, Florida.

1706 Delhalle, Nicholas, B.C., Recollect (parish priest, Detroit), killed by Ottawa, Michigan.

1708 Gravier, Jacques, Franciscan, died of wound inflicted by Illinois (1705), Illinois.

1715 (circa) Vatier, Léonard, Recollect, killed by Foxes, Wisconsin.

1718 Mantedocia (Mantes de Oca), Brother Luis de, Franciscan, killed in prairie fire, Texas.

1720 (circa) Mingüés, Juan, Franciscan, killed in massacre by Missouri, Missouri (?).

1721 Pita, Brother José, Franciscan, killed in massacre by Lipan, Texas.

1729 du Poisson, Paul, Jesuit, killed by Natches, Mississippi.

1730 Souel, Jean, Jesuit, killed by Yaozo, Mississippi.


1736 Senat, Antoninus, Jesuit, tortured and burned with whole party by Chickasaw, Mississippi.

Aulneau (Arnaud), Jean-Pierre, Jesuit, killed with twenty others in massacre by Sioux, on Massacre Island, Lake Pepin, about two miles beyond the Minnesota-Canada line.

1752 Ganzabal, José Francisco, Franciscan, held by Coco (Karankawa), Texas.

1758 (circa) Silva, —, Franciscan, killed by Yuma, California.

1760 Terreros, Alonso G.de, killed in massacre at San Gaspar, by missionary Indians, Texas.

1775 Jayme, Luis, Franciscan, killed by Diegueno, California.

1780 Díaz, Juan Morena, Matías Queses, Francisco Yuma, California.

1812 Quintana, Andrés, Franciscan, killed by Mission Indians, California.

1833 Díaz, —, killed by Caddo (?), Texas.

Bancroft, histories, California, Oregon, Washington, New Mexico, Arizona, etc. (San Francisco, 1856-90); Barcia, Ensayo Cronológico (Madrid, 1723); Bureau Cath. Ind. Missions, annual reports (Washington); Jesuit Relations and Travels (Boston, 1883); Greener, Catholic Missions in the Interior of North America, 1839-1901, New York, 1890; Murdock, Catholic Church in Western Canada (2 vols., Montreal, 1910); Parman, Jesuits in North America (Boston, 1867); Fremont, Missions in the Far West (Boston, 1833); Shae, Catholic Missions (New York, 1855); Shae, Catholic Church in Colonial Days (New York, 1885); also authorities under crosses-referenced articles.

James Mooney.

**MISSIONS**

**MISSIONS, CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL.**—This term is used to designate certain special exertions of the Church's pastoral agencies, made for the most part, among Catholics, to instruct them more fully in the truths of their religion, to convert sinners, rouse the torpid and indifferent, and lift the good to a still higher plane of spiritual effort. To distinguish them from those missions which represent the apostolic activity of the Church among pagans and heathens, these home missions are known in some communities of English-speaking Catholics as "parochial missions". Such missions usually consist of a systematic course of preaching and instruction, extending over a stated number of days, performed by authorized missionaries. The present article treats of: I. The Necessity and Utility of Popular Missions; II. Origin of History; III. Method.

**I. Necessity and Utility.**—From the above definition it is evident that the primary object of a popular mission is not the making of converts to the Faith. However, owing to the familiar relations between Catholics and non-Catholics in the United States, this is so common a result that it may be regarded as normally a part of the work in that country, and from the last decade of the nineteenth century, as
organized missionary movement for the conversion of non-Catholics has been carried on throughout that country. (See Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle.) But the converts whom a pastor most of all seeks during a regular parish visit are his own people. And it cannot be denied that the clear, forcible, and consecutive exposition of the most important truths of salvation, together with a course of instructions to prepare the people for the worthy reception of the sacraments and enlighten them on the duties of their daily lives, affords a powerful means to renovate a parish spiritually. Everyone finds in these sermons and instructions something that appeals peculiarly to him, and is likely to bear fruit in the future. These missions are for the laity what retreats are for the clergy and religious communities. In fact they are an adaptation to the needs and capacities of the faithful of the spiritual exercises long traditional in the Church, and made use of especially during the Ages of Faith when people were in the habit of retiring to monasteries to devote themselves for a certain period of time to that renewal in the spirit of their mind, which the Apostle recommends: “And be renewed in the spirit of your mind: and put on the new man, who according to God is created in justice and holiness of truth” (Eph., iv, 22-24). Moreover, from a retreat, it is no exaggeration to say that, in the ordinary course of Divine Providence, a mission is the greatest grace that God can confer upon any parish. “There is nothing”, says St. Alphonsus, “that is better adapted than missions or retreats to enlighten the minds of men, to purify corrupt hearts and to make them new creations in Christ.”

The usefulness of missions, moreover, for the sanctification and salvation of souls has received not a little recognition from various popes during the last two centuries. Paul III recommended the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius as “full of piety and sanctity and very useful and salutary for the edification and spiritual life”, and Leo XIV, after comparing missionaries to those whom the Apostles Peter and Andrew called to assist them in landing their nets, says that for “purifying corrupt morals... nothing is more effective than to solicit the aid of others, namely to establish everywhere (that is in every diocese) sacred missions. Nor can there be too many, nor too few, and they should be proposed for purifying the morals of the people. It is an old one and indeed the only one suitably adapted to cure existing evils, one which many bishops have employed in their dioceses with extraordinary results” (“Gravissimum”, 8 Sept., 1745). Pius VI condemned the proposition of those who called missions an empty noise with at most a transient effect (Auct. Fid., prop. 65). Leo XII granted a plenary indulgence to the missions given by the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. Gregory XVI extended this indulgence to the sick who could not attend the missions, but complied with the required conditions at their homes; and in 1834 the same pontiff extended it to all missions of the latter type. His life was a missionary life, “teaching daily in the temple”, “preaching to the multitude from the ship”, and, at the close of His life’s work, entrusting its continuation to His Apostles—“Going therefore, teach ye all nations... Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you” (Matt., xxviii, 19, 20). Obedient to this injunction, the Church has become a history of missionary activity, whether by it be understood the prolonged missionary labour among heathen tribes, or the exercise of regular mission work among the faithful.

It is true that until the beginning of the seventeenth century there existed no organised form of popular missionary work in the Church. But even in the early ages of the Church we find such eminent saints and doctors as the two Gregories (of Nazi...
The apostolic labours of these missionaries were everywhere blessed with remarkable success. In France, the birthplace of popular missions, the Lazarists and the Jesuits were the pioneers of a missionary activity which stirred up the faithful to greater zeal and dedication. Missionaries in every part of the country. Other congregations gradually came to their assistance, and, though there was a slight falling off in this respect during the period of the French Revolution, yet, in the reign of Napoleon I, the emperor himself arranged for missions in the dioceses of Troyes, Poitiers, La Rochelle, and Metz, to be conducted at the expense of the Government. After the Restoration in 1815, a new impetus was given to missionary work by the Abbé Forbin-Janson, who, with his friend the Abbé de Rauzan, founded the Missionaries of France, and by Charles de Mazenod, who founded the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, at Marseilles, in 1815. In Germany parochial missions had been given sporadically, chiefly by the Jesuits and the Redemptorists, before 1848; after that date they became more general. The bishops everywhere encouraged and urged them. The Cardinal Archbishop of Meechin, in 1843, maintained that the people of every parish are entitled, at least ex caritate, to have the benefit of a mission. During this period the German Church could pride itself on many eminent missionaries: Redemptorists, Dominican, Franciscans—devoted themselves entirely to popular mission work: the names of Fathers Roh, Klinkhofström, Pottgeser, and others are still held in benediction. On the expulsion of the Jesuits, Redemptorists and other orders from the German Empire, in 1872, there was a short interruption, but the work was soon taken up and carried on in the richest by the congregations which had been permitted to remain. The Redemptorists, on their return in 1894, entered the field with renewed vigour.

In Italy systematic mission work was introduced by the Lazarists during the lifetime of their founder. With the rise of the Redemptorists, the Passionists, the Fathers of the Precious Blood, and several other congregations, the work spread rapidly over the entire peninsula, and, in spite of the disturbances of the nineteenth century, popular missions have flourished there. In Austria they developed during the reign of Maria Theresa, but under her successor, Joseph II, missions were to a great extent prohibited, and missionaries banished. But could labour only on condition of submitting to official persecution. It was only after the Revolution of 1848 had spent itself that the Redemptorists, Jesuits, Capuchins, and Franciscans could carry on the work of missions un molested, especially in Bohemia and the Tyrol, in Westphalia, Bavaria, and Württemberg. On the expulsion of the Jesuits and Redemptorists, missions were again prohibited. Later, however, Capuchins and Franciscans took up the work, and diocesan priests also entered the field as missionaries and directors of retreats. In 1786, St. Clement Mary Hofbauer, second founder of the Redemptorists, with his friend Thadäus Hübl, founded a house of the Redemptorist Congregation in Würzburg. In 1844, a German Knight of St. Januarius, Dr. Poniatowski placed the German national church of St. Benno at their disposal. The labours of St. Clement and his companions at Warsaw from 1786 to 1808 were crowned with extraordinary success.

After the death of St. Alphonso, his missionaries evangelized the desert. Catholics in the Russian Province, of Courland, and Livonia, on the invitation of Monsignor Saluzzo, Apostolic Nuncio in Poland. In Belgium and in Holland the missionary spirit has, with one or two slight interruptions, always been active. The Lazarists laboured in Great Britain as early as 1840, and until the penal laws made organized mission work impossible. It was not until 1865 that the work was effectively begun in that country. In Ireland, missions were recommended by national and
MISSISSIPPI provincial synods—e.g., by the Plenary Synod of Thurles, in 1850; by the Synod of Cashel, 1853, and of Tuam, 1854, and the Plenary Synod of Maynooth, 1875. In England they were recommended by the Provincial Council of Westminster in 1852, and again in 1859; in Scotland by the Plenary Council of 1886. The Plenary Council of Australia, held at Sydney in 1885, and, in Canada, the Provincial Council of Quebec, in 1863, strongly urged parochial missions.

In the United States there was no systematic popular missionary work until about 1860, though missions had been given earlier. The Lazarist Fathers arrived in 1816, the Redemptorists in 1832, and the Passionists in 1852; but, although missions and spiritual retreats are the special work of these congregations, the scarcity of priests in this country compelled them at first to postpone such work to the ordinary spiritual wants of a scattered population. In 1839 Gregory XVI sent the Abbé Forbin-Janson on a missionary tour through the United States, where, for two years, he gave missions to the people and retreats to the clergy, bringing the faithful to the sacraments in numbers which since then have scarcely been equalled. In the Second Provincial Council of Cincinnati (1858), the Baltimore (1860), and the Tenth Provincial Council of Baltimore (1869), parochial missions are strongly recommended. Among the more active missionaries of this period, Fathers Smarius, Weniger, Damen, D. Young, O.F., and Hewit are still gratefully remembered.

With the increase in the number of priests, the parish boundaries as follows: "inhis case usually on the Mississippi River at a point where the southern boundary of the State of Tennessee strikes the same, thence east along the said boundary line to the Tennessee River, thence up the same to the mouth of Bear Creek, thence by a direct line to the north-west corner of the County of Washington, thence due south to the Gulf of Mexico, and thence westward within six leagues of the shore, to the most eastern junction of Pearl River with Lake Borgne, thence up said River to the thirty-first degree of North latitude, thence west along said degree of latitude to the Mississippi River, thence up the same to the beginning." The state in its extreme length is 330 miles; its greatest breadth is 199 miles. It has a coast-line on the Gulf of Mexico of about 75 miles. By government surveys begun in 1803, the state is divided into sections and townships.

Topography.—It contains no mountains, but there is a decided difference of levels between the alluvial lands lying between the Mississippi and Yazoo Rivers and the other sections of the state, which may be generally characterized as the uplands of the state. The latter comprise approximately five-sixths of the entire area of the state, constituting a plateau of an undulating character, the level of which gently descends in a general southerly direction to the coast. Its general elevation above the level of the Gulf of Mexico near Plaquemines Point is about 50 feet. The western and north-eastern portions are from about 150 to 500 and 600 feet above the level of the Gulf of Mexico. The drainage on the west is the Mississippi River and its principal tributaries the Yazoo, Tallahatchie, Coldwater, Sunflower, Big Black, and Womochitto Rivers; in the middle part the Pearl, which empties into Lake Pontchartrain, and, as a third chief tributary, the Chickasawha River, and the Escatawpa River, and in the south the Wolf, Pascagoula, Biloxie, Aboloitchi, and Catahoula Rivers. The upland sections of the state are undulating, and successive ridges divide the area between the water courses. The north-eastern portion contains a large area of prairie formation on the alluvial lands, known also as the Cherty Clay. The middle comprises a

MISSISSIPPI

sively and the second for men. If it is to continue four weeks, the first week is for married women, the second for unmarried women, the third for married men, and the fourth for unmarried men. As far as time will permit, the sermons are usually dealt with the following general subjects, which are varied to some extent according to circumstances: Salvation, Sin, Repentance, Hell, Death, Judgment, Heaven—with special instructions on matrimony, temperance, Christian education, etc. The instructions deal also with the essentials of the sacraments, of penance, certain commandments of God, of the Church, Holy Communion, the Mass, devotion to the Blessed Virgin, prayer, duties of parents and children, etc. The style of these instructions is simple and didactic.


JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Mississippi, one of the United States of America, takes its name from the Mississippi River that forms its western boundary from 35° to 31° N. lat. The Act of Congress of 1 March, 1817, creating the state, fixed its boundaries as follows: "Beginning at the point where the Mississippi River at a point where the southern boundary of the State of Tennessee strikes the same, thence east along the said boundary line to the Tennessee River, thence up the same to the mouth of Bear Creek, thence by a direct line to the north-west corner of the County of Washington, thence due south to the Gulf of Mexico, and thence westward within six leagues of the shore, to the most eastern junction of Pearl River with Lake Borgne, thence up said River to the thirty-first degree of North latitude, thence west along said degree of latitude to the Mississippi River, thence up the same to the beginning." The state in its extreme length is 330 miles; its greatest breadth is 199 miles. It has a coast-line on the Gulf of Mexico of about 75 miles. By government surveys begun in 1803, the state is divided into sections and townships.

Topography.—It contains no mountains, but there is a decided difference of levels between the alluvial lands lying between the Mississippi and Yazoo Rivers and the other sections of the state, which may be generally characterized as the uplands of the state. The latter comprise approximately five-sixths of the entire area of the state, constituting a plateau of an undulating character, the level of which gently descends in a general southerly direction to the coast. Its general elevation above the level of the Gulf of Mexico near Plaquemines Point is about 50 feet. The western and north-eastern portions are from about 150 to 500 and 600 feet above the level of the Gulf of Mexico. The drainage on the west is the Mississippi River and its principal tributaries the Yazoo, Tallahatchie, Coldwater, Sunflower, Big Black, and Womochitto Rivers; in the middle part the Pearl, which empties into Lake Pontchartrain, and, as a third chief tributary, the Chickasawha River, and the Escatawpa River, and in the south the Wolf, Pascagoula, Biloxie, Aboloitchi, and Catahoula Rivers. The upland sections of the state are undulating, and successive ridges divide the area between the water courses. The north-eastern portion contains a large area of prairie formation on the alluvial lands, known also as the Cherty Clay. The middle comprises a
Fauna and Flora.—In Mississippi we meet with all the different animals that are found in the gulf states. There are about forty different species of mammals in the state. Among them is the American opossum, which is abundant, and is highly prized as an article of food. The deer and the black bear, that once existed in great numbers, are disappearing owing to the clearing up of the country and the inefficient enforcement of the game laws. About one hundred and fifteen varieties of birds are found, about twenty of which are migratory, coming from the north during the fall and winter months. The mocking bird, exclusively a southern bird, and the most remarkable songster in the world, is found in the state, especially in the middle and southern portions, in great numbers. The wild turkey, a native of this country, is found in nearly all parts of the state. Quail are also very abundant. The game laws are more effective and are enforced vigorously than heretofore. More than fifty species of reptiles are found here, prominent among them being the alligator (A. mississippiensis), existing mainly in the middle and southern portions of the state on the rivers and lakes. It attains a maximum length of from 14 to 15 feet. There are at least sixty species of fish, the majority of which are edible. The oysters and crustaceans of the gulf exist in great quantities and are of the finest quality for food.

The state, in almost its entire area, was covered originally with a magnificent growth of forest trees. More than one hundred and twenty species exist at present. Among them are fifteen varieties of oak, including live oak and white and red oaks which are the most valuable. Cypress is still abundant in the river bottoms and on the lakes. Besides several species of hickory, the black walnut, chestnut, sweet gum, red cedar, red gum, elms of various varieties, maple, cah, sycamore exist here, among many other valuable varieties, all of large growth and valuable as timber. The long-leaf pine, the most valuable tree for timber for various uses, abounds in the southern portion of the state. The short-leaf pine, not quite so valuable, is widely distributed throughout the middle and northern sections. Next to cotton, timber is the most valuable product of the state. The value of the pine timber in the state was estimated in 1880, approximately, at $250,000,000. Allowing for the cutting since that time and also for the increase in the price of lumber, a conservative approximation estimate of its value should not be less than $300,000,000 at the present time.

Agriculture.—This is the principal industry in the state; of the male population 77.7% and of the female 71.8% are engaged in agricultural pursuits. Fully one half of the state is of extraordinary fertility. The only portion that is unproductive is the small strip of territory known geographically as Flat Woods, where only the bottom lands are fertile. Cotton is the principal product, being probably three times greater than the other industries of the state combined. The value of the cotton crop as shown by the census of 1900 was $54,032,941. The crop of 1879–1880 was valued at $80,000,000, showing an increase during that period of over $8,000,000. Among other minor products are Indian corn, oats, hay, peas of every variety, wheat, cane, sorghum, rice, potatoes, and almost every variety of orchard and garden product. In the southern
part of the state, sub-tropical and several varieties of tropical fruits are successfully cultivated. The Yazoo-Delta region, the most fertile section of the state. Its area is 6480 square miles, or 4,147,200 acres. With an alluvial soil that is practically inexhaustible, its cotton production exceeds that of any other land in the world. Its land produces from three quarters to a bale and a half an acre, and with careful tillage and in a good cotton year as much as a bale and a half to two bales to the acre. The increase in the value of the lands in the Delta, both timber and cultivated, is remarkable. In 1881 the state sold 1,500,000 acres of timber lands, by levee tax titles, which have been held valid, for six and one half cents per acre. These lands are now worth, on an average, $20 per acre. Twenty years ago cotton lands in a bale of cotton, and the market prices of cotton. The population of the delta is 195,346; of this number 24,137 are whites and 171,209 are negroes. The negroes generally cultivate the cotton farms and the large cotton plantations of the state, while the small farms are cultivated by white labor.

Population.—The state, as shown by the census of 1900, is 1,551,270, of which 641,200 are white and 907,630 are negroes, with 2203 Indians and 237 Chinese. A small percentage of the population is foreign born. There are 5345 males and 2536 females foreign born; total, 7891. Of these 7625 are white, and 266 negroes. The total number of males of voting age is 3,921,179, of whom 3,130,530 are whites and 190,649 negroes. There are 118,057 illiterate males of voting age, and of these 105,331 are negroes and 12,293 are whites. Illiteracy in the total population amounts to 32%. The illiteracy of the entire white population is 8% and of the total negro population, 49.1%. Under the influence of the extensive school facilities provided in the state, the percentage of illiteracy is steadily decreasing.

Administration.—The civil government of the state is structurally similar to that of the other states. There are three departments—executive, legislative, and judicial. The state officers and members of the legislature are elected by the people every four years. There are three supreme court judges, thirteen circuit court judges and eight chancellors, all appointed by the governor with the approval of the senate. The elective franchise contains the following conditions, viz: a voter must be twenty-one years old, he must be able to read or to understand the state Constitution when read to him (that is, a layman's and not a lawyer's test of comprehension); he must have resided in the state two years and in the precinct one year, and have paid all taxes, including an annual poll tax of $2 for two years preceding the election. Conviction of certain crimes against honesty entails the disfranchisement of a voter. This qualified suffrage has given the state a large white majority in its elected bodies. The validity of these suffrage qualifications has been sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Williams vs. The State of Mississippi, decided by a unanimous court in 1896. The state maintains institutions for the insane, the blind, and the deaf and dumb, affording ample facilities for both races. There is a state hospital at Natchez and one at Vicksburg.

Education.—The public educational system of the state consists of a common school system in which each county is a school district, and in which many of the municipalities constitute separate school districts. This system is maintained at the public expense, by state, county, district; and town educational facilities are extended to all of the educable children of both races in the state. In addition, the state maintains the Industrial Institute and College for girls, at Columbus, and maintains,

in large part, the University at Oxford, the Agricultural and Mechanical College at Starkville. For colored students the state maintains the Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College near Brunswick and and Rodney College near Rodney, both in Claiborne County. The total number of children enrolled during 1906–1907 was 482,208, and the average attendance for the same period was 258,047. The total average attendance in 1905–1906 was 287,995, showing an increase of 19,053. There are 721 schools in the school districts, and 117 schools in the separate school districts. In the session of 1906–1907, there was a larger attendance of negro pupils than white pupils by 15,335. For the session of 1906–1907, $2,631,790.35 of public money went to the support of schools, as compared with $2,432,426.33 for 1905–1906. There are the following public institutions: 721 schools for white students: Jefferson College, near Natchez; Rust University, Holly Springs; Millsaps College and Belhaven College, Jackson; Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain; Mississippi College, Clinton; East Mississippi College, Meridian; Stanton College, Natchez. There are other private schools of lesser prominence.

Penitentiary System.—The period of military government in the South, a prison system known as convict leasing was established in this and other southern states, and was continued in Mississippi until 1890, when it was abolished and the present system was adopted of working the prisoners on state lands at agricultural pursuits for the exclusive benefit of the state. The state owns 20,000 acres of cotton and land upon which the entire prison population of about 1200 prisoners are worked. The penitentiary lands cost originally $145,600 and are now worth at least $600,000. The annual cash income to the state from the labour of the prisoners is not less than $150,000. In addition to this, valuable improvements being made on the property by the prisoners. The present system is a satisfactory solution of the convict problem, in which all conditions, moral and sanitary, are obtained. Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, and Louisiana have adopted this system.

Transportation.—The railroad mileage in the state amounts to 3759 miles, according to the Report of the State Railroad Commission of 1908. The state is well supplied with water transportation, having the following navigable rivers: Mississippi, Yazoo, Tallahatchie, Sunflower, Pearl, Pascagoula, Big Black, Tombigbee, and some minor streams that are navigable during a portion of the year. There are deep-water harbours on the Gulf coast at the Mouth of Saline, Ship Island, and Ship Island opposite Gulf Port. There is a depth of water at the pier of the Gulf and Ship Island Railroad at Gulf Port of 23 feet at low tide, and 30 feet in the protected roadstead inside of Ship Island, which is accessible by tugs and lighters through a deep-water channel. There are also harbours at Bay of St. Louis and Biloxi.

History.—In 1540 Hernando De Soto, one of the most adventurous of the Spanish explorers, discovered the Mississippi River, and his expedition reached the present limits of this state, and remained until his death in 1542. The expedition, under the leadership of Marcos de Nunez, was withdrawn in 1543, descending the river to the sea and thence along the coast to Mexico. It is difficult to trace the exact route of De Soto. It is known, however, that he passed through Florida and Georgia as high as 35° N. lat., then went to the vicinity of Mobile and then north-west to the Mississippi River. In 1682 La Salle and Fonti descended to the mouth of the Mississippi River and claimed the entire region for the King of France. In 1698 D'Ilbarville came to Mississippi, authorised by the French king to colonize the lower Mississippi. He went to Ship Island and Cat Island, to the mainland on Biloxi Bay, to Bay of St. Louis, and to Mobile. The
Mississippi colony did not prosper. D'Iberville returned to France, leaving his two brothers, Savouillé and Bien-
ville, in charge of the country. In 1699 D'Iberville
revised the boundaries of the Mississippi country,
considering them at that time as no more than a
province.
client and his lawyer. There is a general law by which the governor may grant charters of incorporation to religious denominations exempt from taxation. The only Catholic who has held a state office in Mississippi is the Hon. Frank Johnston, who was attorney-general in the years 1893, 1894, 1895 under appointment by the governor to fill an unexpired term. (See NATURE, DIocese or.)

The State is divided into 81 counties and 23 cities.

MISSOURI, STATE OF.—The State of Missouri was carved out of the Louisiana Territory, and derives its name from the principal river flowing through its territory, the Missouri (Kansas and Missouri). It is not a “big muddy” in the Indian language. Geographically, Missouri is the central commonwealth of the Federal Union.

BOUNDARIES AND AREA.—The boundaries are the State of Iowa on the north; Arkansas on the south; on the east the Mississippi River separates it from Illinois, Indiana, and Tennessee; on the west it is bounded by Nebraska, Kansas, and the new State of Oklahoma. It lies between 39° 30’ and 42° 30’ N. lat., except that a small projection, between the Rivers St. Francis and Mississippi, extends about 34 miles farther south between Tennessee and Arkansas. The area of the state is 69,415 square miles.

RIVER CHARACTERISTICS. The Missouri River follows the western boundary of the state as far south as Kansas City; then turning east, it flows across the state and empties itself into the Mississippi about twelve miles above St. Louis. The portion of the state lying north of the Missouri is a great extent of gently rolling prairie, intersected here and there by streams which are small, fertile, and filled with silt brought into the Missouri or east into the Mississippi. The western portion of the state, north of the Mississippi River, is generally level, but rises to about one thousand feet above sea-level in the north-western corner of the state. The eastern portion, north of the Missouri River, is more broken, with some hilly land bordering the Missouri Rivers. The portion of the state south of the Missouri is more rolling; it is well wooded, especially in the south-east, with some swamp lands in the extreme south-eastern section. The Osark Mountain range breaks into the south central part of the state, but rises to no considerable height (highest elevation 1,600 feet). West of these mountains the land is farmed and fertile, being especially adapted to fruit-growing. It is in this section that the famous Missouri red apples are grown in the greatest quantities.

POPULATION.—According to the first federal census of Missouri, taken in 1810, the state had then 20,845 inhabitants. The census of 1810 places the population at 3,293,335. According to the Missouri Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1909, the population of the state at the beginning of that year was 3,925,335.

RESOURCES.—Agricultural and Farm Products.—The value of the output of farm crops alone for the year 1908 was $171,815,553. Of the total crop valued at $113,354,944, Missouri is constantly gaining as a wool-producing state; in 1908 there was $1,306,922 worth of wool sold. The farm-yard products are important items in the agricultural statistics; the surplus of poultry, eggs, and feathers for the year 1908 was $4,960,973. Missouri has never been considered an important dairy state, but since 1904 there has been a remarkable growth in this industry. The statistics in 1904 show an estimated total value from the dairies of $4,900,783, while the statistics of 1908 give a total value of $20,651,778. The cotton crop of 1908 brought $3,723,352.

Mines and Timber.—In 1907 the Federal authorities ranked Missouri the chief lead-producing state of the Union. The returns from the smelters for 1908 show that the state mined enough lead ore to produce 122,451 tons of primary lead. The total valuation of the lead produced in 1908 was $8,672,- 873. For 1908 the State Mining Department placed the production of lime ore at 197,499 tons, and its value at $6,374,719.

Nickel, copper, and cobalt are among the valuable minerals produced in Missouri. According to the United States geological survey of 1907, Missouri and Oregon were the only states producing nickel; 400 tons of metallic nickel, 200 tons of metallic cobalt, and 700 tons of metallic copper were produced in 1908. Iron ore to the value of 218,182 was produced in the year 1908. There was an output of 28,204 in silver. In the production of clay and shale goods Missouri held seventh rank in 1908. In cement the state also held seventh place. The total output in lime, cement, brick, and tile for 1908 aggregated a value of $8,904,013. Petroleum wells exist in one or two counties close to the Kansas border, and some natural gas has been found in the state. Coal exists in abundance, the value of the output in 1908 being $5,644,530. The products of the forests of Missouri produced in 1908 over 450,000,000 feet of assorted lumber with an estimated valuation of $3,719,822, while over $4,000,000 worth of railroad ties were also produced in that year.

COMMERCE.—The following table of surplus products, given out by the Bureau of Labour Statistics in 1908, is a concise statement of the surplus of the state which was added to the commerce of the world during 1908.

RéSUMÉ OF VALUATIONS BY GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live stock</td>
<td>$112,535,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm crops</td>
<td>34,991,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill products</td>
<td>30,283,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmyard products</td>
<td>46,285,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apis and canine products</td>
<td>117,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest products</td>
<td>22,958,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy products</td>
<td>8,260,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri “Meerschaum”</td>
<td>424,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery products</td>
<td>1,061,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid products</td>
<td>1,210,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and corn</td>
<td>1,872,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing-house products</td>
<td>3,723,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton products</td>
<td>95,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable and canned goods</td>
<td>6,692,426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The year ending 31 December, 1908, consisting of cattle, horses, hogs, mules, and sheep, was 7,097,655 head, valued at $113,354,944. Missouri is constantly gaining as a wool-producing state; in 1908 there was $1,306,922 worth of wool sold. The farm-yard products are important items in the agricultural statistics; the surplus of poultry, eggs, and feathers for the year 1908 was $4,960,973. Missouri has never been considered an important dairy state, but since 1904 there has been a remarkable growth in this industry. The statistics in 1904 show an estimated total value from the dairies of $4,900,783, while the statistics of 1908 give a total value of $20,651,778. The cotton crop of 1908 brought $3,723,352.
Commodity          Value
Fresh fruit         $5,069,384
Wool and mohair    1,308,812
Mineral quarry products 24,925,624
Stone and clay products 8,904,013
Unclassified products 4,623,953

Total value        $314,743,528

Means of Communication.—Although the Mississippi River runs the full length of the eastern boundary of the state, and the Missouri River flows directly through the state, neither of these streams is of any considerable commercial value as means of communication or transportation. Railroad facilities, however, are ample, there being 7991 miles of main line with about 3000 miles of sidings. There are 63 steam systems operating in the state. There are one railroad bridge, one street-car bridge, and one combination railroad, street-car, and passenger bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Louis, and a municipal free bridge for the accommodation of railroads, electric roads, wagons, and foot traffic, is in process of construction.

Educational System. — State University. — The State University of Missouri was established by legislative act approved on 11 February, 1839, and the university college was opened on 24 June, 1839. The corner-stone of the main building was laid on 4 July, 1840. Courses of instruction in academic work were begun on 14 April, 1841, and a Normal Department was established in 1867 and opened in September, 1868. The College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts and the School of Mines and Metallurgy were made departments of the university in 1870, the School of Mines and Metallurgy being located at Rolla. The law department was opened in 1872, the medical department in 1873, the engineering department in 1877, and the department of journalism in 1908. In 1888 the Experiment Station was established under Act of Congress, and the Missouri State Agricultural College was established by Act of Congress in 1890. In the university year 1908 there were enrolled in the entire university 3033 students. The officers of instruction and administration consisted of 104 professors, 64 instructors, and 54 assistants. Apart from the above-mentioned institutions, which are all under the supervision of the University of Missouri proper, there are: the Church of the Good Shepherd, City for the education of negro children in agriculture and mechanic arts.

Public Schools.—The state is divided into 10,053 school districts. The total number of teachers in the public schools in the year 1908 was 17,998, the total number of pupils being 984,659. For the year ending 1 July, 1908, the public schools cost the tax-payers $12,769,689.33. The law requires that every child with sound body and mind, from six to fourteen years of age, attend either a public or private school during each school year. Missouri has the largest permanent interest-bearing school-fund of any state in the Union. This fund in 1908 amounted to $14,014,335.45. Apart from the schools, a number of public buildings called normal institutions, of which one is located in each of the following cities: Columbia (Teachers' College), Kirkville, Warrensburg, Cape Girardeau, Springfield, and Maryville.

First Settlers.—The first settlement was made at Ste. Genevieve in 1735 by the French, and the second by the French at St. Louis in 1764. The Spanish also came up the river in search of gold, and St. Louis was soon a busy trading centre for the citizens and the Indians inhabiting the surrounding territory. From the eastward soon came emigrants from other states—especially Kentucky, Tennessee, and the Virginias—and later came the emigrants from foreign shores, particularly from Germany. The later growth of the state has been made up of settlers from almost all of the states lying to the eastward, but more particularly from those mentioned, with many from Maryland and the Carolinas. There are settlements of Italians, Hungarians, and Bohemians, but on the whole these nationalities make up only a small part of the population. St. Louis is a cosmopolitan city, but the predominant strains of foreign blood are German and Irish.

Admission to the Union.—Missouri was admitted into the Union conditionally on 2 March, 1820, and was formally admitted as a state on 10 August, 1821, during the presidential administration of James Monroe. At a convention held at St. Louis on 19 July, 1820, the people passed on the Act of Congress, which was approved in March of the same year, and a constitution was drawn up and a new state established. Under this constitution, in August, 1820, the people held a general election, in which the state and county officers were chosen and the state government organized. The constitution in force was adopted by vote of the people on 30 October, 1873, and came into operation on 30 November of the same year.

Notable Events in Political History. — The admission of Missouri as a state provoked much bitter discussion in Congress, and terminated in what has since been known as 'The Missouri Compromise'. The bill providing for Missouri was admitted as a slave state, but forever prohibited slavery in the remainder of the Louisiana Territory lying north of 36° 30' N. lat., which line is the southern boundary of Missouri. The matter of slavery was the cause of many controversies during the early history of the state, and while the Civil War over 100,000 soldiers were contributed to the Union army and 50,000 to the Confederacy.

Matters Directly Affecting Religion. — Freedom of Worship. — Section 5, Article 2, of the Constitution of 1875 provides that "all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to their own conscience; that no person can, on account of his religious persuasion or practice, be compelled to erect, support, or attend any place or system of worship, or to maintain or support any priest, minister, preacher, or teacher of any sect, church, creed, or denomination of religion; but if any person shall voluntarily make a contract for any such object, he shall be held to the performance of the same; that no money shall ever be taken from the public treasury directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect, or denomination of religion, or in aid of any priest, preacher, minister, or teacher thereof as such; and that no preference shall be given to any discrimination made against any church, sect, or creed of religion, or any form of religious faith or worship; and there shall be no religious test or oath required by the state, except such as may be created under a general law for the purpose only of holding the title to such
Marriage and Divorce.—Marriages are forbidden and void between first cousins, or persons more nearly related than first cousins, such as uncles and nieces, etc. Any judge of a court of record or justice of the peace, or any ordained or licensed preacher of the Gospel, who is a citizen of the United States, may perform a marriage ceremony. A licence of marriage is required, and no licence will be issued unless the age of twenty-one years be proved. The marriage of a minor of either sex, without the consent of the father of the minor or, if the father cannot act, of the mother or guardian. The law requires that the person performing the marriage ceremony shall return a certificate of the service to the state authorities. The causes for divorce are enumerated in the statute, and besides the usual causes, provided that a divorce may be granted when it is proved that the offending person "has been guilty of conduct that makes the condition of the complaining party intolerable". This clause makes it possible to secure a divorce on any grounds that the judge considers sufficient, and is thought to be the source of some abuse. Residence of one year in the state is required before a petition for divorce may be filed. There is no statutory prohibition against divorced persons marrying at any time after a decree of divorce has been granted.

Catholic Education.—Every parish of any considerable size in the state maintains a parochial school. The parochial schools are 228 in number, with an enrollment of 38,098 children in attendance. Each diocese has its own school-board, and a uniform system of text-books is used throughout the diocese. There are eight colleges and academies for boys with 1872 students in attendance, and 38 academies and institutions of higher education for girls with 4490 pupils in attendance. The St. Louis Province, under the direction of the Jesuit Fathers, is one of the leading educational institutions of the country. It conducts a school of divinity, a school of philosophy and science, a school of medicine, a school of dentistry, an institute of law, and an undergraduate and academic department. There is a total of 850 lay students in attendance. No parochial or private schools receive any assistance or support from the state, and all citizens are required to contribute to the support of the public schools regardless of whether their children attend a private or a public institution.

Charitable Institutions.—There are in the state 1 orphan asylum with 1248 inmates; 25 soldiers' homes; 2 deaf-mute institutions with 60 inmates; 3 homes for aged persons; 1 industrial and reform school; 1 foundling asylum, and 1 newsboys' home—all under Catholic auspices. The state does not contribute anything to the Catholic orphanages; but the foundling asylum in St. Louis receives some remuneration for keeping waifs who are found by the police and intrusted to that institution.

There is a State Board of Charities and Corrections, of which the governor is a member ex officio. This board has general supervision over the charitable institutions conducted by the state. There is a state hospital at Fulton, at St. Joseph, at Nevada, and at Farmington. There is a state Confederate Hospital at Higginsville, and a State Federal Soldiers' Home at St. James. A school for the deaf is maintained at Fulton, a school for the blind at St. Louis, and a colony for the feeble-minded and epileptic at Marshall. The Missouri State Sanitarium for the treatment of tuberculosis is located at Mt. Vernon on the west of the Ozarks.

Sale of Liquor.—Intoxicating liquors may be sold only by licensed saloon-keepers. In cities of two thousand or more inhabitants the application for licence must be accompanied by a petition asking that the licence be granted. This petition must be signed by a majority of the tax-paying citizens owning property on the block or square in which the saloon is to be
kept. In cities or towns of less than two thousand inhabitants the petition must be signed by a majority of the tax-paying citizens, and a majority in the block where the saloon is to be kept. The law provides that the license shall be revoked upon the application of any person showing to the county court that the licence-holder does not keep an orderly house, and it is provided that one (1) whose licence has been revoked, (2) who has violated any of the provisions of the licence law, (3) who has sold liquors to any minor, (4) who has employed in his business of saloon-keeper any person whose licence may be revoked, shall not be entitled to a licence. The law prohibits (1) the sale of intoxicating liquors to habitual drunkards, minors, or Indians, (2) the keeping of female employees in saloons, and (3) the keeping, exhibiting, or using of any piano, organ, or any other musical instrument, in a saloon. These laws are generally enforced. The law provides that upon application by petition to the county court signed by one-tenth of the qualified voters of any county, who shall reside outside of the cities or towns having a population of 2500 or more, an election shall be held to determine whether or not spirituous liquors shall be sold within the limits of such county. In cities or towns within a population of 2500 or more an statute is made by one-third of the qualified voters to the body having legislative functions therein. If a majority of the qualified voters at such election vote against the sale of intoxicating liquors, no licence can be issued for the sale of liquor within such jurisdiction. Section 3034 R. S. of 1889 provides among other things that nothing in the law shall be so construed as to prevent the sale of wine for sacramental purposes.

PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES.—The state penitentiary is at Jefferson City; there is a reformatory for boys at Booneville and an industrial home for girls at Chillicothe. The law provides for the appointment of a board of inspectors of the state institutions, consisting of the state treasurer, auditor, and attorney-general. The law makes no reference to the religious denomination of the chaplain, but provides that his selection shall be governed by his special qualifications for the performance of the duties devolving upon him. He is required to conduct at least three masses a month by St. Charles, Missouri. The board of school inspectors consists of the state treasurer, auditor, and attorney-general. The law makes no reference to the religious denomination of the chaplain, but provides that his selection shall be governed by his special qualifications for the performance of the duties devolving upon him. He is required to conduct at least three masses a month by St. Charles, Missouri. The board of school inspectors consists of the state treasurer, auditor, and attorney-general.

DIOCESES AND CATHOLIC POPULATION.—The state is divided into three dioceses, those of St. Louis, Kansas City, and St. Joseph. The Diocese of St. Louis comprises the eastern two-thirds of the state, the city, and the western portion of the state, south of the Missouri River, and the Diocese of St. Joseph, the western portion of the state, north of the Missouri River. The Catholic population in 1909 was 452,703. There are about 3000 Catholic negroes in the state, with one church in St. Louis and one coloured priest. There is one coloured school with 110 pupils, and one orphan-asylum for coloured children, conducted by the Oblate Sisters of Providence.

FIRST CATHOLIC MISSIONS.—The Cross was planted among the Indians who inhabited the region now known as Missouri during the first half of the sixteenth century by De Soto, who was buried in the waters of the Mississippi in 1541. A French settlement was made near the Mississippi as far south as the thirty-fourth degree in 1673, more than a century and a quarter after De Soto had marched northward, and tells us that he preached the Gospel to all of the nations he met. It is thought by some that there was a white settlement at the mouth of the River Des Peres in Missouri, a few miles below the mouth of the Mississippi. The early settlements of Cahokia, Illinois (the sole centre of civilization in the Mississippi Valley for some time), but the first permanent settlement of which we have any record was made at St. Genevieve about 1734. Among the oldest records in the state are those of the Catholic church at St. Genevieve. There was a mission in 1734 at Old Mines, which was abandoned in 1804. The next mission station in Missouri. St. Genevieve and Old Mines were attended by priests from Cahokia. The first mission was established in St. Louis in 1764, and the first church was built in 1770. A mission was established at Carondelet in 1767. Fredericktown, New Madrid, St. Charles, and Florissant were missionary points during the last half of the eighteenth century. The Lazarist fathers were established at Perryville in 1818, and the Jesuits at Florissant in 1823. The early settlements were made up of French, many of them coming from Canada. A great many German Catholics came to the state during the first part of the nineteenth century, but the first German sermon of which we have any record was preached by Rev. Joseph A. Lutz at St. Louis in 1832. During this same period a large portion of the immigration was made up of Irish Catholics. The names of many of the early settlements bear evidence of the Catholicism of those who were first established there. The later immigration into the state has brought a change, and almost all of the Catholic countries are represented. A famous episode in the state's history was the Drake Constitution of
MITHRAISM

1865. He finally won the case in the Supreme Court of the United States (see OATH, MISSOURI TEST). PRINCIPAL RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS.—According to the Bulletin issued by the Department of Commerce and Labour Bureau of the Census concerning religious bodies in 1906, the total population of church members in the State of Missouri was 1,199,229, and the principal religious denominations were as follows: Roman Catholics, 382,462; Baptists, 218,353; Congregationalists, 11,048; Disciples or Christians, 166, 137; German Evangelicals, 52,715; Lutherans, 46,988; Methodists, 214,431; Presbyterians, 71,909; Episcopalians, 13,328; Reformed Bodies, 1284; United Brethren bodies, 3316; other Protestant bodies, 23,166; Latter-day Saints, 8042; all other bodies, 6439. Thus, 33.9 per cent of the total number of church-going people in the state are Catholics, the Baptists having the next highest percentage (18.2), and the Methodists being third (7.8).

HOEK, Hist. of Missouri (Philadelphia, 1908); WILLIAMS, Hist. of the State of Missouri (Columbia, 1904); BILLON, Annals of St. Louis (St. Louis, 1880); SCHAER, St. Louis City and County (Philadelphia, 1883); Jesuit Relations; BECK, Gazetteer of Missouri (St. Louis, 1875); IRVING, Conquest of Florida (New York, 1877); Econ. of Missouri: Red Book; Bureau of Labour Statistics (Jefferson City, 1909); Manual of the State of Missouri, 1909-10; Bulletin No. 105, Religious Bodies, 1902; Bureau of the Census.

JOHN L. CORLEY.

Mithraism.—A pagan religion consisting mainly of the cult of the ancient Indo-Iranian Sun-god Mithra. It entered Europe from Asia Minor after Alexander's conquest, spread rapidly over the whole Roman Empire in the 2d century, reached its zenith during the third century, and vanished under the repressive regulations of Theodosius at the end of the fourth century. Of late the researches of Cumont have brought it into prominence mainly because of its supposed similarity to Christianity.

Origins.—The origin of the cult of Mithra dates from the time that Hindus and Persians still formed one people, for the god Mithras occurs in the religion and the sacred books of both races, i.e. in the Vedas and in the Avesta. In Vedic hymns he is frequently mentioned and is nearly always coupled with Varuna, but beyond the bare occurrence of his name, little is known of him. Vedic hymns are dedicated to him (Rigveda, III, 59). It is therefore possible that the god Mithras (Oldenberg, "Die Religion des Veda," Berlin, 1894) that Mithras was the rising sun, Varuna the setting sun; or, Mithra, the sky at daytime, Varuna, the sky at night; or, the one the sun, the other the moon.

In any case Mithras is a light or solar deity of some sort; but in the vague and general conception of him seems to indicate that his name was little more than a memory. In the Avesta he is much more of a living and ruling deity than in Indian piety; nevertheless, he is not only secondary to Ahura Mazda, but he does not belong to the seven Ameshaespands or personified virtues which immediately surround Ahura; he is but one of the seven, a solar demon or god. The Avesta however gives his promotion only after the Zoroastrian reformation; the inscriptions of the Achemenides (seventh to fourth century B.C.) assign him a much higher place, naming him immediately after Ahura Mazda and associating him with the goddess Anaitis (Anahata), whose name sometimes precedes his own. Mithras is the god of light, Anaitis the goddess of water. Indefinitely during the Zoroastrian reform, Mithras retained his place as foremost deity in the north-west of the Iranian highlands. After the conquest of Babylon this Persian cult came into contact with Chaldean astrology and with the national worship of Marduk. For a time the two priesthoods of Mithra and Marduk (magi and chaldei respectively) coexisted in Babylon and India, and the dualism became much from this intercourse. This modified Mithraism travelled farther north-westward and became the State cult of Armenia. Its rulers, anxious to claim descent from the glorious kings of the past, adopted Mithraic dates as their royal name (so five kings of Georgia, and Eupator of the Bospors). Mithraism then entered Asia Minor, especially Coin in Asia Minor, and spread to many Greek cities. When it came into contact with the Phrygian cult of Attis and Cybele from which it adopted a number of ideas and practices, though apparently not the gross obscenities of the Phrygian worship. This Phrygian-Chaldean-Indo-Iranian religion, in which the Iranian element remained predominant, came, after Alexander's conquest, into contact with the Western World. Hellenism, however, and especially Greece itself, remained remarkably free from its influence. When finally the Romans took possession of the Kingdom of Pergamum, occupied Asia Minor and stationed two legions of soldiers on the Euphrates, the success of Mithraism in the West was secured. It spread rapidly from the Bospors to the Atlantic, from Illyria to Britain. Its foremost apostles were the legionaries; hence it spread first to the frontier stations of the Roman army.

Mithraism was emphatically a soldier religion: Mithras, its hero, was especially a divinity of fidelity, manliness, and bravery: the stress it laid on good fellowship and brotherhood of soldiers and the secret bond among its members have suggested to the idea that Mithraism was Masonry amongst the Roman soldiers. At the same time Eastern slaves and foreign tradesmen maintained its propagandas in the cities. When magi, coming from King Tithides of Armenia, had worshipped in Nero an emanation of Mithras, the cult of Mithras spread through the German, Roman, and secret bond amongst its members were often made use of for the education of slaves and their children. In Rome, at the school of the temple of Mithras, Christian converts were often instructed in the secrets of the mysteries. As Mithraism passed as a Phrygian cult it began to share in the official recognition which Phrygian worship had long enjoyed in Rome. The Emperor Commodus was publicly initiated. Its greatest devotee however was the imperial son of a priestess of the sun-god at Sirmium in Pannonia, Valerian, who according to the testimony of Flavius Valentine, forgot the cave where his mother initiated him. In Rome, he established a college of sun priests and his coins bear the legend "Sol, Dominus Imperii Romani".

Diocletian, Galerius, and Licinius built at Carnuntum on the Danube a temple to Mithras with the dedication: "Fuctor, Imperii Suinulli." But with the triumph of Christianity Mithraism came to an end. According to Julian it had with other pagan cults a shortชาว. The pagans of Alexandria lynched George the Arius, bishop of the city, for attempting to build a church over a Mithras cave near the town. The laws of Theodosius I signed its death warrant. The pagans, however, continued to believe in Mithras, and the number of martyrs to rival the martyrs who died for Christ.

DOCTRINE.—The first principle or highest God was according to Mithraism "Infinite Time"; this was called Ahriman or Seculum, Eridan or Saturnus. This single thing is none other than Zervan, an ancient Iranian concept, which survived the sharp dualism of Zoroastrianism. Zervan was the father of Zervanes, the ancient Christian and connected the two opposites in a higher unity and was still worshipped a thousand years later by the Manichees. This personified Time, ineffable, sexless, passionless, was represented by a human monster, with the head of a lion and a serpent coiled about his body. He carried a sceptre and lightning as sovereign god and held in each hand a key as master of the two worlds. He had two pairs of wings to symbolize the swiftness of time. His body was covered with sodalical signs and the emblems of the seasons (i.e. Chaldean astrology combined with Zervanism). This first principle begat Heaven and Earth, which in turn begat their son and equal, Ocean. As in the European legend, Heaven was the seat of the Persian Empire, the Spenta Armaeti of the Persians or the Juno of the Westerns, Ocean is Apam-Napat or Neptune. The Persian names were not for-
gotten, though the Greek and Roman ones were habitually used. Ahura Mazda and Spéítta Armaiti gave birth to a great number of lesser deities and heroes: Artagnes (Hereules), Sharevar (Mars), Atar (Vulcan), Anaitis (Cybele), and so on. On the other hand there were Pluto, or Alfrun, also bequeathed of Infinite Time. This Infernate Evil rose with the army of darkness to attack and dethrone Oromasdes. They were however thrown back into hell, whence they escape, wander over the face of the earth and afflict mankind. It is man’s duty to worship the four simple elements, water and fire, air and earth, which in the main are man’s friends. The seven planets likewise were beneficent deities. The souls of men, which were all created together from the beginning and which at birth had but to descend from the empyrean heaven to the bodies prepared for them, received from the seven planets their passions and characteristics. Hence the seven days of the week were dedicated to the planets, seven metals were sacred to them, seven rites of initiation were made to perfect the Mithraist, and so on. As evil spirits ever lie in wait for hapless man, he needs a friend and saviour who is Mithra. Mithra was born of a mother-rock by a river under a tree. He came into the world: with the Phrygian cap on his head (hence his designation as Pileatus, the Capped One), and a knife in his hand. It is said that shepherds watched his birth, but how this could be, considering there were no men on earth, is not explained. The hero god first gives battle to the sun, conquers him, crowns him with a garland of laurel, makes him his eternal friend and fellow; nay, the sun becomes in a sense Mithra’s double, or again his father, but Πας Μιθρας is one ‘god. Then follows the struggle between Mithra and the bull, the central dogma of Mithraism. Ahura Mazda had created a wild bull which Mithra pursued, overcame, and dragged into his cave. This was a long journey with the struggle bull towards the cave is the symbol of man’s troubles on earth. Unfortunately, the bull escapes from the cave, whereupon Ahura Mazda sends a crow with a message to Mithra to find and slay it. Mithra reluctantly obeys, and plunges his dagger into the bull as it returns to the cave. Strange to say, from the bull’s gore all the life giving plants and herbs that cover the earth, from his spinal marrow the corn, from his blood the vine, etc. The power of evil sends his unclean creatures to prevent or poison these productions but in vain. From the bull proceed all useful animals, and the bull, resigning itself to death, is transported to the heavenly spheres. Man is thus restored and subjected to the malign influence of Ahriman in the form of droughts, deluges, and conf ablators, but is saved by Mithra. Finally man is well established on earth and Mithra returns to heaven. He celebrates a last supper with Helios and his other companions, is taken in his fiery chariot across the ocean, and now in heaven protects his followers. For the struggle between good and evil continues in heaven between the planets and stars, and

on earth in the heart of man. Mithra is the Mediator (Mediator) between God and man. This function first arose from the fact that as the light-god he is supposed to float midway between the upper heaven and the earth. Likewise a sun-god, his planet was supposed to hold the central place among the seven planets. The moral aspect of his mediation between god and man cannot be proven to be ancient. As Mazdean dualists the Mithraists were strongly inclined towards asceticism: abstention from food and absolute continence seemed to them noble and praiseworthy, though not obligatory. They battled on Mithra’s side against all impurity, against all evil within and without. They believed in the immortality of the soul, sinners after death were dragged to hell; the just passed through the seven spheres of the planets, through seven gates opening at a mystic word to Ahura Mazda, leaving at each planet a part of their lower humanity until, as pure spirits, they stood before God. At the end of the world Mithra will descend to earth on another bull, which he will sacrifice, and mixing its fat with sacred wine he will make all drink the beverage of immortality. He will thus have proved himself Nabarse, i.e. “never conquered”. Worship. — There were seven degrees of initiation into the Mithraic mysteries. The consecrated one (myteis) became in succession crow (corax), occult (cypius), soldier (miles), lion (leo), Persian (Perses), solar messengers (heliodromos), and father (pater). On solemn occasions they wore a garb appropriate to their name, and uttered sounds, the sacred oracles. The sacrifice of Mithra

THE SACRIFICE OF MITHRA
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gestures in keeping with what they personified. “Some flay their wings as birds imitating the sound of a crow, others roar as lions”, says Pseudo-Augustine (Quest. V. N. Test. in P. L., XXXIV, 2214). Crows, auxiliaries and soldiers formed the lower orders, a sort of catechumens; lions and those admitted to the other degrees were participants of the mysteries. The fathers conducted the worship. The chief of the fathers, a sort of pope, who always lived at Rome, was called “Pater Patrum” or “Pater Patratus.” The members below the degree of pater called one another “brother,” and social distinctions were forgotten in Mithraic unity. The ceremonies of initiation for each degree must have been elaborate, but they have not been preserved. Many—illustrations and bathtubs, branding with red hot metal, anointing with honey, and others. A sacred meal was celebrated of bread and haoma juice for which in the West wine was substituted. This meal was supposed to give the participants supernatural virtue. The Mithraists worshipped in caves, of which a large number have been found, mainly five at Ostia alone, but they were small and could perhaps hold at most 200 persons. In the apse of the cave stood the stone representation of Mithra slaying the bull, a piece of sculpture usually of mediocre artistic merit and always made after the same Pergamean model. The light usually fell through openings in the top of the caves were near the surface of the ground. A hideous monstrosity representing Kronos was also...
shown. A fire was kept perpetually burning in the sanctuary. Three times a day prayer was offered the sun towards east, south, or west according to the hour. Sunday was kept holy in honour of Mithra, and the sixteenth of each month was sacred to him as mediator. The 25 December was observed as his birthday, the 24 June, the rebirth of the winter sun, unconquered by the rigor of the cold. Mithraism was a community not merely a religious congregation; it was a social and legal body with its decrees, magistri, curatores, defensores, and patroni. These communities allowed no women as members. Women might console themselves by forming associations to worship Analitha, Cybele, but whether these were associated with Mithraism seems Proof of immorality or obscene practices, so often connected with esoteric pagan cults, has never been established against Mithraism; and as far as can be ascertained, or rather conjectured it had an elevating and invigorating effect on its followers. From a chance remark of Tertullian (De Præscript., 3) we gather that their "Pater Patrum" was only allowed to be married once, and that Mithraism had its virgines and continentis; such at least seems the best interpretation of the passage. If, however, Dieterich's Mithras's liturgy be really a liturgy of this sect, as he ably maintains, its liturgy can only strike us as a mixture of heathen and charismatic in which the mystes has to hold his own and lower the sun till he is exhausted, to whistle, smack his lips, and pronounce barbaric agglomerations of syllables as the different mystic signs for the heavens and the constellations are unveiled to him.

RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY.—A similarity between Mithras and Christ strikes every early observer, such as Justin, Tertullian, and other Fathers, and in recent times has been urged to prove that Christianity is but a adaptation of Mithraism, or at most the outcome of the same religious ideas and aspirations (e.g. Robertson, "Pagan Christ", 1903). Against this erroneous and unscientific procedure, which is not endorsed by the greatest living authority on Mithraism, the following considerations must be brought forward.

(1) Our knowledge regarding Mithraism is very imperfect; some 600 brief inscriptions, mostly defaced, some 300 often fragmentary, exiguous, almost identical monuments, a few casual references in the Fathers or Acts of the Martyrs, and a brief passage against the Mithraeum which the Armenian Empire about 450 probably copied from Theodorus of Mopsuestia (d. 428) who lived when Mithraism was almost a thing of the past—these are our only sources, unless we include the Avesta in which Mithra is indeed mentioned, but which cannot be an authority for Roman Mithraism with which Christianity is compared. Our knowledge is mostly and much guess-work; of the real inner working of Mithraism and the sense in which it was understood by those who professed it at the advent of Christianity, we know nothing. (2) Some apparent similarities exist; but in a number of details it is quite as probable that Mithraism was the borrower from Christianity. Tertullian about 200 could say: "hes tertiique sumus evo"q. (we are but of yesterday, yet your whole world is full of us). It is not unnatural to suppose that a religion which filled the whole world, should have been copied at least in some details by another religion which was quite popular during the third century. Moreover the resemblances pointed out are superficial and external; some may be of which we are unconscious. (3) There is a sense that matters. During these centuries Christianity was coining its own technical terms, and naturally took names, terms, and expressions current in that day; and so did Mithraism. But under identical terms each system thought its own thoughts. Mithra is called a mediator; and so is Christ; but Mithra originally only in a cosmogonic or astronomical sense; Christ, being God and man, is the Mediator between God and man. And so in similar instances. Mithraism had a Eucharist, but the idea of a sacred banquet is as old as the human race and existed at all ages and amongst all peoples. Mithra saved the world by sacrificing a bull; Christ by sacrificing Himself. It is hardly possible to conceive a more geometrical difference than that. Christ was born of a Virgin; there is nothing to prove that the same was believed of Mithra born from the rock. Christ was worshipped in a cave; and Mithraists, but Mithra was born under a tree near a river. Much has been made of the presence of adoring shepherds; but their existence. The adoration of the idols and considering that man had not yet appeared, it is an anachronism to suppose their presence. (3) Christ was an historical personage, recently born in a well-known town of Judea, and crucified under a Roman Governor, whose name figured in the ordinary official lists. Mithraism was an abstraction, a personification not even of the sun but of the diffused daylight; his incarnation, if such it may be called, was supposed to have happened before the creation of the human race, before all history. The small Mithraic congregations were like masonic lodges for a few and for men only and even those mostly of one class, the military; a religion that excludes the half of the human race and to which all other cults are more or less inferior and tolerant of every other cult, the Pater Patrum himself was an adept in a number of other religions; Christianity was essentially exclusive, condemning every other religion in the world, alone and unique in its majesty.

Mitre.—Form, Material, and Use.—The mitre is a kind of folding-cap. It consists of two like parts, each stiffened by a lining and rising to a peak; these are sewn together on the sides, but are united above by a piece of material that can fold together. Two lappets trimmed on the ends with fringe hang down from the back. The mitre is, theoretically, always supposed to be white. The official "Ceremoniale Romanum" distinguishes three kinds of mitres: the mitra pretiosa, auriphrugiata, and simplex. The first two differ from each other only in the greater or less richness of the ornamentation; the mitra simplex, or simple mitre, is the common one of which we speak of in our common language. The fringe on the lappets at the back should be red. The bishop must wear the mitra pretiosa on those days on which the hymn Te Deum is used in the Office, the mitra auriphrugiata in the seasons of Advent and Lent, on fast days and during penitential processions, the mitra simplex on Good Fridays, at ordinations, and in the Mass on the days stroke the solemnity of the seasons. When bishops attend a general council, or are present at solemn pontifical acts of the pope, they wear a plain linen mitre, while the cardinals on such occasions wear a simple mitre of silk damask. The right to wear the mitre belongs by law only to the pope, the cardinals, and the bishops. Others require for its use a special papal privilege. This privilege
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it is possessed, for example, by numerous abbots, the dignitaries of many cathedral chapters, and by certain prelates of the papal Curia, as well as by the pope; and, as it is more or less limited: for instance, such prelates can only use a simple mitre of white linen, unless the contrary is expressly granted them. The mitre is distinguished from the other episcopal vestments in that it is always laid aside when the bishop preys; for example, at the orationes of the Mass, the Office, in conferring Holy Orders, at the Canon of the Mass, etc. The reason for this is to be found in the commandment of the Apostle that a man should pray with uncovered head (I Cor., xi, 4). The giving of the mitre is a ceremony in the consecration of a bishop. It occurs at the close of the Mass after the solemn final blessing, the consecrator having first blessed the mitre.

Antiquity.—From the seventeenth century much has been written concerning the length of time the mitre has been worn. According to one opinion its use extends back into the age of the Apostles; according to another, at least as far back as the eighth or ninth century, while a further view holds that it did not appear until the beginning of the second millennium, but that before this it was a traditional dress of bishops. Exhaustive proof for this is given in the work (see also bibliography, “Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient” (pp. 431-48), where all that has been brought forward to prove the high antiquity of the mitre is exhaustively discussed and refuted. The mitre is depicted for the first time in the illuminations of the beginning of the thirteenth century; the one in a baptismal register, the other in an Exultet-roll of the cathedral at Bari, Italy. The first written mention of it is found in a Bull of Leo IX of the year 1049. In this the pope, who had formerly been Bishop of Toul, France, confirmed the primacy of the Church of Trier to Bishop Eberhard of Trier, his former metropolitan, who had accompanied him to Rome. As a sign of this primacy, Leo granted Bishop Eberhard the Roman mitre, in order that he might use it according to Roman custom in performing the offices of the Church. By about 1100-50 the custom of wearing the mitre was general among bishops.

Origin.—The pontifical mitre is of Roman origin: it is derived from a non-liturgical head-covering distinctive of the pope, the camelaucum, to which also the tiara is to be traced. The camelaucum was worn as early as the beginning of the eighth century, as shown by the biography of Pope Constantine I (708-815) in the “Liber Pontificalis.” The same head-covering is also mentioned in the so-called “Donation of Constantine.” The Ninth Oration states that the camelaucum was made of white stuff and shaped like a helmet. The coins of Sergius III (904-11) and of Benedict VII (974-83), on which St. Peter is portrayed wearing a camelaucum, give the cap the form of a cone, the original shape of the mitre. The camelaucum was worn by the pope principally during solemn processions. The mitre developed from the camelaucum in this way: in the course of the tenth century the pope began to wear this head-covering not merely during processions to the church, but also during the subsequent church service. Whether any influence was exerted by the recollection of the sacerdotal head-ornament of the high-priest of the Old Testament is not known, but probably not—at least there is no trace of any such influence. It was not until the mitre was universally worn by bishops that it was called an imitation of the Jewish sacerdotal head-ornament.

Granting of the Mitre to Dignitaries other than Bishops.—The Roman cardinals certainly had already the right to wear the mitre towards the end of the eleventh century. Probably they possessed the privilege as early as in the first half of the century. For if Leo IX granted the privilege to the cardinals of the episcopal See of Basançon (see CARDINAL: I. Cardinali Præstis) in 1051, the Roman cardinals surely had the same ornamental head-covering before that date. The first authentic granting of the mitre to an abbot dates from the year 1063, when Alexander II conferred the mitre upon Abbot Egilshus of the Abbey of St. Augustine at Canterbury. From this time on instances of the granting of the mitre to abbots constantly increased in number. At times also secular princes were granted permission to wear the mitre as a mark of distinction; for example, Duke Wratislav of Bohemia received this privilege from Pope Alexander II, and Peter of Aragon from Innocent III. The right also belonged to the German emperors.

Development of the Shape.—As regards shape, there is such difference between the mitre of the eleventh century and that of the twentieth that it is difficult to recognize the same form. In its earliest form the mitre was a simple cap of soft material, which ended above in a point, while around the lower edge there was generally, although not always, an ornamental band (circulus). It would also seem that lappets were not always attached to the back of the mitre. Towards 1100 the mitre began to have a curved shape above and to grow into a round cap. In many cases there soon appeared a depression in the upper part similar to the one which is made when a soft felt hat is pressed down on the head from the forehead to the back of the head. In handsome mitres an ornamental band passed from front to back across the indentation; this made more prominent the puffs on the upper part of the cap to the right and left sides of the head. This calotte-shaped mitre was used until late in the twelfth century; in some places until the last quarter of the century. From about 1125 a mitre of another form and somewhat different appearance is often found. In it the puffs on the sides had developed into horns (cornua) that ended each in a point and were stiffened with parchment or some other interlining. This mitre formed the transition to the third style of mitre which is essentially the one still used to-day; the third mitre...
is distinguished from its predecessor, not actually by its shape, but only by its position on the head. While retaining its form, the mitre was henceforth so placed upon the head that the 
corona no longer arose above the temples but above the forehead and the back of the head. The lappets had, naturally, to be fastened to the under edge below the horn at the back. The first example of such a mitre appeared towards 1150. Elaborate mitres of this kind had not only an ornamental band (circulus) on the lower edge, but a similar ornamental band (titulus) went vertically over the middle of the horns. In the fourteenth century this form of mitre began to be distorted in shape. Up to

ornamented with about five hundred more or less costly precious stones; it weighs over five and a half pounds. Similar mitres are also mentioned in the inventory of 1295 of Boniface VIII. Eight medieval mitres are preserved in the cathedral of Halberstadt. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the mitre was ornamented with rich, heavy embroidery in gold, which gave it a still more imposing appearance. A mitre of the eighteenth century preserved in the cathedral treasury at Limburg-on-the-Lahn is remarkable for the large number of precious stones that adorn it. The original material of the mitre appears to have been white linen alone, but as early as the thirteenth cen-

then the mitre had been somewhat broader than high when folded together, but from this period on it began, slowly indeed, but steadily, to increase in height until, in the seventeenth century, it grew into an actual tower. Another change, which, however, did not appear until the fifteenth century, was that the sides were no longer made vertical, but diagonal. In the sixteenth century it began to be customary to curve, more or less decidedly, the diagonal sides of the horns. The illustration gives a summary of the development of the shape of the mitre. It should, however, be said that the changes did not take place everywhere at the same time, nor did the mitre everywhere pass through all the shapes of the development. A large number of mitres of the later Middle Ages have been preserved, but they all belong to the third form of mitre. Many have very costly ornamentation. For even in medieval times it was a favourite custom to ornament especially the mitre with embroidery, rich bands (auriflavia), pearls, precious stones, small ornamental disks of the precious metals; and even to use painting. Besides several hundred large and small pearls, a mitre of the late Middle Ages in St. Peter’s at Salsburg is also

tury (with the exception of course of the simple mitre) it was generally made of silk or ornamented with silk embroidery.

The Liturgical Head-Covering in the Greek Rite.—In the Orthodox Greek Rite (the other Greek Rites need not here be considered) a liturgical head-covering was not worn until the sixteenth century. Before this only the Patriarch of Alexandria, who wore one as early as the tenth century, made use of a head-covering, and his was only a simple cap. The Greek pontifical mitre is a high hat which swells out towards the top and is spanned diagonally by two hoops; on the highest point of the dome-shaped top is a cross either standing upright or placed flat.

Of Litur., Anciens vêtements sacrédaux, 2e série (Paris, 1882); Bock, Geschichte der liturg. Gewänder, II (Bonn, 1866); Rolhaug, De fleury, La messe, VIII (Paris, 1889); Braun, Die pontifikalen Gewänder des Abendlandes (Freiburg im Br., 1898); Idem, Die liturgische Gewandung im Oecident und Orient (Freiburg im Br., 1907).

Joseph Braun.

Mittarelli, Nicola Giacomo (in religion Gian Benedetto), monastic historian, b. 2 September, 1707, at Venice; d. 4 August, 1777, in the monastery of
San Michele di Murano near Venice. After joining the Camaldolese Order at the early age of fourteen, he studied theology at Florence and Rome, whereupon he took the veil of Linnamons, during the life of San Michele di Murano. Because he relinquished the scholastic method, his superiors sent him to the monastery of San Paolino in Treviso where he became confessor and archivist. In 1760 he was elected Abbot of San Michele di Murano and in 1765, General of his Order for the space of five years during which he resigned in 1772. He then retired to Treviso where he remained as abbot until his death. His monumental work, in the preparation of which he was assisted by his confrères Costadini and Calogera, is the "Annales Camaldulenses ordinis S. Benedicti, ab anno 907 ad annum 1770" 9 vols. folio (Venice, 1755-73). It follows the plan of Mabillon's "Annales ordinis S. Benedicti". His other works are: "Memorie della vita di San Pasquale, e del monastero dei Santi Cristiana e Paolino di Treviso" (Venice, 1748), "Memorie del monastero della Santa Trinità di Fienza" (Fienza, 1749), "Ad Scriptores rerum Italicarum A. Muratoriis accessiones historice Faventinum" (Venice, 1771), "De litterarum Faventinorum" (Venice, 1773). He was a learned and sagacious writer, but gave himself more to historical than to theological studies; and in 1792 was appointed Lecturer on Comparative Anatomy at St. Mary's Hospital Medical School. In 1787, he was appointed professor of Biology at the (Catholic) University College, Kensington. From 1809 to 1893 he gave a course of lectures on "The Philosophy of Natural History" in the University of Louvain, where he was professor of Natural History in the Royal Institution; Fellow of the Zoological Society from 1858, and Vice-President twice (1869 and 1882); Fellow of the Linnean Society from 1862; Secretary of the same during the years 1874-80, and Vice-President in 1882. In 1867 he became a member of the Royal Society—elected on account of the merit of his work on the "Apparatus Vegetabilium"

Milly, a titulary archbishopric in the island of Lesbos. Inhabited, first by the Pelasgians, then by the Iolians, it was ruled in turn by the Persians, the Athenians, the Macedonians, the Seleucids, and the Romans. Included in the empire of the East after the time of Theodosius it suffered much from the different invasions of the Scythians in 376, the Slavs in 769, the Arabs in 821, 981, 1035, the Russians in 864 and 1027. In 1204 after the foundation of the Latin empire, the city became a possession of the French, only to be reconquered in 1245 by John Duca Vatazete. It belonged to the Genoese when the sultan, Mahomet II, conquered it in 1462. The home of many famous persons, among them Sappho, Alccestis, and the sage Pithacus, Milly was famous for its beauty and for the state of the sea for many leagues. St. Paul visited it on his third journey (Acts, xx, 14). Among its bishops, whose names will be found in part in Le Quen, "Orients christianus", I, 953-962, are Zacharias Rhetor, or the Scholastic, the author of an Ecclesiastical History about the year 336; Saint George who died in exile at Cherson before 524 and whose feast occurs on 7 April and 16 May; another Saint George who died in 843 and is venerated by the Greeks on 1 February with his two brothers, Saint Simeon and Saint David (Analectaollandiana XVIII, 209 sq.). Until this time Milly was only an autocephalous archiepiscopical; the "Nottita" of Leo the Wise about 900 describes it as a metropolitan see with five suffragans. Doctor of the Church, member of the friends of the Council at the Union of Council of which he wrote a history in Greek (Mansi, XXXI, 463 sqq., 997, 1009). The list of the Latin titulars of 1205 to 1412 may be found in Le Quen, III, 991-994; Eubel, I, 370; Gams, 449. The present city of Metmion numbers 15,000 inhabitants, the greater number leavish Grecian, Frant, and Turkish. The island is still grouped about Milly and are included in the archbishopric of Smyrna. The parish is directed by the Franciscans; the Marist Brothers have a school for boys.


S. Salaville.

Mivart, St. George Jackson, Ph.D., M.D., F.R.S., F.Z.S. Corresponding member of the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia; Member of the Royal Institution, London; 30 November, 1827, d. there, 1 April, 1900.

Professor Mivart, whom Darwin styled the "distinguished biologist", third son of James Edward Mivart, owner of Mivart's Hotel in Brook Street, was born at 39 Brook St., Grosvener Square, London. His parents were Evangelicals; and his early success was received at the Grammar Grammar School, at Harrow, and at King's College, London; from which latter institution he intended to go to Oxford. His enthusiasm for architecture led him, at the age of sixteen, to make a tour of Pugin's Gothic churches; and while visiting St. Chad's, in Birmingham, he met Dr. Moore (afterwards President of St. Mary's College, Oscott) who received him into the Catholic Church in 1844. Mivart's conversion is said to have been determined by Milner's "End of Religious Controversy". On his reception he proceeded to Oscott College, where he remained until 1846. On 15 January of that year he became a student at Lincoln's Inn, and was called to the Bar in 1851. He did not, however, follow a legal career, but gave himself to biologic studies; and in 1862 was appointed Lecturer on Comparative Anatomy at St. Mary's Hospital Medical School. In 1874, he was appointed professor of Biology at the (Catholic) University College, Kensington. From 1890 to 1893 he gave a course of lectures on "The Philosophy of Natural History" in the University of Louvain, where he was professor of Natural History in the Royal Institution; Fellow of the Zoological Society from 1858, and Vice-President twice (1869 and 1882); Fellow of the Linnean Society from 1862; Secretary of the same during the years 1874-80, and Vice-President in 1882. In 1867 he became a member of the Royal Society—elected on account of the merit of his work on the "Apparatus Vegetabilium"

This work was communicated to the Society by Professor Huxley. Mivart was a member of the Metaphysical Society from 1874. He received the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy from Pope Pius IX in 1876, and of Doctor of Medicine from Louvain in 1884.

His communications, dating from 1864, to the "Proceedings" of learned societies, and the "Records of the Linnean, and the Zoological—are numerous and of great scientific value. He contributed articles to the "Encyclopedia Britannica," and to all the leading English and American reviews.

In 1871 he published his "Genesis of Species", in which work, foreshadowed by an article in the "Quarterly Review" of the previous year, he was an ardent opponent of the Darwinian hypothesis. This estranged him from Darwin and Huxley; but his reputation as a specialist in biological science was in no way impaired by the position he took up. In subsequent editions of his "Origin of Species" Darwin deals at great length with the objections raised by Mivart. His writings published and Lectured on have contributed to the evidence of how weighty he felt them to be. Mivart, however, himself professed a theory of evolution; but he hesitatingly and consistently asserted the irreconcilable difference between the inanimate and animate, as well as between the purely animal and the rational. By maintaining the creationist theory of the origin of the human soul he attempted to reconcile his evolutionism with the Catholic faith. In philosophical problems, towards which he turned more and more in later years, his attitude was rather that of a neo-scholastic as against the post-Cartesian philosophers; and he opposed with success a critical, or moderate realist, system of knowledge to the widely prevalent teleological view of things. Toward the end of his life Mivart's philosophical speculations began to verge on an "interpretation" of theological dogma that was incompatible with the Faith. The crisis, however,
did not become acute before his articles in the "Nineteenth Century" ("Modern Catholics and Scientific Freedom" in July, 1885; "The Catholic Church and Biblical Criticism" in July, 1887; "Catholicity and Reason" in December, 1887; "Sins of Belief and Disbelief" in October, 1888; "Happiness in Hell" in December, 1892) were placed on the Index.

In July, 1890, he was brought into the gravest suspicion by the articles "The Continuity of Catholicism" ("Nineteenth Century", January, 1900) and "Some Recent Apologists" ("Fortnightly Review", January, 1900). In the same month (18 January, 1900), after admonition and three formal notifications requiring him in vain to sign a profession of faith that would exonerate him, he was inhibited from the sacred functions by Cardinal Vaughan "until he shall have proved his orthodoxy to the satisfaction of his ordinary." The letters that passed between Archbishop's House and Dr. Mivart were published by him in the columns of the "Times" newspaper (27 January, 1900); and in March a last article—"Scripture and Roman Catholicism"—repudiating ecclesiastical authority, appeared in the "Nineteenth Century".

Dr. Mivart died of diabetes 1 April, 1900, at 77 Inverness Terrace, Bayswater, London, W., and was buried without ecclesiastical rites. After his decease his friends, persuaded that the gravity and nature of the illness from which he suffered offered a complete explanation of the anomalies of his position, thought it would be better for the bishop, by some private conversations, to have brought home to him the obligation of having an abler mind to deal with the public questions with which he had been called upon to deal. The text of the certificate has not been published, but an account of the matter is to be found in the second volume of "Life of Cardinal Vaughan".

Dr. Mivart's chief works are the following:—
"One Point of Controversy with the Agnostics" in Manning's "Essays on Religion and Literature" (1883); On the Genesis of Species" (London, 1871); 
"An Examination of Mr. Herbert Spencer's Psychology"; 
"Lessons in Elementary Anatomy" (London, 1873); "The Common Frog" in "Nature series" (1873); "Man and Ape" (London, 1873); "Lessons from Nature" (London, 1876); "Contemporary Evolution" (London, 1876); 
"Address to the Biological Section of the British Association" (1879); "The Cat" (London, 1881); "Nature and Thought" (London, 1882); "A Philosophical Catechism" (London, 1884); "On Truth" (London, 1889); "The Origin of Human Reason" (London, 1889); "Dogs, Jackals, Wolves and Foxes, Monograph of the Canidae" (London, 1890); "Introduction Générale à l'Étude de la Nature: Cours de Doctrine Physique à l'École Normale de Paris" (Paris, 1891); "Birds" (London, 1892); "Essays and Criticisms" (London, 1892); 

See Gentleman's Magazine (1856 and 1900); Royal Society Year Book (1901); Men and Women of the Time (1885); Darwin, the Life and Letters of Charles Darwin (London, 1891); Sears-Cox, The Life of Cardinal Vaughan (London, 1910); Oscodn, Jubilee Number (1888); The Times (January 12, 13, 27, 29, and April 4, 1900); The Tablet (April 7, 1900); Nature (April 12, 1900).

FRANCIS AVELING.

Mixe Indians (also Mixe, Latin, Mi-she), a mountain tribe in southern Mexico, noted for their extreme conservatism, constituting together with the neighboring Zoque, a distinct linguistic stock, the Zoquean. The Mixe occupy a number of towns and villages in the district of Yautatepe, Villa Alta, and Tehuantepco in southern Oaxaca and number altogether about 25,000. They maintained their independence against both the Aztec Empire and the powerful Zapotec with whom they are still at enmity and even yet can hardly be said to have been subdued by the Spaniards, as they hold themselves aloof from the whites, retaining a great deal of the ancient life, religion, and superstition of their ancient rite and superstitions even while giving ostensible obedience to the Church and manifesting a docile attachment to their resident priests. With the other tribes of Oaxaca, the Mixe were brought under subjection by the Spaniards in 1521–4. In 1584 the Mixe were placed under the jurisdiction of the Dominicans under Father Gonazlo Lucero and continued with them, shared after 1575 by the Jesuits until turned over to secular priests under later settled conditions. The work of conversion was slow and uncertain for many years, in consequence of the exceptional attachment of these tribes to their ancient religion. Idols were frequently discovered buried under the crosses erected in front of the chapel, so that they might be worshipped in secret under pretense of devotion to the Christian symbol, and heathen sacrifices were even offered up secretly from the very altars, under an impression, intelligible enough to the Indian, that the sacredness attaching to the Christian environment enabled the Sianuces to remain pagan rite. This prevailed to a great extent to-day.

Physically the Mixe are of good height and strongly built, not handsome in features, but hardy and active, and notable burden carriers. Many wear beards. Although described in ancient times as savage and warlike and addicted to cannibalism, they are commonly regarded to-day as timid, stupid, and suspicious, although industrious. It is probable, however, that the apparent stupidity is rather indifference and studied reserve, and Starr, their most recent visitor, expresses his surprise at their industry, neatness, and general prosperity, in view of what he had previously been told. It is characteristic of their stubborn disposition that their roads almost invariably run straight up and down the mountain instead of zigzagging to lessen the difficulties of the ascent. In the same way they still keep their villages upon the heights, while the other tribes, under Spanish influence, have generally moved their settlements down into the valleys. Their houses vary from light thatched structures in the country districts to adobe houses in the towns. They are good farmers, producing sugar, coffee, and bananas, and the women are noted for their pottery and weaving arts, producing beautiful fabrics in silk and cotton, with interwoven animal and bird designs and dyed in fadeless colours. From Starr we have an interesting account of their present
day customs and beliefs, including many pagan survivals, particularly bird and other animal sacrifices. Food is still buried with the dead and libations made to the earth, while offerings are still made secretly at heathen shrines and before idols hidden away in secret caves. One of these was discovered by the parish priest of their principal town a few years ago, and according to reliable testimony instances of cannibal sacrifices have occurred within living memory in Qu-\n-tam (c. 1660-1734). It was published at Puebla in 1729 and reprinted at Oaxaca in 1891.

BANCROFT, Native Races, I-III (San Francisco, 1883); IDEM, Hist. of Mexico (San Francisco, 1888-9); BARNARD, J. du Four, Mexico (New York, 1892); BASTION, America Race (New York, 1901); PIMENTEL, Lenguas indigenas de Mexico, II (Mexico, 1903); STEARN, Ethnography of Southern Mexico in Proc. Davenport Acad., Sciences, VIII (Davenport, 1901); IDEM, Recent Mexican study of the native languages of Mexico in Bulletin IV, Dept. philology, Univ. of Chicago (Chicago, 1900); IDEM, In Indian Mexico (Chicago, 1908).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mixed Marriages. See MARRIAGE, MIXED.

Mixteca Indians (also MIXTECA, Latin, Mieb-\ntekas), one of the most important civilized tribes of southern Mexico, occupying an extensive territory in western and northern Oaxaca and extending into Guerrero and Puebla. They number in all about 250,000 souls, or somewhat more than the whole Indian population of the United States together. Their eastern neighbors are the people of the cultivated and powerful Zapotec, with the last named of whom they constitute a distinct linguistic stock, designated as the Zapotecan. The ancient culture and governmental forms of the Mixteca were practically the same as those of the Zapotec. They are now industrious farmers, weavers, and potters, the pottery manufacture, contrary to the Indian custom generally, being in the hands of the men. They stand high for industry and ingenuity, dignified and reliable disposition, hospitality and love of liberty. They were brought under Spanish dominion about the same time as the Zapotec and Mixe, in 1521-4, shortly after which the work of their conversion was begun by the Dominicans with such success that the whole nation may now be considered as Christian, notwithstanding some survivals from pagan times. They are active and enterprising, and have taken prominent part in Mexican politics, being particularly devoted to the Revolutionary cause in 1811. President Díaz of Mexico is of one-fourth Mixteca blood. His towns, one of them, is described by Starr as a delightful place, large and strung along two or three long straight streets. The houses were of poles set upright, with thick thatchings of palms, in yards completely filled with fruit trees, and garden beds of spinach, lettuce, and onions. Beehives in quantity were seen at nearly every house. Almost every woman wore garments, many of which were beautifully decorated. The men wore brilliant sahues, woven in the town. At Tepeculaca, "the great convent church historically interesting, is striking in size and architecture. The priest, an excellent man, is a pure-blooded Mixteca Indian, talking the language as his mother tongue. With great pride he showed us about the temple, which was once a grand Dominican monastery. ... The cura had ten churches in his charge. He seemed a devout man, and emphasized the importance of his preaching to his congregation in their native tongue and his. So convinced is he that the native idiom of the people is the shortest road to their heart and understanding, that he has prepared a catechism and Christian dox- trine in the modern Mixtec, which has been printed." The Mixteca language is spoken in a number of dialects and in spite of its peculiarly difficult character, has been much studied on account of the importance of the tribe. The standard authority is the "Arte en lengua Mixteca" of Fr. Antonio de los Reyes (Mexico, 1593, and reprinted at Mexico in 1750). The Indian poet, author and poet, is Fr. Castelano Palacios, whose "Catecismo" was published in Oaxaca in 1896. Pimentel also devotes a chapter to the language. (See also Zapotec.)

BANCROFT, Native Races, I-III (San Francisco, 1883); IDEM, Hist. of Mexico (San Francisco, 1888-9); BARNARD, J. du Four, Mexico (New York, 1892); BASTION, America Race (New York, 1901); PIMENTEL, Lenguas indigenas de Mexico, II (Mexico, 1903); STEARN, Ethnography of Southern Mexico in Proc. Davenport Acad., Sciences, VIII (Davenport, 1901); IDEM, Recent Mexican study of the native languages of Mexico in Bulletin IV, Dept. philology, Univ. of Chicago (Chicago, 1900); IDEM, In Indian Mexico (Chicago, 1908).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mixtecas. See Hujuálapam de León, Diocese of.

Moab, Moabités.—In the Old Testament, the word Moab (2670) designates (1) a son of Lot by his elder daughter (Gen. xix. 37); (2) the people of whom this son of Lot is represented as the ancestor (Ex. xvi, 15, etc.), and who are also called "the Moabités" (Gen. xix. 37); and possibly (3) the territory occupied by the Moabités (Num. xxi. 11). Its etymology: "from my father"; which is added by the Septuagint to the Hebrew text in Gen. xvi. 37. The name is found in no other language than any derivation suggested by modern scholars. The origin and race of the Moabites need not be discussed here, since according to Gen. xix. xii they are the same as those of the Ammonites, which have been examined in the article Ammonites.

From the mountainous district above Segr (Zoar), a town which lay in the plain near the south-western end of the Dead Sea (cf. Gen. xix. 30), Lot's children forcibly extended themselves in the region of eastern Palestine. Ammon settled in the more distant north-east country, Moab in the districts nearer to the Dead Sea. These were inhabited by the Emims, a gigantic people, whom, however, the Moabites succeeded in expelling (Deut. ii. 9, 10). Moab's territory was at first of considerable extent, some fifty miles long by thirty broad. It comprised the highlands east of the Dead Sea and the Jordan as far as the mountains of Galad, together with the level stretch between the highlands and the river, and the well-watered and fertile land at the south end of the Dead Sea. On three sides it had natural boundaries, and on the north, the Dead Sea and the southern sector of the Jordan; on the south, the Wady el-Hasy, separating the uplands of Moab from those of Edom; on the east, the Arabian desert. Only on the north, were there no natural features conspicuous enough to form a fixed boundary, and hence Moab's northern frontier fluctuated at different periods between the main range and the desert, to the south-east from the torrent now called Wady Nimrin to the Arabian desert.

The highlands are the great bulk of this territory. They form a table-land about 3000 feet above the Mediterranean, or 4300 feet above the Dead Sea, rising slowly from north to south, having steep western slopes, and separated eastward and from the desert by low, rolling hills. The geography of this almost treeless plateau is the same as that of the range of western Palestine; but its climate is decidedly colder. In spring, its limestone hills are covered with grass and wild flowers, and parts of the plateau are now sown with corn. It is traversed by three deep valleys, the middle of which, the Arnon, is the deepest, and it abounds in streams. It is dotted with dolmens, menhirs, and stone circles, and also with ruins of villages and towns, mostly of the Roman and Byzantine periods. In Old Testament times, Moab was an excellent pasture land (IV Kings, iii. 4), and its population was
MOABITE

much more considerable than at the present day, as is proved by the numerous cities, such as Ar Moab, Galilim, Kir Moab, Luith, Nemrim, Segor, Nephe, Onoam, Qiriath Husos (A.V. Kirjath-husoth), Aroer, Baal-meon, Beer Elim, Beth-gannam, Beth-simoth, Beth-phogor, Bosor, Cariath, Diboun, Eleale, Hebron, Hesebon, Jasa, Medabs, Mephaath, Sabama etc., which the Moabites inhabited at the time of the Judges.

Shortly before Israel’s final advance towards Palestine, the Moabites had been deprived of their territory north of the Arnon by the Amorrites, coming probably from the west of the Jordan (Num., xxi, 13, 26). Moab’s king at the time was Balaa’ who, in his unfriendliness towards the Hebrew tribes, hired Baal-meon to hold them back, but the Moabites, not only failed in this undertaking but the expected curses were divinely changed into blessings (see Balam). Another fiendish attempt in a different direction was only too successful; the daughters of Moab enticed the Israelites into their idolatry and immorality, and thereby brought upon them a heavy retribution (Num., xxv). Moab’s subsequent relations with the Hebrew tribes (Ruben, Gad) who had settled in its ancient territory north of the Arnon, were probably those of a hostile neighbour anxious to recover this lost territory. In fact, in the early history of the Judges, the Moabites had not only regained control of at least a part of that land, but also extended their power into western Palestine so as to oppress the Be thaath. After the Moabite Rose over Benjamin, it finally put an end to by Aod, the son of Gera, who as assassinated Eglon, Moab’s king, slaughtered the Moabites, and recovered the territory of Jericho to Israel (Judges, iii, 12-30). To this succeeded a period of friendly intercourse, during which Moab was a refuge for the family of Elimelech, and the Moabites Ruth was taken as the Israelites from which David descended (Ruth, i, 1; iv, 10-22). Saul again fought against Moab (I Kings, xiv, 47), and David, who, for a while confided his parents to a Moabite king (xxxi, 3, 4), ultimately invaded the country and made it tributary to Israel (II Kings, viii, 2). The subjugation apparently continued under Solomon, who had Moabite women in his harem and “built a temple for Chamos the idol of Moab” (III Kings, xi, 1, 7). After the disruption, the Moabites were vassals of the northern kingdom; but on the death of Achab, they broke into an open revolt the final result of which was their independence, and the full circumstances of which are best understood by combining the data in IV Kings, 1, and II Chronicles, 20. The inscription of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Moab, found in 1888 at the ancient Dibon, now preserved in the Louvre.

It seems that after this, they made frequent incursions into Israel’s territory (cf. IV Kings, xiii, 20), and that after the captivity of the trans-Jordanic tribes, they gradually occupied all the land anciently lost to the Amorrites. This new prosperity is frequently referred to in the prophetical writings, while their exceeding pride and corruption are made the object of threatening oracles (Is., xv-xvi; xxv, 10; Jer., xlvi; Ezech., xxv, 8-11; Amos, ii, 1-3; Soph., ii, 8-11; etc.). In the cuneiform inscriptions, their rulers are repeatedly mentioned as tribute-payers to Assyria. This was indeed the condition of their Molochous prosperity. It can hardly be doubted, however, that they sided at times with other Western nations against the Assyrian monarchs (Fragment of Sargon II; opening chapters of Judith). In the last days of the Kingdom of Judah, they transferred their allegiance to Babylonia, and fought against Nabuchodonosor against IV Kings, 21. Even after the fall of Jerusalem, Moab enjoyed a considerable prosperity under Nabuchodonosor’s rule; but its utter ruin as a state was at hand. In fact, when the Jews returned from Babylon, the Nabatean Arabs occupied the territory of Moab, and the Arabians instead of the Moabites were the allies of the Ammonites (cf. II Ead., iv, 7; I Mach., ix, 32-42; Josephus, “Antiq.”, xili, 13, 5, xiv, 1, 4). As is shown by the Moabite Stone, the language of Moab was “simply a dialect of Hebrew”. Its use of the waaw consecutive connects most intimately the two languages, and almost all the words, inflections, and idioms of this inscription occur in the original text of the Old Testament. At the time of the Moabite disintegration, Moab’s religious and national state was such that the fact that while the Moabites adored Chamos as their national god, they also worshipped Ahab as their consort. Besides these two divinities, the Old Testament mentions another local deity of the Moabites, viz. Baal of Mount Phegor (Peor; Beelpegor) (Num., xxv, 3; Deut., iv, 3; Osee, ix, 10, etc.). The Moabites* were divided into this same number of tribes. Although their religion is not fully known, it is certain that human sacrifices and also impure rites formed a part of their worship (IV Kings, iii, 27; Num., xxv, Osee, ix, 10).’

TRUSTEES, Land of Moab (London, 1874); CONDER, Hez and Moab (London, 1884); BARTTEN, Briefe aus dem Religionsgeschichte (Berlin, 1888); W. R. SMITH, Religion of the Semites (London, 1894); BLAISE, Narrative of an Expedition to Moab and Gilead (London, 1860); G. A. SMITH, Historical Geography of the Holy Land (New York, 1897); LAFARGE, Bilder sur les Regions Semitiques (Paris, 1903).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

MOABITE STONE. See MESSA.

MOBILE (Fr. MOBIL, Sp. MAURILIA), DIACRIP OF (MOMILHIA, suffragan of New Orleans, comprises the State of Alabama (51,540 sq. miles) and western Florida (7281 square miles), and derives its name from Mauvila, the fort and chief city of the Gulf Indians, who with their “emperor”, Tuscaloosa, “black warrior” were conquered by the Spanish soldier and explorer, Hernando de Soto, in 1540.

The Rev. Henry Royer de la Vente was the first priest (July, 1704), his curate, the Rev. Alexander Huvé. The first entry found in the records of the new parish is that of the baptism of an Apalache girl (6 September, 1703), by the Rev. A. Davion. The Rev. J. B. de St. Cosme was murdered by savages on his way to Mobile from Natchez late in 1706. The last record of the secular clergy (13 January, 1721), that of the Rev. Alexander Huvé, appears in the ancient register of Mobile. The work was then resumed by the religious orders. The Quebec Act of 1774 conferred on the parish priest of Mobile among others, a legal title to its tithes. With the surrender of Mobile to Spain in 1783, the records are kept in Spanish, and the church in Mobile is definitely known as the church of the Immaculate Conception. Pius VII erected the diocese of St. Louis of New Orleans (25 April, 1793), usually styled Louisiana and the Floridas. The jurisdiction, therefore, of the ordinaries of Quebec and Santiago de Cuba over that immense territory ceased with the selection of its first
bishop, the Right Rev. Luis Peñalver y Cardenas, who arrived in New Orleans 17 July, 1795. From 1792 to 1800 the parish priest of Mobile was the Rev. Constantine McKenna, and its last incumbent under Spanish rule, the Rev. Vincent Genin.

BISHOPS.—(1) MICHAEL PORTER, b. at Montbrison, France, 1795; d. at Mobile, 4 May, 1859. He came to the United States 4 September, 1817. Completing his studies at St. Mary’s Seminary, Baltimore, Md., he was ordained priest by Bishop Dubourg at St. Louis (1818), and eight years later, in the same city was consecrated titular Bishop of Oleno by Bishop Rosati, and became first vicar Apostolic of the new Vicariate of Alabama and the Floridas. At the time of his accession he was the only clergyman in the vicariate and had practically only three congregations with churches, Mobile, Ala., and the old Spanish cities of St. Augustine, Fla. (founded 1565), and Pensacola, Fla. (founded 1560). The first priest who came to his assistance was the Rev. Edward T. Mayne, a student of Mt. St. Mary’s College, Emmitsburg, Md., sent by Bishop England of Charleston, to take charge of the deserted church of St. Augustine. Bishop Porter began his administration by riding through his vicariate and visited Pensacola, Tallahassee, and St. Augustine, all of which were newly organized and ministering the Sacraments as he went. He sailed for Europe (1829) in quest of assistants, and returning with two priests and four ecclesiastics, found the vicariate raised to the Diocese of Mobile. His cathedral was a little church twenty feet wide by fifty feet deep, his residences still smaller two-roomed frame structures. But in 1850 new edifices were erected in Mobile, Spring Hill, Summerville, Mount Vernon, Fish River, Pensacola, Tuscaloosa, and Montgomery. He was somewhat relieved in the same year by the detachment of the eastern portion of Florida and its annexation to the newly-created See of St. Petersburg, Fla. To add to his relief the new cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, built mainly through the uniring efforts of the Rev. J. McGahan, was finished at a cost of over eighty thousand dollars, and consecrated 8 December, 1850. About 1830 Bishop Porter established Spring Hill College and Seminary, at the head of which he was elected President and in 1848 he was consecrated Bishop of Dubuque (10 December, 1837) by Bishop Portier, who also consecrated another president of Spring Hill, the Rev. John S. Bazin, third Bishop of Vincennes, 24 October, 1847. Spring Hill College, for a time in charge of the Eustis Fathers, was taken over by the Jesuit Fathers (1846) and has since been one of the foremost institutions in Mobile. Bishop Porter held there a diocesan synod (19 January, 1835). In 1833 he secured from the Visitations convent, Georgetown, a colony of nuns who established in Mobile a house and academy, which is in a very flourishing condition. He brought the Brothers of the Sacred Heart from France (about 1847), and the Sisters of Mercy from Ireland (1844), and later established Bishop of Dubuque, and was ordained Bishop Portier, who also consecrated another president of Spring Hill, the Rev. John S. Bazin, third Bishop of Vincennes, 24 October, 1847. Spring Hill College, for a time in charge of the Eustis Fathers, was taken over by the Jesuit Fathers (1846) and has since been one of the foremost institutions in Mobile. Bishop Porter held there a diocesan synod (19 January, 1835). In 1833 he secured from the Visitations convent, Georgetown, a colony of nuns who established in Mobile a house and academy, which is in a very flourishing condition. He brought the Brothers of the Sacred Heart from France (about 1847), and the Sisters of Mercy from Ireland (1844), and later established orphan asylums for boys and girls respectively. One of his last acts was the foundation of an infirmary at Mobile conducted by the Sisters of Charity.

(2) JOHN QUINLAN, second Bishop of Mobile, b. in County Cork, Ireland, 19 October, 1826; d. at Mobile, 9 March, 1883. He came to the United States 1844, studied for the priesthood in Mt. St. Mary’s College, Emmitsburg, Md., and was ordained by Archbishop Purcell (1853), with a fellow student, Richard Gilmour, afterwards second Bishop of Cleveland. He was consecrated Bishop of Mobile, 4 Dec., 1859, by Archbishop Blanc in St. Louis’ cathedral, New Orleans, and the next year, or at least 1859, he travelled through the United States and fourteen schools for which he had only eight secular priests, and he therefore brought from Ireland eleven young candidates for the priesthood. Two of the priests who came to Bishop Quinlan at this time were zealous workers in the diocese to-day, the Very Rev. C. T. O’Callaghan, D.D., V.G., pastor of St. Vincent’s church, Mobile, several times administrator of the dioce; and the Very Rev. D. Savage, D.D., pastor of St. Peter’s church, Montgomery, a member of the bishop’s council. Bishop Quinlan’s administration fell upon the stormy days of interminable strife. After the battle of Shiloh, he hastened on a special train to the blood-stained battle-ground and ministered to the temporal and spiritual wants of North and South. After that war the diocesan activities were crippled. Nevertheless, besides repairing ruined churches, Bishop Quinlan built the portico of the Mobile cathedral, founded St. Patrick’s and St. Mary’s churches in the same city, and established churches in Huntsville, Decatur, Tuscumbia, Florence, Cullman, Birmingham, Eufaula, Whistler, and Toulminville. April, 1879, Bishop Quinlan invited the Benedictines from St. Vincent’s Abbey, Pa., to the diocese, and they settled at Cullman. The first abbot of the new settlement was the Rev. Benedict Menges, O.S.B., succeeded (1905) by Rt. Rev. Bernard Menges, O.S.B., under whose capable management the monastery and college are progressing and extending their influence considerably.

(3) DOMINIC MANUCY, third Bishop of Mobile, b. in St. Augustine, Fla., 20 December, 1823; d. at Mobile, 4 December, 1885. He was educated at Spring Hill College, and ordained (1850) by Bishop Portier, and for twenty-four years laboured in Montgomery and Mobile. He was consecrated at Mobile (9 Dec., 1874) Bishop of Duluth and was assigned to North Brownsville, Tex., and was transferred to the Diocese of Mobile (9 March, 1884), without being relieved, from his duties as vicar Apostolic, but finding the burden too great he resigned and was appointed, to the present see of Marona.

(4) JEREMIAH O’SULLIVAN, fourth Bishop of Mobile, b. in County Cork, Ireland, 1844; d. at Mobile, 10 August, 1896. He came to the United States, 1863, entered St. Charles College, Ellicott City, Md., whence he proceeded to St. Mary’s Seminary, Baltimore, Md., was ordained priest (June, 1868) by Archbishop Spalding, and consecrated Bishop of Mobile (20 Sept., 1868), by Cardinal, then Archbishop, Gibbons, Baltimore, Md. The present cathedral edifices were built by Bishop O’Sullivan, who successfully strove to restore the ruined financial status of the diocese. A gifted administrator, an admired orator, an extremely zealous and holy bishop, Bishop O’Sullivan travelled and laboured unceasingly in the diocese, left to posterity a monument of noble results, temporal and spiritual, quietly and unostentatiously achieved.

(5) EDWARD PATRICK ALLEN, fifth and present Bishop of Mobile, was born in Lowell, Mass., 17 March, 1853, and educated at Mt. St. Mary’s College, Emmitsburg, Md., where he was ordained priest by the Rev. Joseph W. Becker, 17 March, 1877, and was elected president of Mt. St. Mary’s (1884), and filled that office most aceptably until his consecration as Bishop of Mobile, by Cardinal Gibbons, in the cathedral, Baltimore, Md. (16 May, 1897). Under the able and prudent management of Bishop Allen, the diocese has advanced with great strides, and is still developing at a rapid growth. Many churches and missions have been erected, hospitals, orphanages, and schools established, the number of priests more than doubled, and considerable property acquired with a view to the further development of his rapidly increasing charge. The diocese was soon tried by a fearful storm and tidal wave (Sept., 1900). Many churches either partially or entirely destroyed, and the property of schools or repaired. But the complete results of Bishop Allen’s prosperous administration are best noticed by a comparison between the standing of the
where he assumed control and its existing admirable style.

Statistics.—1897 (year of Bishop Allen’s arrival).

—Churches with resident priests, 22; parishes with parochial schools, 15; children under Catholic care in colleges, academies, and schools, 2,556; hospitals, 2; orphanages, 2; baptisms, infants, 820, converts, 60; marriages, 163; Catholic population, 17,000; priests, secular and religious, 48.

1910—Priests, secular, 49; religious, 52, total, 101; churches with resident priests, 43; missions with churches, 31; total churches, 74; stations, 149; chapels, 25; brothers, 41; religious women, 274; children under Catholic care, 5039; colleges, 3; high school, 1; academies, 7; schools, 31, and orphanages, 3; hospitals, 4; home for aged poor, 1; baptisms, infants, 1,478, converts, 552; marriages, 302; Catholic population, 38,000.

Bishop Allen takes a lively interest in the Negro Missions, and is largely responsible for the good work being done by the Josephite Fathers in Mobile and vicinity, Birmingham, and Montgomery. Near the latter city is St. Joseph’s College, founded (1901) by the Benedictine Fathers, the only primary object of which is “to educate young colored men to be catechists and teachers.” With Bishop Allen’s sanction a colored fraternal organization was instituted in Mobile, 1909, by the Rev. C. Rebocher, which gives promise of universal good.

Benefactors.—The chief benefactors of the diocese were giveth of Old McGill—McGill Insti-tute, a high school for boys, bears their name. The Hannon Home for the aged poor is a tribute to the generosity of Major P. C. Hannon, who built it along the lines of Bishop Allen’s choosing.

Religious Orders.—In the Diocese of Mobile are the Jesuits, Benedictines, Josephite Fathers, and Brothers of the Sacred Heart. There are also the Visitations, Sisters of Charity, Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of Loreto, Sisters of St. Joseph, Sisters of St. Benedict, Little Sisters of the Poor, and Sisters of Perpetual Adoration. There are three Catholic cemeteries, one in Mobile, one in Birmingham, and one in Montgomery. The intrepid Admiral Semmes and Father Ryan, the poet-priest, are buried in the Catholic Cemetery, Mobile. By a singular coincidence the first priest who came to labour in the new Diocese of Mobile and the last and ruling Bishop of Mobile were students at Mt. St. Mary’s College, Emmitsburg, Md., while the first Bishop of San Antonio, Tex., the Rt. Rev. Anthony D. Pellicer, and its present Bishop, the Rt. Rev. Anthony M. Pellicer, and its present Bishop, the Rt. Rev. Anthony M. Pellicer, and its present Bishop, the Rt. Rev. Anthony M. Pellicer, and its present Bishop, the Rt. Rev. Anthony M. Pellicer, and its present Bishop, the Rt. Rev. Anthony M. Pellicer, and its present Bishop, the Rt. Rev. Anthony M. Pellicer, and its present Bishop, the Rt. Rev. Anthony M. Pellicer, and its present Bishop, the Rt. Rev. Anthony M. Pellicer, are natives of Mobile, and the native priests of the diocese, both having been consecrated in its cathedral (the former, 8 Dec., 1874, the latter, 14 April, 1910), of which each in turn was pastor.

HAMILTON, Colonial Mobile (Boston and New York, 1897); STRA, History of the Catholic Church in the United States (Akron, O., New York, Chicago, 1886, 1892); IDEM, Defenders of Our Faith (Chicago, 1886, 1892); MOTHER AUGUST, A Catholic History of the United States (New York, 1897); Metropolitan Catholic Almanac and Louis’s Directory (Baltimore, 1892); Official Catholic Directory (Milwaukee, Baltimore, New York, 1910); REGIER, Die Benediktiner im Staate Alabama (New York, 1898).

THOMAS J. EATON.

Mocissa, a titular metropolitan see of Cappadocia. Procopius (De sedif., V, iv) informs us that this fortified site, in north-western Cappadocia, was constituted metropolis of Cappadocia Tertia by Justinian, when he divided that province into three parts. The emperor gave it the name of Justinianopolis. Nothing is known of its history, and its name should perhaps be written Moccissus. There is no doubt that the site of Mocissus, or Moccissus, is that occupied by the modern town of Kir-Sheir, chief town of a sanjak in the vilayet of Angora, which possesses 8,000 inhabitants, most of them Musulmans. In the neighbourhood of Kir-Sheir there are some important ancient ruins. This metropolis figures in the “Notitiae episcopatuum” until the twelfth century. Only a few of its titulars are known: the earliest, Peter, attended the Council of Constantinople (536); the last, whose name is not known, was a Catholic, and was consecrated after the Council of Florence by Patriarch Metrophanes of Constantinople.

Le Quien, Orients christ., I, 407; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog., s. v.; Ramaty, Asia Minor, 300. S. Pétridina.

Mocoví Indians.—The name is also written Marco, Mocobi, Mocobí, Mocoví. They are a warlike and predatory tribe of Guayanese stock, and are closely related linguistically to the Toba, Mbayas, and Apbópí, their usual allies, settled principally along the middle and upper Orinoco River, in the Chaco region of northern Argentina, although they formerly extended their forays as far south as Santa Fé and even to the gates of Buenos Aires. In habit of life and general characteristics they resembled the rest of the tribes just mentioned, but were distinguished even among the tribes of the Orinoco by their arrogance, avarice, and cruelty and hatred to the Spaniards. They conspired to ruin Tucuman, proving themselves formidable, not to solitary estates merely, but to whole cities”. They entirely destroyed the town of Concepción and massacred its inhabitants.

This special hostility to the people of Tucuman was due to the fact that a large number of Mocoví, who had been induced through the efforts of the Jesuits fathers Altamirano and Díaz to come in from the war-path and had been organized into the mission of San Xavier, had been treacherously seized and distributed as slaves by the governor of that province. They received a temporary check in 1710 from the Governor of the State of Santa Fé, but the sale of three thousand men against the Chaco tribes, with the result that several tribes made peace, while the Mocoví retired to the south-west and continued their raids in that quarter. Thirty years later, during a period of truce, some of the Mocoví became acquainted with the Jesuits of the College of Santa Fé, through whose influence they were won to friendship with the Spaniards, and the chiefs Aletín and Chitalin consented to receive Christian instruction together with their people. As a result the Mocoví mission colony of San Xavier was established in 1743 by Father Francisco Burgos Navarro, thirty leagues from the city, and from a small beginning increased rapidly until it contained at least seven hundred souls, who, were, from time to time, won over by the persuasions of the new converts. Prisoners captured in the various expeditions were also brought into the new mission, while many voluntarily took refuge there to escape pursuit.

The Mocoví proved devout, tractable, and willing workers, and particularly competent musicians under the instruction of the German Father Florian Pauke, who organized a band and chorus whose services were in demand on church occasions even in Buenos Aires. With bell in hand, the chief himself, Aletín, acted as crier every morning to call his people to Mass, and took the lead in every task of difficulty. A third chief, who had long held out against the Spaniards and made war upon his mission kinsmen in revenge for their abandonment of the old life, finally came voluntarily. In 1765 a second Mocoví mission, San Pedro y Pablo, was established by Father Pauke with another portion of the tribe which had until then continued hostile.

The time of the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767 the two missions contained about 1200 Mocoví, of whom all but a few were Christians. Deprived of their accustomed teachers, most of them finally rejoined their wild kinsmen in the forests of the Chaco.
In 1800 the tribe was still loosely estimated at 2000 warriors or over 6000 souls. They are now reduced far below that number, but retain their tribal organization and habits, though no longer hostile, and range generally along the western banks of the Paraná. The best study of their language is Father Tavolini's "Introduzione al Arte Mocoví." (See also Toba.)

**Modena, Archidioecese of (Mutinensis), in central Italy, between the rivers Secchia and Panaro. The city contains many fine buildings. The Romanesque cathedral, begun in 1069, consecrated by Lucius III in 1184, bears on its interior façade scenes from the Old and from the New Testament sculptured in white marble, and the high altar possesses a Pieta by Guido Reni; the inlaid work of the choir, by the Lendinara brothers (1465), is very beautiful; in the belfry, called the Ghirlandina, is kept the famous wooden palm taken from the Bolognese after the battle of Zappolino (1325); this palm is the subject of the heroic-comic epic of Tassoni, "La Secchia Rapita"; the pulpit is a noteworthy work of Arrigo del Camocio. Notable churches of Modena are San Agostino, which contains the tombs of the historians Sigonio and Muratori; San Pietro, with its beautiful specimens of the art of Giambellini, Dossi, and Francia; San Stefano della Pomposa, of which Muratori was provost, and others, rich in works of art. The magnificent Ducal Palace, built in 1635 by Duke Francesco I, according to the plans of Avanzini, besides a valuable gallery of pictures, contains frescos by Franceschini, Tintoretto, Dossi, and others, and a library with more than three thousand manuscripts. The Royal, Comunal, and Capitolary archives possess many important documents. The university was founded by Duke Francesco III in 1378, but Modena, as early as 1182, had a studium generale which rivalled that of Bologna. The citadel, pentagonal in shape, dates from 1635; its walls and bastions were transformed into a public promenade in 1816. There has been a military school for infantry and cavalry in the royal palace of Modena since 1850: it was abolished in the last duke, Francesco V. The various beneficent institutions of this city are united in the Opera Pia Generale.

At the time of the Gallic War, Mutina, the Latin name of Modena, was already in the power of the Romans, who were besieged there in 223 B.C. A Roman colony was taken from Mutina, 234 B.C., and a deacon of the town was in the power of the Ligurians for a year. It was there, also, that Spartacus defeated the consul Cassius in 71 B.C. The famous bellicum Mutinense (42 B.C.) decided the fate of the republic at Rome. During the Empire Modena was one of the most prosperous cities in Italy, but in the war between Constantine and Maxentius, the city was besieged and fell into great decadence until 698, when it was revived by King Cunibert.

Charlemagne made it the capital of a line of counts, whose authority, however, was before long eclipsed by that of the bishops, one of whom, St. Lodoinus, in 897 surrounded the city with walls, to protect it against Hunidian incursions, and who was formally invested with the title of count by Emperor Conrad I. Later, Modena was a possession of the Countess Matilda, after whose death (1115) the city became a free commune, and in time joined the Lombard League against Barbarossa. In the struggle between the popes and Frederick II Modena was Ghibelline, and in conflict with the Guelph cities; nevertheless, it harboured a strong Guelph party, under the leadership of the Aigion family, while the Ghibellines were led by the Grasoli. In 1288, to put an end to internal dissensions, Modena gave its allegiance to Obizzo II of Este, Lord of Ferrara, who also became master of Reggio in 1291. After the death of his son Azzo VIII (1308), Modena became free again, but lost a part of its territory. On the arrival of Henry VII, the town received an imperial vicar; in 1317, it welcomed a pontifical legate, choosing later for its lord John of Bohemia, while, in 1336, it was ceded by Manfredo Pio of Carpi to Obizzo III of Este and Ferrara in whose family it remained until 1859. Among his successors were Nicolò III, who recovered Reggio and the Garfagnana for Modena. Borso, a natural son of Nicolò III, received the title of Duke of Modena from the emperor in 1452, and later that of Duke of Ferrara, from Paul II. In the sixteenth century, in the palace of the Grifillensi family, there flourished an academy of letters. The city submitted to Julius II in 1510, but was restored to the Duke of Parma in 1530 by Charles V at the death of Alfonso II; however, in 1597 Ferrara returned to immediate dependency upon the Holy See, but Modena, with Reggio and its other lands, as a fief of the Empire, passed to Cesare, cousin of Alfonso II.

From that time a new era began for Modena, henceforth the home of a court devoted to the arts and letters, and solicitous for the public weal. The son of Cesare, Alfonso III, after a reign of only one year (1529), became a Capuchin monk in the convent of Castelnuovo di Garfagnana, founded by him, and died in 1614. Alfonso IV, in 1602, was succeeded by the young Francesco II, whose regents were his mother Laura and his great-uncle Cardinal Rinaldo. He built the Ducal Palace and the citadel and added Coreggio to his territory. As Francesco II died without progeny (1658), Modena came into the possession of his uncle Rinaldo, a cardinal also, who married...
Carlotta of Brunswick, and after a reign frequently troubled by French invaders, left the ducal throne to his son Francesco III in 1727, when the latter was fighting against the Turks in Hungary. Francesco III also governed Modena for Maria Theresa. Ercole III, who by his marriage acquired the duchy of Massa and Carrara, succeeded to that of Modena in 1780, and at the approach of Napoleon, sought refuge at Venice. Modena declared the capital of the Caspadian republic, and eventually was incorporated into the Kingdom of Italy. In 1803 Ercole received, as compensation for the loss of Massa, Breisgau and Ortenua. His daughter and only child, Maria Beatrice, married the Archduke Ferdinando of Austria, and their son Francesco IV, in 1814 received the Duchy of Carrara while Maria Beatrice governed the Massa and Carrara until her death. In 1831 occurred the famous conspiracy of Ciro Menotti on the night of the third and fourth of February; it was discovered, and Menotti was imprisoned, taken to Milan by the duke, who had been constrained to flee to that city by the revolt of Bologna, and was hanged on 16 May, after the duke had returned to Modena. In 1846 Francesco V succeeded to the duchy, and in the troubles of 1848 was compelled to seek refuge in Austria, but returned in the following year. In 1859, however, having declared for Austria, he was again obliged to leave his states, and the provisional government, under Carlo Farini, decreed the annexation of Modena to the Kingdom of Italy.

In 1859, however, having declared for Austria, he was again obliged to leave his states, and the provisional government, under Carlo Farini, decreed the annexation of Modena to the Kingdom of Italy.

In the reign of Francesco IV the chief nobility of Modena were the astronomer Geminiano Montanari, the anatomist Gabriele Falloppio, the great Austrian general Monteculii, Cardinal Savoletto, Sigionius, Muratori, Tiraboschi, and the poet Tassoni. According to local tradition, the first Bishop of Modena was St. Cletus—probably sent there by Pope Dionysius about 270. After him three, perhaps more, bishops of Modena, one Antonius, or Autonuminus, to whom reference is made in the life of St. Germaninus his predecessor; this great bishop and protector of the city sheltered in 334 St. Athanasius and died in 349. Other bishops of Modena were St. Theodulus (about 308), formerly a notarius or secretary of St. Ambrose; St. Germaninus II (311) according to Capparulo, who is said to have induced Attila to enter the abbey of Modena (452); St. Lupicinus (749), in whose time the famous abbey of Nonantola was founded by Duke Anselm of Friuli; and Egidius (1097), who began the construction of the cathedral. In 1148 the Diocese of Modena was suppressed for a time on account of discord among the Abbots of Nonantola. William III of Modena, who in 1221, frequently served the pope, Henry III, and Gregory IX, as legate, especially among the Prussians, the Livonians, the Estonians, etc.; eventually he resigned his see to devote himself to the conversion of those peoples (cf. Balan, "Sulle legazioni compiute nei paesi nordici da Guglielmo vescovo di Modena," ibid., 1872). Bonadonna Bechettti, bishop in 1311, was the first Franciscan in the diocese, and the Ghiliani of Nicolò Boardo (1401) did much for ecclesiastical discipline; Nicolò Sandonino (1479) was pontifical legate in Spain; Giovanni Morone (1529) founded the seminary, and is famous for missions on which he was sent to Germany in the beginnings of Lutheranism. Under him, through the "Academia", Protestantism obtained a firm hold in Modena, and St. John of the Cross was excommunicated with difficulty; Egidio Foesarari (1550), to whom the Council of Trent entrusted the correction of the Roman Missal and the preparation of its Catechism for Parish Priests; Roberto Fontana (1646) and Giuseppe M. Folignano (1757) both restorers of the episcopal palace, while the second did much for the endowment of the cathedral.

In 1821 the Abbey of Nonantola, a prelatura nullius dioecesis, was united to the Diocese of Modena; and the latter, a suffragan of Milan until 1852, was then raised to the dignity of a metropolitana see, with Carpi, Guastalla, Massa, and Reggio Emilia for its suffragans. The Abbey of Nonantola was famous, once, as a center of discipline and ecclesiastical learning, and through it a great impetus was given to agriculture in the surrounding country. Politically, Nonantola entered into an alliance with Bologna to preserve its independence, especially against Modena, but like the latter it became a possession of the house of Este in 1441. Until 1441 the administration of Nonantola was confided to commendatory abbots, one of whom was St. Charles Borromeo. The literary treasures of the abbey gradually found their way into the various libraries of Italy.

The Archdiocese of Modena, with Nonantola, contains 250 parishes, in which there are 220,400 faithful, 745 secular and 80 regular priests; 8 religious houses of men, and 13 of women; 5 schools for boys and 7 for girls; 60 seminarians; 450 churches or chapels.

Cappelletti, La Chiesa d'Italia, XV; Tiraboschi, Memorie storiche moderne (Modena, 1793-94); In dem, Storia della Basilica di Nonantola (Modena, 1784); Salmi, Storia della diocesi di Modena (1785); Baraldi, Compendio storico della vita di Modena (Modena, 1795); Grimani, Gli scrittori di Modena (1801-9); Sandonini, Modena sotto il governo dei papali (Modena, 1879); Monumenti di storia patria per le province modenese (Parma, 1861—).
they called "Modernismo nel clero" (Modernism among the clergy). Several pastoral letters of the year 1906 made use of the same term; among others we may mention the Lenten charge of Cardinal Nava, Archbishop of Catania, to his clergy, a letter of Cardinal Bacileri, Bishop of Verona, dated 22 July, 1906, and a letter of Mgr Rossi, Archbishop of Acerenza and Matera. "Modernismo e Modernisti", a work by Abbate Cavallanti which was published towards the end of 1906, gives long extracts from these letters. The name "modernism" was not to the liking of the reformers. The propriety of the new term was discussed even amongst good Catholics. When the Decree "Lamentabili" appeared, Mgr Baudoilart expressed his pleasure at not finding the word "modernism" mentioned in it. "I use the term "modern" (Decree of 20 June, IV, p. 578). He considered the term "too vague". Besides it seemed to insinuate "that the Church condemns everything modern". The Encyclical "Pascendi" (8 Sept., 1907) put an end to the discussion. It bore the official title, "De Modernistarum doctrinia". The introduction declared that the name commonly given to the upholders of the new errors was not inapt. Since then the modernists themselves have acquiesced in the use of the name, though they have not admitted its propriety (Loisy, "Simplex refexionis sur le decret 'Lamentabili' et sur l'encycliche 'Pascendi' du 8 Sept., 1907", p. 14; "Il programma dei modernisti"; note at the beginning).

THEORY OF THE MODERNISTS. The essential error of Modernism. — A full definition of modernism would be rather difficult. First it stands for certain tendencies, and secondly for a body of doctrine which, if it has not given birth to these tendencies (practice often precedes theory), serves at any rate as their explanation and support. Such tendencies, which manifest themselves in different churches, are not united in every individual, nor are they always and everywhere found together. Modernist doctrine, too, may be more or less radical, and it is swallowed in doses that vary with each one's likes and dislikes. In the Encyclical "Pascendi", Pius X says that modernism embraces every heresy. M. Loisy makes practically the same statement when he writes that "in reality all Catholic theology, even in its fundamental principles, the general philosophy of religion, Divine law, and the laws that govern our knowledge of God, come up for judgment before this new court of assize" (Simples reflxions, p. 23). Modernism is a composite system: its assertions and claims lack that unity of thought which usually pertains to systems of thought or to the systematic thought of any one. The Encyclical "Pascendi" was the first Catholic synthesis of the subject. Out of scattered materials it built up what looked like a logical system. Indeed friends and foes alike could not but admire the patient skill that must have been needed to fashion something like a co-ordinated whole. In their answer to the Encyclical "Il programma dei modernisti", the Modernists tried to retouch this synthesis. Previous to all this, some of the Italian bishops, in their pastoral letters, had attempted such a synthesis. We would particularly mention that of Mgr Rossi, Bishop of Acerenza and Matera. In this respect, too, Abbate Cavallanti's book, already referred to, deserves mention. Even earlier still, German and French Protestants had done some synthetical work in the same direction. Prominent among them are Kant, "Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der reinen Vernunft" (1803); Schleiermacher, "Der christliche Glaube" (1821-1822); and A. Sabatier, "Esquisses d'une philosophie de la religion d'apres la psychologie et l'histoire" (1897).
IONS, and tendencies. From time to time these tendencies work out into systems, that are to renew the basis and superstructure of society, politics, philosophy, theology, of the Church herself and of the Christian religion. A remodelling, a renewal according to the ideals of the twentieth century—such is the longing that possesses the modernists. "The avowed modernists," says M. Loisy, "form a fairly definite group of thinking men united in the common desire to adapt Catholicism to the intellectual, moral and social needs of to-day" (op. cit., p. 13). "Our religious attitude," as "il programma dei modernisti" states (p. 5, note 1), "is ruled by the single wish to be one with Christians and Catholics who live in harmony with the spirit of the age." The spirit of this plan of reform may be summarized under the following heads: (a) A wholesome, complete emancipation, tending to weaken ecclesiastical authority; the emancipation of science, which must traverse every field of investigation without fear of conflict with the Church; the emancipation of the State, which should never be hampered by religious authority; the emancipation of the private conscience, whose inspirations must not be overruled by pastoral definitions or anathemas; the emancipation of the universal conscience, with which the Church should be ever in agreement; (b) A spirit of movement and change, with an inclination to a sweeping form of evolution such as abhors anything fixed and stationary; (c) A spirit of reconciliation among all men through the heartiest good-will and the most moderate and least provocative of the modernist dreams of an understanding between the different Christian religions, nay, even between religion and a species of atheism, and all on a basis of agreement that must be superior to mere doctrinal differences.

Such are the fundamental tendencies. As such, there is no need to explain, justify, and strengthen themselves in an error, to which therefore one might give the name of "essential" modernism. What is this error? It is nothing less than the perversion of dogmas. Manifold are the degrees and shades of modernist doctrine on the question of our relations with God. But no real modernist keeps the Catholic notions of dogmas intact. Are you doubtful as to whether a writer or a book is modernist in the formal sense of the word? Verify every statement about dogmas; examine his treatment of its origin, its nature, its sense, its authority. You will know whether you are dealing with a veritable modernist or not, according to the way in which the Catholic conception of dogma is traversed. Dogma by itself is an impenetrable barrier; dogma and.evidence are correlative terms; one implies the other as the action implies its object. In this way then we may define modernism as "the critique of our supernatural knowledge according to the false postulates of contemporary philosophy." It will be advisable for us to quote a full critique of such supernatural knowledge as an example of the mode of procedure. (In the meantime however we must not forget that there are partial and less advanced modernists who do not go so far). For them, external intuition furnishes man with but phenomenal, contingent, sensible knowledge. He sees, he feels, he hears, he tastes, he touches this something, this phenomenon that comes and goes without telling him aught of the existence of a suprasensible, absolute and unchanging reality outside all enirlinging space and time. But deep within himself man feels the need of a higher hope. He aspires to perfection in a being on whom he feels his destiny depends. And so he has an instinctive, an affective yearning for God. This necessity at first has its origins in the subconsciousness. Once consciously understood, it reveals to the soul the intimate presence of God. This manifestation, in which God and man collaborate, is nothing else than revelation. Under the influence of its yearning, that is of its religious feelings, the soul tries to reach God, to adopt towards Him an attitude that will satisfy its yearning. It generates, it searches. These gropings form the soul's religious experience. They are more easy, successful and far-reaching, or less so, according as it is now one, now another individual soul that sets out in quest of God. Anon there are privileged ones who reach extraordinary results. They communicate their discoveries to their fellow men, and forthwith demand of them the formation of a new religion, which is more or less true in the proportion in which it gives peace to the religious feelings.

The attitude Christ adopted, reaching up to God as to a father and then returning to men as to brothers—such is the meaning of the precept, "Love God and thy neighbour"—brings full rest to the soul. It makes of the man a child of God, a child of the modern religious faith, a true and definitive religion. The act by which the soul adopts this attitude and abandons itself to God as a father and then to men as to brothers, constitutes the Christian Faith. Plainly such an act is an act of the will rather than of the intellect. But religious sentiment tries to express itself in intellectual concepts, which in their turn serve to preserve this sentiment. Hence the origin of those formulas concerning God and Divine things, of those theoretical propositions that are the outcome of the successive religious experiences of souls gifted with the same faith. These formulae become dogmas, when religious authority approves of them for the life of the community. For the modernist it is not a matter of dogmas and of creeds, but of the consciences of the same faith, and with it comes authority. Dogmas promulgated in this way teach us nothing of the unknowable, but only symbolize it. They contain no truth. Their usefulness in preserving the faith is their only raison d'être. They survive as long as they exert their influence. Being the work of man in time, they are adapted to his varying needs, best but contingent and transient. Religious authority too, naturally conservative, may lag behind the times. It may mistake the best methods of meeting needs of the community, and try to keep up worn-out formulae. Through respect for the community, the individual Christian who sees the mistake continues in an attitude of outward submission. But he does not feel himself inwardly bound by the decisions of higher powers; rather he makes praiseworthy efforts to bring his Church into harmony with the times. He may confine himself, too, if he cares, to the older and simpler religious forms; he may live his life in conformity with the dogmas accepted from the beginning, as the Church wrote to Rome, as written to Freiburg, and such was his own private practice. (2) Catholic and Modernist Notions of Dogma Compared. The tradition of the Catholic Church, on the other hand, considers dogmas as in part supernatural and mysterious, proposed to our faith by a Divinely instituted authority on the ground that they are part of the general revelation the Apostles preached in the name of Jesus Christ. This faith is an act of the intellect made under the sway of the will. By it we hold firmly what God has revealed and what the Church proposes to us to believe. For believing is holding something firmly on the authority of God's word, when such authority may be recognized by signs that are sufficient, at least with the help of grace, to create certitude. Comparing these notions, the Catholic and the modernist, we shall see that modernism alters the source, the manner of promulgation, the object, the stability and the truth of dogma. For the modernist, the only and the necessary source is the private consciousness. And logically so, because hidden as signs of God's word (il programma, p. 96). For the Catholic, dogma is a free communication of God to the believer made through the preaching of the Word. Of course the truth from without, which is above and beyond any natural want, is preceded by a certain interior finality or perfecti-
bility which enables the believer to assimilate and live the truth revealed. It enters a soul well-disposed to receive it, as a principle of happiness which, though an unmerited gift to which we have no right, is still such as the soul can enjoy with unmeasured gratitude. In the modernist conception, the Church can no longer define dogmas in God's name and with His infallible help; it is no longer the Church's authority which is the repository of infallibility, in a second function, subject to the collective consciousness which she has to express. To this collective consciousness the individual need conform only externally; as for the rest he may embark on any private religious adventures he cares for. The modernist proportions dogma to his intellect or rather to his heart. For the modernist, the Incarnation or the Infallibility are either unthinkable (a modernist Kierkegaard) or at most a reach of the unintended reason (a modernist Hegelian tendency). "The truth of religion is in him (man) implicitly, as surely as the truth of the whole physical universe, is involved in every part of it. Could he read the needs of his own spirit and conscience, he would need no teacher." (Tyrrell, "Scylla and Charybdis", p. 277).

Assuredly Catholic truth is not a lifeless thing. Rather is it a living tree that breaks forth into green leaves, flowers, and fruits. There is a development, or gradual unfolding, and a clearer statement of its dogmas. Besides the primary truths, such as the Divine, the Humility of Jesus, the Mass, the Virgin Mary, the Communion of Saints, there are others which, one by one, become better understood, better defined, e. g. the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and that of the Infallibility of the Pope. Such unfolding takes place not only in the study of the tradition of the dogma but also in showing its origin in Jesus Christ and the Apostles, in the understanding of it, of which it is the proof, and in the historical or rational proofs added in support of it. Thus the historical proof of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception has certainly been strengthened since the definition in 1854. The rational conception of the dogma of Divine Providence is a continual object of study; the dogma of the Sacrifice of the Mass allows the reason to inquire into the idea of sacrifice. It has always been believed that there is no salvation outside the Church, but as this belief has gradually come to be better understood, many are now considered within the soul of the Church who would have been placed without, in a day when the distinction between the soul and the body of the Church had not generally obtained. It may be that the mind must first be purged of the idea of its truth is not sterile, but always serves to nourish devotion. But whilst holding with life, progress, and development, the Church rejects transitory dogmas that in the modernist theory would be forgotten unless replaced by contrary formula. She cannot admit that "thought, hierarchy, cult, in a word, everything has changed in the history of the Church," nor can she be content with "the identity of religious spirit" which is the only permanency that modernism admits (II programma dei Modernisti).

Truth consists in the conformity of the idea with its object. Now, in the Catholic concept, a dogmatic formula supplies us with at least an analogical knowledge of a given object. For the modernist, the essential nature of dogma consists in its correspondence with and its capacity to satisfy a certain momentary need of the religious feeling. It is an arbitrary symbol that tells nothing of the object it represents. At most, as M. Leroy, one of the least radical of modernists, suggests, it is a positive prescription of a practical order, a condition of superior obedience, the act of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist means: "Act as if Christ had the local presence, the idea of which is so familiar to you". But, to avoid exaggeration, we add this other statement of the same writer (loc. cit.), "This however does not mean that dogma bears no relation to thought; for (1) there are duties concerning the action of thinking; (2) dogma itself implicitly affirms that reality contains in one form or another the justification of such prescriptions as are either reasonable or salutary".

VARIOUS DEGREES OF MODERNISM AND ITS CRITERION.—Modernist attacks on dogma, as we have already remarked, vary according to the degree in which its doctrines are embraced. Thus, in virtue of the leading idea of modernism, we find an agnostic modernist, and Campbell (a Congregationalist minister) is a symbolic modernist. Again the tendency to innovation is at times not at all general, but limited to some particular domain. Along with modernism in the strict sense, which is directly theological, we find other kinds of modernism in philosophy, politics, and social and such cases a wider meaning must be given to the term.

Here, however, it is needful to speak of warning against unreasonable attacks. Not every novelty is to be condemned, nor is every project of reform to be dubbed modernist because it is untimely or exaggerated. In the same way, the attempt fully to understand modern philosophic thought so as to grasp what is true in such systems, and to discover the points of contact with the old philosophy, is very far from being modernism. On the contrary, that is the very best way to refute modernism. Every error contains an element of truth. Isolate that element and accept it. The structure which it helps to support, having lost its foundation, will be undermined and destroyed. The modernist then will be appropriate only when there is question of opposition to the certain teaching of ecclesiastical authority through a spirit of innovation. The words of Cardinal Ferrari, Archbishop of Milan, as cited in "La Revue Pratique d'Apologetique" (VI, 1906, p. 125), are characteristic: "We are deeply pained", he says, "to find that certain persons, in public controversy against modernism, in pamphlets, newspapers and other periodicals, go to the length of detecting the evil everywhere, or at any rate of imputing it to those who are very far from being infected with it". In the same year, Cardinal Maffei had to condemn "La Penta azuera", an anti-modernist organ, on account of its exaggeration in this respect. On the other hand, it is regrettable that certain avowed leaders of modernism, carried away perhaps by the desire to remain within the Church at all costs,—another characteristic of modernism,—have taken refuge in equivocation, reticence, or quibbles. Such a line of action merits no sympathy with its authors, for to talk not altogether justly, the distrust of sincere Catholics.

PROOFS OF THE FOREGOING VIEWS.—But does the principle and the quasi-essential error of modernism lie in its corruption of dogma? Let us consult the Encyclical "Pascendi". The official Latin text calls the modernist dogmatic system a leading chapter in their doctrine. The French translation, which is also authentic, speaks thus: "Dogma, of origin and nature, such is the ground principle of modernism. The fundamental principle of modernism is, according to M. Loisy, "the possibility, the necessity and the legitimacy of evolution in understanding the dogmas of the Church, including that of papal infallibility and authority, as well as in the manner of exercising this authority" (op. cit., p. 124). The character and leaning of our epoch confirm our diagnosis. It likes to substitute leading and fundamental questions in the place of side issues. The problem of natural knowledge is the burning question in present-day metaphysics. It is not surprising therefore that the modernist knowledge the object of discussion in religious polemics. Finally, Pius X has said that modernism embraces all the heresies. (The same opinion is expressed in another way in the encyclical "Edite" of 16 May, 1910.) And what error, we ask, more fully justifies the pope's statement than that which alters dogma in its root and es-
sence? It is furthermore clear—to use a direct argument—that modernism fails in its attempt at religious reform, if it makes no change in the Catholic notion of dogma. Moreover, does not its own conception of dogma explain both a large number of its propositions and its leaning towards independence, evolution, and conciliation?

MODERNIST AIDS EXPLAINED BY ITS ESSENTIAL ERROR.—The definition of an unchangeable dogma imposes itself on every Catholic, learned or otherwise, and it necessarily supposes a Church legislating for all the faithful, passing judgment on State action—from its own point of view of course—and that even seeks alliance with the civil power to carry on the work of the Apostolate. On the other hand, once dogma is held to be a mere symbol of the unknowable, a science which merely deals with the facts of nature or history could neither oppose it nor even enter into controversy with it. If it is true only in so far as it excites and nourishes religious sentiment, the private individual is at full liberty to throw it aside when its influence on him has ceased; nay, even the Church herself, whose existence depends on a dogma not different from the others in nature and origin, has no right to legislate for a self-sufficing State. And thus independence is fully realized. There is no need to prove that the modernist spares no effort to exploit the even in popular mony with its concept of ever-changing dogma and is unintelligible without it; the matter is self-evident. Finally, as regards the conciliation of the different religions, we must necessarily distinguish between what is essential to faith regarded as a sentiment, and beliefs which are accessory, mutable, and practically negligible. If the modernist attempts to adapt the Christian faith to the spirit of the age, he is a scholar, a philosopher, a theologian, a missionary, a publisher. He is a man of world, a man of business; he is a critic. When he is a believer, that is to say, a symbolical expression of faith, then docility in following generous impulses may be religious, and the atheist's religion would not seem to differ essentially from yours.

MODERNIST PROPOSITIONS EXPLAINED BY ITS ESSENTIAL ERROR.—We make a selection of the following propositions as the most flagrant for discussion: (a) The Christ of faith is not the Christ of history. Faith portrays Christ according to the religious needs of the faithful; history represents Him as He really was, that is, in so far as His appearance on earth was a concrete phenomenon. In this way it is easy to understand how a believer may, without contradicting his faith, believe in the resurrection and at the same time deny them in the quality of historian. In the “Hibbert Journal” for Jan, 1909, the Rev. Mr. Robert wished to call the Christ of history “Jesus” and reserve “Christ” for the same person as idealized by faith; (b) Christ's work in founding the Church and instituting the sacraments was mediata, not immediate. The main point is to find supports for the faith. Now, as religious experience succeeds so well in creating useful dogmas, why may it not do likewise in the matter of institutions suited to the age? (c) The sacraments act as eloquent formulae which touch the soul and carry it away. Precisely; for if dogmas exist only in so far as they preserve religion and order, and order as the substance of the sacraments? (d) The Sacred Books are in every religion a collection of religious experiences of an extraordinary nature. For if there is no external revelation, the only substitute possible is the subjective religious experience of men of particular gifts, experiences such as are worthy of being preserved for the community. THE MODERNIST MOVEMENT.—The late M. Poinc dated the modernist movement from the French Revolution. And rightly so, for it was then that many of those modern liberties which the Church has reproved as unrestrained and ungoverned, first found sanction. Several of the propositions collected in the Syllabus of Pius IX, although enunciated from a rationalist point of view, are characteristic of modernism; for example, are the fourth proposition, which derives all religious truth from the natural force of reason; the fifth, which affirms that revelation, if it joins in the onward march of reason, is capable of unlimited progress; the seventh, which treats the prophecies and miracles of Holy Scripture as poetical imaginations; propositions six to eighteen enunciate the equal value of all religions from the point of view of salvation; proposition fifty-five on the separation of Church and State; propositions seventy-five and seventy-six, which oppose the temporal power of the pope. The modernist tendency is still more apparent in the last proposition, which was condemned on 18 March, 1861: “The Roman Pontiff can and ought to conform with the modernist prophecies and to curb temptation in the name of the true and ancient faith.”

TAKING only the great lines of the modernist movement within the Church itself, we may say that under Pius IX its tendency was politico-liberal, under Leo XIII and Pius X social; with the latter pontiff still reigning, its tendency has become avowedly theological. It is in France and Italy above all that modernism is properly so-called, that is, the form which attacks the very concept of religion and dogma, has spread its ravages among Catholics. Indeed, some time after the publication of the Encyclical of 8th September, 1907, the German, English, and Belgian bishops congratulated themselves that their respective countries had been spared. But what has happened since? Individual upholders of the new error are to be found everywhere, and even England as well as Germany has produced modernists of note. In Italy, on the contrary, even before the Encyclical appeared, the bishops have raised the cry of alarm in their pastoral letters of 1906 and 1907. Newspapers and reviews, open and secret, open and secret are publishing the Divina Quaestio and the gravity of the danger which the Sovereign Pontiff sought to avert. After Italy it is France that has furnished the largest number of adherents to this religious reform or ultra-progressive party. In spite of the notoriety of certain individuals, comparatively few laymen have joined the movement; so far it has found adherents mainly among theologians, philosophers, and modernist writers. France possesses a modernist publishing house (La librairie Nourry). A modernist review founded by the late Father Tyrrell, "Nova et VETERA", is published at Rome. "La Revue Moderne Internationale" was started this year (1910) at Geneva. This monthly periodical calls itself "the organ of the international modernist movement", and represents the modernist opinions, and claims to have co-workers and correspondents in France, Italy, Germany, England, Austria, Hungary, Spain, Belgium, Russia, Rumania, and America. The Encyclical "Pascendi" notes and deplores the ardour of the modernists propagandists. A strong current of modernism is running through the Russian Schismatic Church. The Anglican Church has not escaped. And indeed liberal Protestantism is nothing but a radical form of modernism that is winning the greater number of the theologians of the Reformed Church. Others who oppose the innovation find refuge in the authority of the Catholic Church. THE PHILOSOPHICAL ORIGIN AND CONSEQUENCES OF MODERNISM can only be understood from its philosophical base. It does great service to the cause of truth; but error calls for its assistance too. Many consider the philosophical groundwork of modernism to be Kantian. This is true, if by Kantian philosophy is meant every system that has a root connexion with the philosophy of the Königsberg sage. In other words, the basis of modernist philosophy is Kantian if, because Kant's way to the most illustrious moderate representative, all a negativism be called Kantian (by negativism is meant the philosophy which denies that reason, used in any rate in a speculative and theoretical way, can gain true knowledge of suprasensible things). It is not our business here to oppose the application of the intellect Kantian axioms to the philosophy of faith. If we compare the two systems, we shall find that they have
two elements in common, the negative part of the "Critique of Pure Reason" (which reduces pure or speculative knowledge to phenomenal or experiential intuition), and a certain argumentative method in distinguishing dogma from the real basis of religion. On the positive side, however, modernism differs from Kantism in some essential points. For Kant, faith is a really rational adhesion of the mind to the postulates of God, liberty, and immortality. Modernist faith, on the other hand, is a matter of sentiment, a clinging of oneself towards the Unknowable, and cannot be scientifically justified by reason. In Kant, system, dogmas and the whole positive framework of religion are necessary only for the childhood of humanity or for the common people. They are symbols that bear a certain analogy to images and comparisons. They serve to inculcate those moral precepts that for Kant constitute religion. Modernist symbols, though changeable and fleeting, correspond to a law of human nature. Generally speaking, they help to express sentiments, and the internal religious sentiment which Kant (who knew it from his reading of the pietists) calls schepparmeri. Kant, as a rationalist, rejects supernatural religion and prayer. The modernists consider natural religion a useless abstraction; for them it is prayer rather that constitutes the inner life of religion. It would be incorrect to say that modernism is an offshoot of Schleiermacher (1768-1834), who though he owed something to Kant's philosophy, nevertheless built up his own theological system. Ritschl called him the "legislator of theology" (Rechtl. und Vers., III, p. 486). Schleiermacher conceives the modernist plan of reforming the church and the world through intellect and science. Thus would he establish an enlacement of culture among the various cults, and even between religion and the Infinite. Like a modernist, he has dreams of new religious apologetics; he wants to be a Christian; he declares himself independent of all philosophy; he rejects natural religion as a pure abstraction, and derives dogma from religious experience. His principal writings on this subject are "Ueber die Religion" (1799; note the difference between the first and the later editions) and "Der Christliche Glaube" (1821-22). Ritschl, one of Kant's disciples, recognizes the New Testament as a scientific document of faith. In Christ the consciousness of an intimate union with God, and considers the institution of the Christian religion, which for him is inconceivable without faith in Christ, as a special act of God's providence. Thus has he prepared the way for a form of modernism more temperate than that of Schleiermacher. Though he predicted a conflict, he did not foresee a complete solution of religion. Schleiermacher admitted a certain fixity of dogma. For this reason it seems to us that modernists owe their radical evolutionary theory to Herbert Spencer (1820-1903). It was through the writings of A. Sabatier (1839-1901), a French Protestant of the Broad Church type, that the religious theories we have spoken of, spread among the Latin races, in France and in Italy. It is in these countries, too, that modernism has done greatest harm among the Catholics. Sabatier is a radical modernist. He has especially drawn upon Schleiermacher for the composition of his two works on religious synthesis ("Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion d'après la psychologie et l'historic", Paris, 1848; "L'Etat d'autorité et la religion de l'esprit", Paris, 1902).

The fundamental error of the modernist philosophy is its misunderstanding of the scholastic formula which takes account of the two aspects of human knowledge. Doubtless, the human mind is a vital faculty endowed with an activity of its own, and tending towards its own object. However, as it is not in continual activity, it is not self-sufficient; it has not in itself the full principle of its operations, but is forced to utilize sensible experience in order to arrive at knowledge. This incompleteness and falling short of perfect autonomy is due to man's very nature. As a consequence, in all human knowledge and activity, account must be taken both of the intrinsic character of the external object. Urged so by the finitude that inspires him, man tends towards those objects which suit him, while at the same time objects offer themselves to him. In the supernatural life, man acquires new principles of action and, as it were, a new nature. He is now capable of acts of which God is the formal object. These acts, however, must be proposed to man, whether God designs to do so by direct revelation to man's soul or whether, in conformity with man's social nature, God makes use of intermediaries who communicate exteriorly with man. Hence the necessity of preaching, of motives of credibility, and of external teaching authority. Catholic philosophy does not deny the soul's spontaneous life, the sublimity of its supersensible and supernatural possibilities, the incompleteness of vue to inculcate its yearnings. Scholastic doctors give expression to mystical transports far superior to those of the modernists. But in their philosophy they never forget the lowliness of human nature, which is not purely spiritual. The modernist remembers only the internal element of our higher activity. To make it for his advantage he chooses a definition of the modernist calls "vital immanence". When deprived of the external support which is indispensable to them, the acts of the higher intellectual faculties can only consist in vague sentiments which are as indeterminate as are those faculties themselves. Hence it is that modernist doctrines, not only in theory but in practice, are so intangible. Furthermore, by admitting the necessity of symbols, modernism makes to extrinsic a concession which is its own refutation.

(2) The Consequences.—The fact that this radically intrinsic conception of the spiritual or religious activity of man (this perfect autonomy of the reason sui-d-eus of what is exterior) is the fundamental philosophical conception of the modernists, as the alteration of dogma is the essential characteristic of their heresy, can be shown without difficulty by deducting from it their entire system of philosophy. First of all, of their agnosticism: the vague nature which they attribute to our faculties does not permit them, without a gory, to arrive at anything. Next, of their evolutionism: there is no determined object to assure to dogmatic formula a permanent and essential meaning compatible with the life of faith and progress. Now, from the moment that these formulæ simply serve to nourish the vague sentiment which for modernism is the only common intellectual result. Next, of their evolutionism: there is no determined object to assure to dogmatic formula a permanent and essential meaning compatible with the life of faith and progress. Now, from the moment that these formulæ simply serve to nourish the vague sentiment which for modernism is the only common intellectual result. Hence, radical modernism preaches union and friendship, even with mystical atheism. Modernism is inclined to pantheism also by its doctrine of Divine Immanence, that is, of the intimate presence of God within us. Does this God declare Himself as distinct from
us? If so, one must not then oppose the position of modernism to the Catholic position and reject exterior revelation. But if God declares Himself as not distinct from us, the position of modernism becomes open. Such is the dilemma proposed in the Encyclical. Modernism is pantheistic also in its way of reasoning. Independent of and superior to religious formule, the religious sentiment on the one hand originates them and gives them their entire value, and on the other hand, it cannot neglect them, it must express itself in them and by them; they are its reality. But we have here the ontology of pantheism, which teaches that the principle does not exist outside of the expression that it gives itself. In the pantheist philosophy, Being or the Idea, God, is before the world and superior to it, He creates it, and yet He has no reality outside the world; the world is the realization of God.

The POLITICAL CAUSES OF MODERNISM.—Curiosity and pride are, according to the Encyclical “Pascendi”, two remote causes. Nothing is truer; but, apart from offering an explanation common to all heretical obstinacy, we ask ourselves here why this pride has taken the shape of modernism. We proceed to consider this question. In modernism we find, first of all, the echo of many tendencies of the mentality of the present generation. Inclined to doubt, and distrustful of what is affirmed, men’s minds tend of their own accord to minimize the value of dogmatic definitions. Men are struck by the diversity of the religions which exist on the face of the earth. The Catholic religion is no longer, in their eyes, as it was in the thirteenth century, the universal religion of humanity. They have been shown the influence of race on the diffusion of the Gospel. They have been shown the good sides of other cults and beliefs. Our contemporaries find it hard to believe that the greater part of humanity is plunged in error, especially if they are ignorant that the Catholic religion teaches that the Catholic Church is the last hope of those who err in good faith. Hence they are inclined to overlook doctrinal divergencies in order to insist on a certain fundamental conformity of tendencies and of aspirations.

Then again they are moved by sentiments of liberalism and moderation, which reduce the importance of exactness; reason, as the various authors say, is only private opinions which change with time and place, and which merit an equal respect from all. In the West, where people are of a more practical turn, a non-intellectual interest explains the success of heresies which win a certain popularity. Consider the countries in which modernism is chiefly promulgated: France has opposed, a priori, the dogmas of religious science; in Italy, ecclesiastical authority has imposed social and political directions which call for the sacrifice of humanitarian and patriotic ideas or dreams. That there are important reasons for such commands does not prevent discontent. The majority of men have not enough virtue or nobility to sacrifice for long, to higher duties, a cause which touches their interest or which engages their sympathy. Hence it is that some Catholics, who are not quite steady in their faith and religion, attempt to revolt, and count themselves fortunate in having some doctrinal pretexts to cover their secession.

The leader of the periodical “La Foi Catholique”, a review started for the purpose of combating modernism, adds this explanation: “The insufficient cultivation of Catholic philosophy and science is the second deep explanation of the origin of modernist errors. Both have too long confined themselves to answers which, though fundamentally correct, are but little suited to the mentality of our adversaries, and are formulated in a language which they do not understand and which is not to their point. Instead of utilizing the fact that particular recognition which is quite consonant with the best scholastic tradition: "In this way, we have failed to secure a real point of contact between Catholic and modern thought" (Gaudue, “La Foi Catholique”, I, pp. 62–63). Another point is that the intrinsic nature of the movement of contemporary philosophy has been too much despised or ignored in Catholic schools. Instead of utilizing it that partial recognition which is quite consonant with the best scholastic tradition: "In this way, we have failed to secure a real point of contact between Catholic and modern thought" (Gaudue, ibid.). For lack of professors who knew how to mark out the actual path of religious science, many cultured minds, especially among the young clergy, found themselves defenseless against an error which seduced them by its speciousness and by any element of truth contained in its reproaches against the Catholic schools. It is scholasticism ill-understood and calumniated that has incurred this disdain. And for the pope, this is one of the immediate causes of modernism.” Cardinal Mercier, on the occasion of his first solemn visit to the Catholic University of Louvain (8 December, 1907), addressed the following compliment to the professors of theology: “Because, with more good sense than others, you have vigorously kept to objective study, and the calm examination of facts, you have both preserved our Alma Mater from the straying of modernism and have secured for her the advantages of modern scientific methods.” (“Annuaire de l’Université Catholique de Louvain”, 1908, p. XXI, XXVI.) Saint Augustine (De Genesi contra Manichaeos, I, Bk. I, 1) has text that universal admirable, the beautiful and the benevolent had come to the assembly, and the clear vision, if you have brought to our Alma Mater from the straying of modernism and have secured for her the advantages of modern scientific methods.” (“Annuaire de l’Université Catholique de Louvain”, 1908, p. XIX, XXVI.) Saint Augustin (De Genesi contra Manichaeos, I, Bk. I, 1) has text that universal admirable, the beautiful and the benevolent had come to the assembly, and the clear vision, if you have brought to our Alma Mater from the straying of modernism and have secured for her the advantages of modern scientific methods.” (“Annuaire de l’Université Catholique de Louvain”, 1908, p. XXI, XXVI.) Saint Augustin (De Genesi contra Manichaeos, I, Bk. I, 1) has text that universal admirable, the beautiful and the benevolent had come to the assembly, and the clear vision, if you have brought to our Alma Mater from the straying of modernism and have secured for her the advantages of modern scientific methods.” (“Annuaire de l’Université Catholique de Louvain”, 1908, p. XXI, XXVI.)
propositions. (5) The injunction of the Holy Office, "Recentissimo of 28 August, 1907, which with a
topic, in the history of the denunciations of the Pope, 8 September, 1907, of which we shall speak later on. (7) Three letters of the Cardinal Secretary of State, of 2 and 10 October, and of 5 November, 1907, on the attendance of the clergy at secular universities, urging the execution of the Declaration of 18 September, 1907, on the validity of the Encyclical on this subject. The Encyclical had extended this regulation to the whole Church. (8) The condemnation by the Cardinal-Vicar of Rome of the pamphlet "Il programma dei modernisti", and a decree of 29 October, 1907, declaring the excommunication of its authors, with special reservations. (9) The decree Motu Proprio of 18 November, 1907, on the validity of the decisions of the Biblical Commission, on the decree "Lamentabili", and on the Encyclical "Pascendi". These two documents are again confirmed and upheld by ecclesiastical penalties. (10) The address at the Consistory of 16 Dec., 1907. (11) The decree of the Holy Office of 13 Feb., 1908, in condemnation of the two newspapers "Sonrisa sacra" and "L'Illustrazione Cattolica". Since then several condemnations of the books have appeared. (12) The Encyclical "Pascendi" of 26 May, 1910, renewed the previous condemnations. (13) Still stronger is the tone of the Motu Proprio "Sacrorum
Antistitum", of 1 September, 1910, declared (14) by a decree of the Consistorial Congregations of 25 September, 1910, to investigate the modernist obstinacy and specious cunning. After having quoted the practical measures prescribed in the Encyclical, the Pope urges their execution, and, at the same time, makes new directions concerning the formation of the clergy in the seminaries and religious houses. Candidates for higher orders who refuse the profession of faith as priests, canons, the benefited clergy, the bishop's staff, Slovene preachers, the officials of the Roman congregations, or tribunals, superiors and professors in religious congregations, all are obliged to swear according to a formula which reproaches the principal modernist tenets. (15) The pope's letter to Prof. Decurtins on literary modernism. (All these documents are contained in Vermeersch, op. cit. infra.)

These acts are for the most part of a disciplinary character (the Motu Proprio of September, 1910, is clearly of the same nature); the decree "Lamentabili" is entirely doctrinal; the Encyclical "Pascendi" and the Motu Proprio of 18 March, 1907, are both doctrinal and disciplinary in character. The Church does not agree as to the authority of the two principal documents; the decree "Lamentabili" and the Encyclical "Pascendi". In the present writer's opinion, since the new confirmation accorded to these decrees by the Motu Proprio, they contain in their doctrinal conclusions the infallible teaching of the Vicar of Christ. But there is not a more modern opinion of Choupin in "Etudes" (Paris, CXIV, p. 119-120.)

The decree "Lamentabili" has been called the new Syllabus, because it contains the proscription by the Holy Office of 65 propositions, which may be grouped under the following heads: Prop. 1-8, errors concerning the teaching of the Church; Prop. 9-19, errors concerning the inspiration, truth, and study of Holy Writ, especially the Gospels; Prop. 20-36, errors concerning revelation and dogma; Prop. 27-28, Christological errors; Prop. 39-51, errors relative to the sacraments; Prop. 52-57, errors concerning the institution and organization of the Church; Prop. 58-65, errors on doctrinal evolution. The errors are neither less in number nor more grave, but the gravity of the danger, pointed out the necessity of firm and decisive action, and approved of the title "Modernism" for the new errors. It gives us first a very methodical exposition of modernism; next it follows its general condemnation with a word as to corollaries that may be drawn from the heresy. The Church then goes on to point out the effects of modernism, and finally seeks the necessary remedies. Their application he endeavours to put into practice by a series of energetic measures. An urgent appeal to the bishops fittingly closes this striking document.

MODIGLIANA
MODIGLIANA
MODIGLIANA
MODRA

Cappelletti, La Chiesa d'Italia, XVII (Venice, 1837).

U. Benigni.

Modra, a titular see of Bithynia Secunda, suffragan of Nicea. The city of Modra figures only in Strabo (XII, 543), who places it in Phrygia Epicetica, at the sources of the Gallus. It was probably situated at or near Aine Gueul, in the vilayet of Brousse. The region is called Medrena by Theophanes the Chronographer and Constantine Porphyrogennitus (De mat. vi). Several "Notitia episcopatum" mention the See of Medrena, or Mela. The name of this second place is also written Melina, and was called for a time Justinianopolis Nova in honour of Justinian. As from the twelfth century we find only Melagna, Melangeis, or Melanias, it is evident that the earlier Mela is the Malagina often mentioned by Byzantine historians as the first large station of the imperial armies in Asia Minor on the road from Constantinople to Doryleum, and an important strategic point. This city must have been located between Lefke and Vezirkhan, two railway stations on the Constantinople-Bagdad line. The bishops recorded are: Macedonius of Justinianopolis Nova, present at the Council of Chalcis (552); Theodore of Justinianopolis Nova or Mela, present at Constantinople (860); Necarius, or Nicetas of Mela, present at Nicea (787); Constantius of Mela, present at Constantinople (869); Paul of Mela, present at Constantinople (879); John of Malagina (1252); Constantine of Melangeis (thirteenth century); N. of Melanizia (1401).

Modruss. See Zeng, Diocese of.

Moeller, Henry. See Cincinnati, Archdiocese of.

Mohammedan Confraternities.—The countries where Mohammedanism prevails are full of religious associations, more or less wrapped in seccrety, which are also political, and which may prove troublesome at some future time. The oldest of them, the Kadiyra, dates from the twelfth century of our era, having been called into existence by the necessity of united counsels in order to make head against the Crusades. To the operations of its founder the Persian Sidi-abd-el-Kader-el-Djiliani, who died at Bagdad in 1166. His disciples speak of him as "The Sultan of the Saints". One of the more recent association, and a very aggressive one, is that of the Senoussiya, founded by an Algerian, Sheikh Senoussi (d. 1859). In contrast to the exclusive spirit of the other, this one has admitted hares to all of them, allowing them to keep their own names, doctrines, usages, and privileges. The prevailing principle of this combination is hatred of Christians; it isolates them in anticipation of the uprising which, on the appointed day of the Lord, will drive them out of "the Land of Islam" (dar el Islam, as opposed to dar el harb, "Land of the Infidels"), or, literally, "Land of the Holy War"). Its motto is: "Turks and Christians, I will break them all with one blow!" Those affiliated to the confraternities are called khousans (brethren) in North Africa; derevishes (poor men) in Turkey and Central Asia; fakirs (beggars) in India; moudirs (disciples) in Egypt, Syria and Spain. Since the conquest of Algeria by the French (1830) the reaction has resulted in an immense development of confraternities in all Mohammedan countries. Except among the wealthy and sceptical of the great cities, very few Musulmans escape the infection of this movement, and M. Pommerol numbers the total membership at 170,000,000. Leaving aside the excellent administrative and financial organization of the confraternities, we will here discuss only their religious side.

As is well known, at the call of the muezzins every Mohammedan is bound to recite daily certain prayers at stated hours. The khousans are also bound to follow these prayers with others, peculiar to their association. Among the chief of these is a kind of litany, called dikh (repeated three times), for which a chaplet is used. Fundamentally, it is the same for all the orders, but with slight variations, by which the initiated are enabled to recognize each other easily. In general, it contains the Mohammedan symbol or Credo: "There is no God but the true God" (La shaka d'll Allah, literally "No god except God"), which is repeated, say it is a hundred times. Other phrases or invocations are added, such as "God sees me", "God pardon", part of a verse of the Koran, or names of the Divine attributes, as "O Living One", a hundred times, or simply the "Allah is the Movable House" (Him). When the recitation in chorus becomes accelerated, the syllables of La shaka d'll Allah are gradually reduced to la hou, la hou, la hou, or even hou, ha, hi, or hou-hou. The phrase La shaka, etc., must be repeated by the Kadiyra one hundred and sixty-five times after each of the five daily prayers; by the Kzarazya, five hundred times; for the Assous, the daily total of repetitions is thirteen hundred and six hundred; and various confraternities have mystical tendencies, and make it their object to attain, on certain days and during certain moments, a profound union with God. This union (ittid), which is described by the Persian and Hindu sufis of the ninth century, resembles the Nirvana of the Buddhists. It is the annihilation of the personality by the identification (da'w). What is more, Sidi-abd-el-Kader-el-Djiliani proclaimed that "happiness is in unconsciousness of existence". Sheikh Senoussi defined ecstasy as "the annihilation of a man's individuality in the Divine Essence", and Abd-el-Kerim summed it up in two words, "unconsciousness and insensibility". Such teaching cannot shock Musulmans, for they venerate madmen as saints and believe that God dwells in empty brains, which explains why they allow demented persons a liberty which, to us, seems excessive. Sometimes the initiated person endeavours to obtain union with the founder of his order, whom he regards as a superior embodiment of the Godhead and His all-powerful intermediary. As to the method of arriving at this pseudo-ecstatic union: Sufism, which preceded the confraternities, and from which many of them are derived, was content to teach the moral method of renunciation-detachment carried as far as possible. This was the absence of primitive Sufism, which was simply a "way" (tariqah), a method of salvation, not a dogmatic system or an organization. The confraternities added special exercises, and in this lies the great difference from Christian mysticism. The latter confesses the impossibility of attaining a true mystical state by one's own efforts; God must produce it, and then it comes unexpectedly, whether during prayer or in the midst of some indifferent occupation. The Mussulman thinks otherwise: there is a physical process which consists in the manner of reciting the dikh in common and which takes effect especially on Sunday, the weekly holy day of Islam. There are various prescriptions as to how the breath should be blown, and its rapidity, and its reduplication. Among the most important details is the exhausting bodily exercise which is enjoined to produce a kind of vertigo or hysterical intoxication, followed either by convulsions or by extreme weakness. Thus, among the Kadiyra, says Le Chatelier, "the khousans give themselves up to a rapid and gradually accelerated swaying of the
upper part of the body which superinduces congestion of the cerebro-spinal system. Under the double influence of this purely physical cause and the concentration of all the intellectual faculties upon the same idea, that of the majesty of God, the phenomena of religious hysteria are produced in many of the adepts. . . . They are much in evidence in the convents of the order” (p. 29). The founder had prescribed that the faithful should continue their repetition to "ka, turning the head to the right, hou, turning it to the left, hi, bowing it, and prolonging each sound as much as the breath permits. It is easy to imagine the effect that may be produced on the most soundly constituted temperament by the repetition of these syllables accompanied with violent movements of the head” (p. 33). At the present time the Zaheiriya go through the same movements with the formula, La ilaha ill Allah, spoken in one breath, and sometimes as often as twenty-one times without a respiration. The Sarehouriyya, founded in the thirteenth century, repeat an indefinite number of times without interruption the phrase La ilaha, etc., while raising the head from the nave to the right shoulder, and thus they fall into a dumb state of unconsciousness. The Zaheiriya add the left shoulder. The Nakechabendiyia sometimes help the process with opium and similar drugs. Among the Beoumiyya the body is bent, at each invocation, down to the waist, while the arms are extended; they are uncrossed while the body is raised again, and then the hands are clapped together at the level of the face.

Some confraternities deserve special mention for the intense nervous paroxysms attained by their members. First, among the Khelouatiyya, founded in the fourteenth century, the members from time to time change their "place" (whence the name from kheloua, retreat); thus separated from the world, the disciple can communicate with others only by signs or in writing; he fasts from sunrise to sunset, and takes only such nourishment as is strictly necessary. By the use of coffee, he reduces his sleep to two or three hours. He recites certain sacred words, such as Haou (Him), Vaygoums (Immutable), Haqq (Truth), which have to be repeated from 10,000 to 30,000 times a day, according to the directions of the initiator. “The upper eyelid is briskly pressed down on the lower, to produce a distillation in the organ of sight which acts on the optic nerve and, through it, on the cerebral system. . . .” The word Vaygoums is repeated, and then the disciple kisses and kisses the head, with closed eyes. The rapidity of repetition cannot exceed once in every second, and the duration of such a prayer is from five to six hours. Supposing that the candidate is given three names to repeat in this way, it must take him eighteen hours a day. . . . The system of the order compare the Khleutins’ initiation to a deadly poison when taken in too large doses at first, and which can be assimilated by progressive use. . . . All the members who make frequent retreats, even if the duration is not prolonged, are seriously affected in mind. Emaciated, haggard-eyed, they return to ordinary life still retaining the traces of their harash trials. . . . An extreme exaltation, then, is the characteristic of this order, and it, more than any other, must be regarded as the focus of an intense fanaticism” (ibid., 62 sqq.).

Another very remarkable confraternity is that of the Aisseens, founded in the fifteenth century by Sidi-Mohammed-ben-Abessa. The dikr takes the shape of raucous cries, “to the cadence of a muffled music in the wind, the creaking of the knees, the rubbing of the hips, increasing in rapidity, accompany each of these cries, or circular movements of the head, which are also calculated to shake the nervous system. The nervous crises thus superinduced are soon expressed in cerebral intoxication and anæsthesia variously localised in different subjects. As these phenomena are successively recognized by the practised eye of the presiding sheikh, the khouans, at a given signal, pierce their hands, arms, and cheeks with darts. Others slash their throats or bellies with sabres. Some crunch pieces of glass between their teeth, eat venomous creatures, or chew cactus leaves bristling with thorns. All, one after another, fall exhausted, into a torpor which a touch from the mogaddem (presiding initiator) transforms, in certain cases, into hypnosis” (ibid., 101).

In another confraternity, that of the Refaya, founded in the twelfth century by Refal, a nephew of Sidi-abd-el-Kader, most of the devotees faint when the hysterical intoxication supervenes; others “eat serpents and live coals, or roll themselves about among burning brasiers. They accustom themselves moreover, to casting themselves down on the points of darts, to piercing their arms and cheeks, and to being trodden under foot by their sheikh” (ibid., 204, 206). The howling and the whirling dervishes, who give public exhibitions at Constantinople and at Cairo, belong to the Refaya. Their ceremony begins with shouting accompanied by oscillations and leaps keeping time to the beating of drums. “Forming a chain”, writes Théophile Gautier, “they produce, from deep down in their chests, a hoarse and prolonged howling: Allah hou! which seems to have nothing of the human voice in it. The whole band, acting under a single impulse, springs forward simultaneously, uttering a hoarse, muffled sound, like the growling of an angry menagerie, when the lions, tigers, panthers, and hyenas think that their feeding-time is being delayed. Then, by degrees, the inspiration comes, their eyes shine like those of wild beasts in the depths of a cave; an epileptic froth comes at the corners of their mouths; their faces become distorted and livid, shining through the sweat; the whole line lies down on the invisible breath, like blades of wheat under a storm, and still, with every movement, that terrible Allah-hou is repeated with increasing energy. How can such bellows be kept up for more than an hour without bursting the osseous frame of the breast and spilling the blood out of the broken vessels?” (Constantinople, xi). The whirling dervishes, founded in the thirteenth century, are Maoulaniya, also called Mevlevis. “They walkt with arms extended, head inclined on the shoulder, eyes half-closed, mouth half-opened, like confident swimmers who are letting themselves be borne away on the stream of ecstasy. . . . Sometimes the head is thrown back, showing the whites of their eyes and lips flecked with a light foam” (Constantinople, xi). At last they fall on their knees, exhausted, face to the earth, until the chief touches them, sometimes having to rub their arms and legs. No beholder, without previous information, would suspect the religious significance of these physical exercises of the
Mohammed and Mohammedanism. — I. The Founder. — Mohammed, "the Praised One", the prophet of Islam and the founder of Mohammedanism, was born at Mecca (20 August?) A. D. 570. Arabia was then torn by warring factions. The tribe of Fihr, or Quraish, to which Mohammed belonged, had established itself in the south of Hijaz (Hedjaz), near Mecca, which was, even then, the principal religious and commercial centre of Arabia. The power of the tribe was continually increasing; they had become the masters and the acknowledged guardians of the sacred Kaaba, within the town of Mecca—then visited in annual pilgrimage by the heathen and by the heathenish and pagan nations and tribulations—and had thereby gained such preeminence that it was comparatively easy for Mohammed to inaugurate his religious reform and his political campaign, which ended with the conquest of all Arabia and the fusion of the numerous Arab tribes into one nation, with one religion, one code, and one state. (ARABIA, CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.) Mohammed’s father was Abdallah, of the family of Hashim, who died soon after his son’s birth. At the age of six the boy lost his mother and was thereafter taken care of by his uncle Abu-Talib. He spent his early life as a shepherd and an attendant of caravans, and at the age of twenty-five married a rich widow, Khadeejah, fifteen years his senior. She bore him six children, all of whom died very young except Fatima, his beloved daughter.

On his commercial journeys to Syria and Palestine he became acquainted with Jews and Christians, and acquired an imperfect knowledge of their religion and traditions. He was a man of retiring disposition, addicted to study and fasting. He was subject to epileptic fits. In his fortieth year (A. D. 610), he claimed to have received a call from the Angel Gabriel, and thus began his active career as the prophet of Allah and the apostle of Arabia. His first converts were about forty in all, including his wife, his daughter, his father-in-law Abu Bakr, his adopted son Ali Omar, and his slave Zayd. By the power and guidance of God, Mohammed conquered the heathenism, Mohammed provoked persecution which drove him from Mecca to Medina in 622, the year of the Hijra (Flight) and the beginning of the Mohammedan Era. At Medina he was recognized as the prophet of God, and his followers increased. He took the field against his enemies, conquered several Arab tribes, and it would seem that it would end in complete triumph in 630, demolished the idols of the Kaaba, became master of Arabia, and finally united all the tribes under one emblem and one religion. In 632 he made his last pilgrimage to Mecca at the head of forty thousand followers, and soon after his return died of a violent fever in the sixty-third year of his age, the eleventh of the Hijra, and the year 633 of the Christian era.

The sources of Mohammed’s biography are numerous, but on the whole untrustworthy, being crowded with fictitious details, legends, and stories. None of his biographies was compiled during his lifetime, and the earliest were written a century and a half after his death. The Koran is perhaps the only reliable source for the leading events in his career. His earliest and chief biographers are Ibn Ishaq (a. h. 151—A. D. 768), Wakidi (207—822), Ibn Hisham (213—828), Ibn Sa’d (230—845), Tirmidhi (279—892), Tabari (310—929), the “Lives of the Companions of Mohammed”, the numerous Islamic commentators, especially Tabari, quoted above; Zamakhshari (633—1144), the “Muqaddam”, or collection of traditions of Ahmad ibn Hanbal (241—855), the collections of Bukhari (256—870), the “Isbah”, or “Dictionary of Persons who knew Mohammed”, by Ibn Hajar, etc. All these collections and biographies are based on the so-called Hadiths, or “traditions”, the historical value of which is widely disputed. These traditions, in fact, represent a gradual, and more or less artificial, legendary development, rather than supplementary historical information. According to them, Mohammed was simple in his habits, but most careful of his personal appearance. He loved perfumes and hated strong drink. Of a highly nervous temperament, he shrank from bodily pain. Though gifted with great powers of imagination, he was taciturn. He was affectionate and magnanimous, pious and austere in the practice of his religion, brave, zealous, and above reproach in his personal and family conduct. Palgrave, however, wisely remarks that the ideals of Arab virtue were first conceived and then attributed to the Prophet. Not only was Mohammed not allowed for exaggeration, Mohammed is shown by his life and deeds to have been a man of dauntless courage, great generalship, strong patriotism, merciful by nature, and quick to forgive. And yet he was ruthless in his dealings with the Jews, when once he had ceased to hope for their submission. He approved of assassinations, and, however barbarous or treacherous the means, the end justified it in his eyes; and in more than one case he not only approved, but also instigated the crime.

Concerning his moral character and sincerity contradictory opinions have been expressed by scholars in the last three centuries. Many of these opinions are biased either by an extreme hatred of Islam and its founder or by an exaggerated admiration, coupled with a hatred of Christianity. Luther looked upon him as “a devil and first-born child of Satan”. Maracci held that Mohammed and Mohammedanism were not very dissimilar to Luther and Protestantism. Spanheim and D’Herbelot characterize him as a “maddened imbecile”. Far more justice and understanding, indeed, seems to be done him by Prideaux stamps him as a wilful deceiver. Such indiscriminate abuse is unsupported by facts. Modern scholars, such as Sprenger, Noldeke, Weil, Muir, Kelle, Grimme, Margoliouth, give us a more correct and unbiased estimate of Mohammed’s life and character, and substantially agree as to his motives, prophetic mission, personal qualifications, and sincerity. The various estimates of several recent critics have been ably collected and summarized by Zwemer, in his “Islam, A Challenge to Faith!” (New York, 1907). According to Sir William Muir, Marcus Dods, and some others, Mohammed was at first sincere, but later, carried away by success, he practised deception wherever it served his purposes. It was not until about the first period of Mohammed’s life in Khadija, his first wife, after whose death he became a prey to his evil passions. Sprenger attributes the alleged revelations to epileptic fits, or to “a paroxysm of cataleptic insanity”. Zwemer himself goes on to criticize the life of Mohammed by the standards, first, of the Old and New Testament, both of which he regarded as Divine revelation; second, by the pagan morality of his Arabian compatriots; lastly, by the new law of which he pretended to be the “divinely appointed medium and custodian”. According to this author, the prophet was false even to the ethical traditions of the idolatrous brigands among whom he lived, and grossly violated the easy sexual morality of
his own system. After this, it is hardly necessary to say that, in Zwemer's opinion, Mohammed fell very far short of the most elementary requirements of Scriptural morality. Quoting Johnstone, Zwemer concludes by remarking that the judgments of these modern scholars, however harsh, rests on evidence which "comes all from the lips and the pens of his own devoted adherents. . . . And the followers of the prophet can scarcely complain if, even on such evidence, the verdict of history goes against him".

II. THE SYSTEM.—A. Geographical Extent, Divisions, and Distribution of Mohammedianism. After Mohammed's death Mohammedianism aspired to become a world power and a universal religion. The weakness of the Byzantine Empire, the unfortunate rivalry between the Greek and Latin Churches, the schisms of Nestorius and Eutyches, the failing power of the Sassanian dynasty of Persia, the lax moral code of the new religion, the power of the sword and of fanaticism, the hope of plunder and the love of conquest—all these factors combined with the genius of the caliphs, the successors of Mohammed, to effect the conquest, in considerably less than a century, of Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia, Egypt, North Africa, and the South of Spain. The Moslems crossed the Pyrenees and threatened to stable their horses in St. Peter's at Rome, but were at last defeated by Charles Martel at Tours, in 732, just one hundred years from the death of Mohammed. This defeat arrested their western conquests and saved Europe. In the eighth and ninth centuries they conquered Persia, Afghanistan, and a large part of India, and in the twelfth century they had already become the absolute masters of all Western Asia, Spain and North Africa, Sicily, etc. They were finally conquered by the Mongols and Turks, in the thirteenth century, but the new conquerors adopted Mohammed's religion and, in the fifteenth century, overthrew the tottering Byzantine Empire (1453). From that stronghold (Constantinople) they even threatened the German Empire, but were successfully defeated at the gates of Vienna, and driven back across the Danube, in 1683.

Mohammedianism now comprises various theological schools and political factions. The Orthodox (Sunni) uphold the legitimacy of the succession of the first three caliphs, Abu Bakr, Umar, and Ali, while the Schismatics (Shia) champion the Divine right of Ali as against the succession of these caliphs whom they call "usurers", and whose names, tombs, and memorials they insult and detest. The Shia number at present about twelve million adherents, or about one-twentieth of the whole Mohammedan world, and are subdivided into three divisions, called Ihwalis, Ismaelites, and Yazidites. The Sunnis are subdivided into four principal theological schools, or sects, viz., the Hanifites, found mostly in Turkey, Central Asia, and Northern India; the Shafiites in Southern India and Egypt; the Malikites, in Morocco, Barbary, and parts of Arabia; and the Hanbalites in Central and Eastern Arabia and in some parts of India. The Shiites are at present the most numerous of the two sects, as the name implies, but less important. Of the proverbial seventy-three sects of Islam, thirty-two are assigned to the Shia. The principal differences between the two are: (1) as to the legitimate successors of Mohammed; (2) the Shia observe the ceremonies of the month of fasting, Mahurram, in commemoration of Ali, Hasan, Husain, and Bibi Fatimah, whilst the Sunnites only regard the tenth day of that month as sacred, and as being the day on which God created Adam and Eve; (3) the Shia permit temporary marriages, contracted for a certain sum of money, whilst the Sunnites maintain that Mohammed forbade them; (4) the Shiites include the Fire-Worshippers among the infidels; (5) the Shiites do not recognize, as the Sunnites do, knowledge on Jews, Christians, and Moelms as such; (5) several minor differences in the ceremonies of prayer and ablution; (6) the Shia admit a principle of religious compromise in order to escape persecution and death, whilst the Sunni regard this as apostasy.

There are also minor sects, the principal of which are the Alites, or Fatimites, the Asarautes, Babakites, Babys, Idrisites, Ismaelians and Assassins, Jabrians, Kaisanates, Karthamians, Kharijites, followers of the Mahdi, Mut'azilites, Qadrians, Safrians, Sufians, Sufis, Wahabists, and Zaideites. The distinctive features of these various sects are political as well as religious; only three or four of them now possess any influence. In spite of these divisions, however, the principal articles of faith and morality, and the ritual, are substantially uniform.

According to the latest and most reliable accounts (1907), the number of Mohammedans in the world is about 233 millions, although some estimate the number as high as 300 millions, others, again, as low as 175 millions. Nearly 60 millions are in Africa, 170 millions in Asia, and about 5 millions in Europe. Their total number amounts to about one-fourth of the population of Asia, and one-seventh of that of the whole world. Their geographical distribution is as follows:

Asia.—India, 62 millions; other British possessions (such as Aden, Bahrein, Ceylon, and Cyprus), about one million and a half; Russia (Asiatic and European), the Caucasus, Russian Turkestan, and the Amur region, about 15 millions; Philippine Islands, 350,000; Dutch East Indies (including Java, Sumatra, Borneo, Celebes, etc.) about 30 millions; French possessions in Asia (Pondicherry, Annam, Cambodia, Cochinchina, Tonking, Laos), about one million and a half; Bokhara, 1,200,000; Khiva, 800,000; Persia, 8,800,000; Afghanistan, 4,000,000; China and Chinese Turkestan, 30,000,000; Japan and Formosa, 30,000; Korea, 10,000; Siam, 1,000,000; Asia Minor, 7,179,000; Armenia and Kurdistan, 1,795,000; Mesopotamia, 1,200,000; Syria, 1,100,000; Arabia, 4,500,000.

Total, 170,000,000

Africa.—Egypt, 9,000,000; Tripoli, 1,250,000; Tunisia, 8,700,000; Algeria, 4,100,000; Morocco, 5,000,000; Eritrea, 150,000; Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1,000,000; Senegambia-Niger, 18,000,000; Abyssinia, 350,000; Kamerun, 2,000,000; Nigeria, 6,000,000;
Dahomey, 350,000; Ivory Coast, 800,000; Liberia, 600,000; Sierra Leone, 333,000; French Guinea, 1,500,000; French, British, and Italian Somaliland, British East African Protectorate, Uganda, Togoland, Gambia and Senegal, about 2,000,000; Zanzibar, German East Africa, Portuguese East Africa, Rhodesia, Congo Free State, and French Congo, about 4,000,000; South Africa and adjacent islands, about 235,000. Approximate total, 60,000,000.

Europe.—Turkey in Europe, 2,100,000; Greece, Servia, Rumania, and Bulgaria, about 1,389,000.

Total, about 3,500,000.

North America and Australia, about 70,000.

About 7,000,000 (i.e., four-fifths) of the Persian Mohammedans and about 5,000,000 of the Indian Mohammedans are Shi'ahs; the rest of the Mohammedan world — about 221,000,000 — are almost all Sunnites.

B. Tenets.—The principal tenets of Mohammedanism are laid down in the Koran (q. v.). As aids in interpreting the religious system of the Koran we have: first, the so-called "Traditions", which are supposed to contain supplementary teachings and doctrine of Mohammed, a very considerable part of which, however, is decidedly spurious; second, the consensus of the doctors of Islam represented by the madrasas, the familiars of the Arabic, Islamic sects, the Koranic commentators and the masters of Mohammedan jurisprudence; third, the analogy, or deduction, from recognized principles admitted in the Koran and in the Traditions. Mohammed's religion, known among its adherents as Islam, contains practically nothing original; it is a confused combination of native Arabian heathenism, Judaism, Christianity, Sabism (Mandaism), Mani- nism, and Zoroastrianism.

The system may be divided into two parts: dogma, or theory; and morals, or practice. The whole fabric is built on five fundamental points, one belonging to faith, or theology, and the other four to morals, or practice. All Mohammedan dogma is supposed to be expressed in the one formula: "There is no God but the true God; and Mohammed is his prophet." But this one confession implies for Mohammedans six distinct articles: (a) belief in the unity of God; (b) in his angels; (c) in his Scripture; (d) in his prophet; (e) in the Day of Judgment; and (f) in God's absolute and irrevocable decree and predetermination both of good and of evil. The four points relating to morals, or practice, are: (a) prayer, ablutions, and purifications; (b) alms; (c) fasting; and (d) pilgrimage to Mecca. (1) Dogma.—The doctrines of Islam concerning God—his unity and Divine attributes—are essentially those of the Bible; but to the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Divine Sonship of Christ Mohammed had the strongest antipathy. As Noldeke remarks, Mohammed's acquaintance with those two dogmas was superficial; even the clauses of the Creed that referred to them were not properly known to him. He felt it his duty to bring them into harmony with the simple Semitic Monotheism; probably, too, it was this consideration alone that hindered him from embracing Christianity (Sketches from Eastern History, 62). The number of prophets sent by God is said to have been about 124,000, and of apostles, 315. Of the former, 22 are mentioned by name in the Koran—such as Adam, Noe, Abraham, Moses, Jesus. According to the Sunni, the Prophets and Apostles were sinless and superior to the angels, and they had the power of performing miracles. Mohammedan angelology and demonology are almost wholly based on later Jewish and early Christian traditions. The angels are divided into four classes. They are free from food or drink; there is no distinction of sex among them. They are, as a rule, invisible, save to animals, although, at times, they appear in human form. The principal angels are: Gabriel, the guardian and communicator of God's revelation to man; Michael, the guardian of men; Azrael, the angel of death, whose duty is to receive men's souls when they die; and Jibril, the angel of the East. Of the seraphim to these there are the Seraphim, who surround the throne of God, constantly chanting His praises; the Archangels, who record the actions of men; the Observers, who spy on every word and deed of mankind; the Travellers, whose duty it is to traverse the whole earth in order to know whether, and when, men utter the name of God; the Angels of the Seven Planets; the Angels who have charge of hell; and a countless multitude of heavenly beings who fill all space. The chief devil is Iblis, who, like his numerous companions, was once the nearest to God, but was cast out for refusing to pay homage to Adam at the command of God. These devils are harmful both to the souls and to the bodies of men, although their evil influence is constantly checked by Divine interference. Besides angels and devils, there are also jinns, or genii, creatures of fire, able to eat, drink, propagate, and die; some good, others bad, but all capable of future salvation and damnation.

God rewards good and punishes evil deeds. He is merciful and pitiful and is propitiated by repentance. The punishment of the impenitent wicked will be fearful, and the reward of the faithful great. All men will have to rise from the dead and submit to the universal judgment. The Day of Resurrection and of Judgment will be preceded and accompanied by seventeen fearful, or greater, signs in heaven and on earth, and eight lesser ones, some of which are identical with those mentioned in the New Testament. The Resurrection will be general and extend to all creatures—angels, jinns, men, and brutes. The torments of hell and the pleasures of Paradise, but especially the latter, are proverbially great and sensuous. Hell is divided into seven regions: Jahannam, reserved for faithless Mohammedans; Laza, for the Jews; Al-Hutama, for the Christians; Al-Saair, for the Sabians; Al-Saqar, for the Magians; Al-Jahm, for idolaters; Al-Hawiyat, for hypocrites. As to the torments of hell, it is believed that the damned will dwell amid pestilential winds and in scalding water, and that in the Resurrection the scorching heat of boiling water will be forced down their throats. They will be dragged by the scalp, flung into the fire, wrapped in garments of flame, and beaten with iron maces. When their skins are well burned, other skins will be given them for their greater torture. While the damnation of all infidels will be hopeless and eternal, the Moslems, who, through holding the true religion, have been guilty of heinous sins, will be delivered from hell after expiating their crimes.

The joys and glories of Paradise are as fantastic and sensual as the lascivious Arabian mind could possibly imagine. "As plenty of water is one of the greatest of the desires of the Arabian mind, so water is one of the most important elements of Paradise." The Koran often speaks of the rivers of Paradise as a principal ornament thereof; some of these streams flow with water, some with milk, some with wine and others with honey, besides many other lesser springs and fountains, whose pebbles are rubies and emeralds, while their earth consists of camphor, their beds of musk, and their sides of saffron. But all these glories will be eclipsed by the resplendent and ravishing girls, or hours, of Paradise, the enjoyment of whose company will be the principal felicity of the faithful. These maidens are created not of clay, as in the case of mortal women, but of pure musk, and free from all natural impurities, and with fair complexions, and free from any blemish, and modest and secluded from public view in pavilions of hollow pearls. The pleasures of Paradise will
be so overwhelming that God will give to everyone the potentialities of a hundred individuals. To each individual a large mansion will be assigned, and the very meanest will have at his disposal at least 80,000 servants and seven thousand of the girls of Paradise. While eating, they will be waited on by 800 attendants, the food being served in dishes of gold, whereof 300 shall be set before him at once, containing each a different kind of food, and an inexhaustible supply of wine and liquors. The magnificence of the garments and gems is conformable to the delicacy of their diet. For the bridegroom shall be clothed in the richest silks and brocades, and adorned with bracelets of gold and silver, and crowns set with pearls, and will make use of silken carpets, couches, pillows, etc., and in order that they may enjoy all these pleasures, God will grant them perpetual youth, beauty, and vigour. Music and singing will also be ravishing and everlasting” (Wollaston, “Muhammad, His Life and Doctrines”). The Mohammedan doctrine of predestination is equivalent to fatalism. They believe in God’s absolute decree and predetermination both of good and of evil; viz., whatever has been or shall be in the world, whether good or bad, proceeds entirely from the will of God, and that we are the mere agents or the pawns designed by Him from all eternity. The possession and the exercise of our own free will is, accordingly, futile and useless. The absurdity of this doctrine was felt by later Mohammedan theologians, who sought in vain by various subtle distinctions to minimize it.

(2) Practice.—The five pillars of the practical and of the religious duties of the Mohammedan are: the recital of the Creed and prayers, fasting, almsgiving, and the pilgrimage to Mecca. The formula of the Creed has been given above, and its recital is necessary for salvation. The daily prayers are five in number: before sunrise, at midday, at four in the afternoon, at sunset, and shortly before midnight. The forms of prayer and the prayers themselves are very minute and very limited Koranic liturgy. All prayers must be made looking towards Mecca, and must be preceded by washing, neglect of which renders the prayers of no effect. Public prayer is made on Friday in the mosque, and is led by an imam. Only men attend the public prayers, as women seldom pray even at home. Several collections of Hadith have commended. Fasting is commended at all seasons, but prescribed only in the month of Ramadan. It begins at sunrise and ends at sunset, and is very rigorous, especially when the fasting season falls in summer. At the end of Ramadan comes the great feast-day, generally called Bajram, or Fitr, i.e., “Breaking of the Fast.” The other great festival is that of Asha, borrowed with modifications from the Jewish Day of Atonement. Almsgiving is highly commended: on the feast-day after Ramadan it is obligatory, and is to be directed to the “faithful” (Mohammedans) only. Pilgrimage to Mecca once in a lifetime is recommended in case of sufficient means and bodily strength; the merit of it cannot be obtained by deputy, and the ceremonies are strictly similar to those performed by the Prophet himself (see Mecca). Pilgrimages to the tombs of saints are very common nowadays, especially in Persia and India, although they were absolutely forbidden by Mohammed.

(2) Morals.—It is hardly necessary here to emphasize the fact that the ethics of Islam are far inferior to those of Judaism and even more inferior to those of the New Testament. Furthermore, we cannot agree with Nöldeke when he maintains that, although in many respects the ethics of Islam are not to be compared even with such a Christian nation as Persia, it is really good in Mohammedan ethics is either commonplace or borrowed from some other religion, whereas what is characteristic is nearly always imperfect or wicked.

The principal sins forbidden by Mohammed are idolatry and apostasy, adultery, false witness against a brother Moslem, games of chance, the drinking of wine or other intoxicants, usurp, and divination by arrows. Brotherly love is confined in Islam to Mohammedans. Any form of idolatry or apostasy is severely punished in Islam, but the violation of any of the other ordinances is generally allowed to go unpunished, unless it seriously conflicts with the social order of the Moslem State. Some of the other prohibitions mention must be made of the eating of blood, of swine’s flesh, of whatever dies of itself, or is slain in honour of any idol, or is strangled, or killed by a blow, or a fall, or by another beast. In case of dire necessity, however, these restrictions may be dispensed with. Infanticide, extensively practiced by the pre-Islamic Arabs, is strictly forbidden by Mohammed, as is also the sacrificing of children to idols in fulfillment of vows, etc. The crime of infanticide commonly took the form of burying newborn females, lest the parents should be reduced to poverty by providing for them, or else that they might avoid the sorrow and disgrace which would follow, if their daughters should become captive virgins or become scandalous by their behaviour.

Religion and the State are not separated in Islam. Hence Mohammedan jurisprudence, civil and criminal, is mainly based on the Koran and on the “Traditions”. Thousands of judicial decisions are attributed to Mohammed and incorporated in the various collections of Hadith. The rules of the Koran are reverence and obedience to parents, and kindness to wives and slaves. Slander and backbiting are strongly denounced, although false evidence is allowed to hide a Moslem’s crime and to save his reputation or life. As regards marriage, polygamy, and divorce, the Koran explicitly (sura iv, v. 3) allows four lawful wives at a time, whom the husband may divorce on any slight occasion or the prompting of a whim, but this warning was not heeded either by Mohammed himself or by his followers. A divorced wife, in order to ascertain the paternity of a possible
or probable offspring, must wait three months before she marries again. A widow, on the other hand, must wait four months and ten days. Immorality in general is severely condemned and punished by the Koran, but the moral laxity and depraved sensualism of the Mohammedans at large have practically nullified Koranic ethics.

Slavery is not only tolerated in the Koran, but is looked upon as a practical necessity, while the manumission of slaves is regarded as a meritorious deed. It must be observed, however, that among Mohammedans, the children of slaves and of concubines are generally considered equally legitimate with those of legal wives, none being accounted bastards except such as are born of public prostitutes, and whose fathers are unknown. The accusation often brought against the Koran that it teaches that women have no souls is without foundation. The Koranic law concerning inheritance insists that women and orphans be treated with justice and kindness. Generally speaking, however, males are entitled to twice as much as females. Contracts are to be conscientiously drawn up in the presence of witnesses. Murder, manslaughter, and suicide are explicitly forbidden, although blood revenge is allowed. In case of personal injury, the law of retaliation is approved. Marriages should be made here to the sacred months, and to the weekly holy day. The Arabs had a year of twelve lunar months, and this, as often as seemed necessary, they brought roughly into accordance with the solar year by the intercalation of a thirteenth month. The Mohammedan year, however, has a mean duration of 364 days, and is ten or eleven days longer than the solar year. Many Mohammedan festivals, accordingly, move in succession through all the seasons. The Mohammedan Era begins with the Hegira, which is assumed to have taken place on the 16th day of July, A. D. 622. To find what year of the Christian Era (A. D.) is represented by a given year of the Mohammedan Era (A. H.), the rule is: Subtract from the Mohammedan date the product of three times the last completed number of centuries, and add 621 to the remainder. (This rule, however, gives an exact result only for the first day of a Mohammedan century. Thus, e. g., the first day of the fourteenth century came in the course of the year of Our Lord 883.) The first, seventh, eleventh and twelfth months of the Islamic year are sacred months; during these months it is not lawful to wage war. The twelfth month is consecrated to the annual pilgrimage to Mecca, and, in order to protect pilgrims, the preceding (eleventh) month and the following (first of the new year) are also inviolable. The seventh month is reserved for the fast which Mohammed substituted for a month (the ninth) devoted by the Arabs in pre-Islamic times to excessive eating and drinking. Mohammed selected Friday as the sacred day of the week, and several fanciful reasons are adduced by the Prophet himself and by his followers for the selection; the most probable motive was the desire to have a holy day different from that of the Jews and that of the Christians. It is certain, however, that it was a day of solemn gatherings and public festivities among the pre-Islamic Arabs. Abstinence from work is not enjoined on Friday, but it is commanded that public prayers and worship must be performed on that day. Another custom dating from antiquity and still universally observed by all Mohammedans, although not explicitly enjoined in the Koran, is circumcision. It is looked upon as a semi-religious practice, and its performance is preceded and accompanied by great festivities.

In matters political Islam is a system of despotism at home and of aggression abroad. The Prophet commanded absolute submission to the Imam. In recent times the sword was to be raised against him. The rights of non-Moslem subjects are of the vaguest and most limited kind, and a religious war is a sacred duty whenever there is a chance of success against the "Infidel". Medieval and modern Mohammedan, especially Turkish, persecutions of both Jews and Christians are perhaps the best illustration of this fa
dinational and religious spirit.
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GABRIEL OTUSIANI.

Mohileff, ARCHIDIOCESE OF (MOTYLOVIENSI), Latin Catholic archdiocese and ecclesiastical province in Russia. For the few Catholics in Russia before the partition of Poland, some mission stations sufficed. The number of Jesuits in Warsaw in 1846 was 27. The Jesuits laboured in Moscow from 1648, and in 1691 built the first Catholic church there. The free exercise of the Catholic religion, granted in 1706 by Peter the Great, was also allowed by his immediate successors, on condition that the missionaries did not attempt to secure converts. The Capuchins, Franciscans, and Dominicans also laboured among the immigrant Catholics with fruitful results. When the Jesuits were suppressed in 1773, many of them found a refuge in Russia. However, no special diocese for Catholics was erected. The partitions of Poland brought under Russian sway many hundred thousand Catholics, whose treatment in striking contrast to that meted out to the Uniates. While Uniate churches were confiscated and delivered to the Orthodox, and such Uniates as refused to join the Orthodox Church were subjected to flogging, imprisonment, and confiscation of property, policy and shrewdness led the empress to treat the Latin Church very differently. Wishing to catch it napping, she erected the Diocese of White Russia with Mohileff as its see (1772), and appointed as first bishop
Stamialaus Siestrzeniecze Bohus, Auxiliary Bishop of Vilna (1773). At first Pius VI refused to recognize this appointment, but after some action and her petition of the Uniat, but finally appointed the bishop vicar Apostolic of the new diocese. In 1782 Catharine arbitrarily raised the bishops to an archdiocese. After some negotiations, the pope recognized the new Archdiocese of Mohileff by the Bull “Unerosa pastoralis officii” of 15 April, 1783, which reserved to the pope the foundation of other dioceses in the territory of the archdiocese, extending from the Baltic to the Pacific Ocean. At the second partition of Poland (1793) five Latin sees fell to Russia, Kamenetz, Kiew, Livonia, Lutsk, and Vilna. Although Catharine had promised in the Treaty of Grodno (1795) to maintain the status quo as regards the Catholic Church, she arbitrarily founded 15 new dioceses, and transferred the sees of Samogitia and Lutsk to Vilna. Part of the property of the suppressed bishopric was confiscated by the State and the rest given to favourites of the empress.

Catharine’s son and successor, Paul I, began, directly after his accession, negotiations with Pius VI, with a view to organizing the Latin Church in Church. Four of the five suppressed sees (Kamenetz, Vilna, Lutsk, and Livonia, the last under the title of Samogitia) were restored, and the new Diocese of Minsk was founded to replace Kiew. Part of the confiscated property was restored to the Church. The four old dioceses, with the new Diocese of Minsk, were united in the Archdiocese of Mohileff, which became a proper ecclesiastical province. Pius VI confirmed this arrangement on 15 November, 1798, by the Bull “Maximis undique pressi”, which forms the substantial basis of the constitution of the Latin Church in Russia to-day. The Archdiocese of Mohileff did not escape the persecutions to which both the Latin and Uniate Churches were subjected almost exclusively, especially during the reigns of Nicholas I and Alexander II (see Russia).

In the hope of weakening the Catholic religion, which it hated and barely tolerated, the Government regularly selected aged or compliant men for Mohileff, leaving the pope no option but to confirm its choice. The first archbishop, Siestrzeniecze (b. 1730; d. 1 Dec., 1826), was one of its most able prelates. Sprung from a noble but impoverished family of Lithuanian Calvinists, Siestrzeniecze, after serving in the army, became acquainted with Bishop Massalki of Vilna, and through his influence entered the Catholic Church and became a priest. Massalki, who never recognized Siestrzeniecze’s lack of character, was himself accused of being a papist and was punished.

Ambitious, uninfluenced by motives of honour or conscientious scruples, and greedy for power, Siestrzeniecze’s sole aim was to curry favour with the secular authorities and thus secure despotic power over the Catholic Church in Russia. To limit as far as possible the power of his clergy, he persuaded Tsar Paul I to establish the “College of the Roman Catholic Church”, to decide, as final court of appeal, all important matters concerning the Catholic dioceses. Its decisions had to receive the approval of the ruling senate, and it was furthermore declared the duty of the clergy to submit unconditionally to the will of the emperor in all matters, secular or ecclesiastical. The presiding officer of the college was Siestrzeniecze, who established an absolute ecclesiastical despotism, appointing to the council only unworthy and subservient men. He granted unlawful divorces for money, induced Alexander I, Paul’s successor, to expel the nuncio (who had reported to Rome the archbishop’s unscrupulous conduct), and did not enter the feebler part of the clergy into the college, which was abolished in 1815, and from Russia in 1820.

Caspier Cieszkowski (b. 1745), Bishop of Lutsk, succeeded Siestrzeniecze (28 February, 1827; d. 16 April, 1831). His great age pre- vented him from doing much in face of the series of oppressive measures of Nicholas I, a fanatical adherent of the Orthodox Church. These measures, which included an attempt to reduce the Catholic Church to a condition of servitude, and if possible to exterminate it completely in Russia, were furthered by the practice of leaving the archdiocese vacant for long periods—e.g. after the death of Cieszkowski and of his successor, Ignaz Ludwig Pawlowski (1841–42; b. 1775).

An epoch-making event in the history of Mohileff was the appointment of Pope Gregory XVI to the tsar during his visit to Rome in 1845 led to a Concordat, ratified by Russia in 1848 and promulgated by Pius IX, in accordance with which the Diocese of Tiraspol, with Saratoff as its see, was founded for the Catholic colonists in Southern Russia and made a suffragan of Mohileff. In December, 1848, Casimir Dzierzbicki, who was consecrated 2 October, 1851, was appointed archbishop. He was succeeded by Ignaz Holowinski (1851–58) and Wenceslaus Zylinski (1856–63), a tool of the government. Persecution, suppression, and confiscation continued even after the Concordat, especially under Alexander II. The Diocese of Kamenetz was arbitrarily suppressed in 1866, and Minsk in 1879. Under Nicholas II free exercise of religion was granted in 1905, while the edicts of toleration of 17 April and 17 October, 1905, weakened in some measure the privileged position of the Orthodox Church. These alleviations have, however, been since whittled down by the arbitrary conduct of subordinate officials, acting in the most rapacious spirit.

The recent archbishops are: Antonius Fialkowski (1871–73); Alexander Casimir Dzierzbicki Gintowt (1883–92); Simon Martin Kozlow (1891–93); Boleslaw Hieronymus Klopotowski (1901–03); George Joseph Elesias a Slupoff Szembek (1903–05); Appendarius Wnukowski (1909), and Vincentius Kluzicki (appointed 5 June 1910).

II. STATISTICS.—The suffragans of Mohileff are: Samogitia, Lutsk-Zhitomir, Vilna, and Tiraspol. From 1866 Kamenetz has been administered by the Bishop of Lutsk, and from 1869 Minsk by the archbishop. The ecclesiastical province is the largest in the world, including three-fourths of European (the ecclesiastical province of Warsaw is excluded) and the whole of Asiatic Russia (5,450,400 sq. miles). According to the diocesan statistics for 1910 the archdiocese contains 28 deaneries, 245 parish churches, 399 priests, 1,023,347 Catholics. The administrators of thirty-four other parishes and chapels are immediately under the jurisdiction of the archbishop. Among them are the most influential of the Roman Catholic rectories of Tashkent (15,000), and in Siberia: Krasnoyarsk (13,000), Tomsk (10,000), Vladivostok (10,500), etc. The see of the archdiocese is St. Petersburg. The archbishop presides over the Roman Catholic Collegium, which regulates the relations between the respective dioceses and the Department of Public Worship, and administers the property of the Catholic Catholic Church in the Kingdom of Poland. The Metropolitan Curia consists of a secretary and four other members; the archdiocesan chapter of a provost, dean, archdeacon, and six canons; the General Consistory of an official (secular administrator for the bishop), vice-official, three assessors, visitor of monasteries, Defensor et matrimoniorum, and twelve lay members. The Roman Catholic ecclesiastical academy at St. Petersburg has a rector, spiritual director, sixteen clerical and seven secular professors, and 58 students. The seminary has 2 provisors, a rector, spiritual director, inspector, 14 clerical and 5 secular professors, 33 theological students, 59 philosophical, and 31 in the preparatory course. There are no statistics as to the monasteries of the Church, but the Roman Catholic monthly has been published at St. Petersburg.
Mohler, Johann Adam, theologian, b. at Igersheim (Würtemberg), 6 April, 1798; d. at Munich, 12 April, 1838. The gifted youth first studied in the gymnasium at Mergentheim, and then attended the lyceum at Ellwangen, where he applied himself primarily to philosophical studies. In 1815 he turned to the study of theology, and, after leaving the theological college at Ellwangen, went to Tübingen to continue his studies. For a time he was a student of the learned professors Drey and Hirscher. In 1818 he entered the seminary at Rottenburg on the Neckar, was ordained priest on 18 September, 1819, and was sent as curate in charge to Weilerstadt and then to Riedlingen. In 1821 he became Repetent (tutor) in the Wilhelmsstift at Tübingen, and for more than a year devoted himself almost exclusively to classical literature, particularly to earlier Greek history and philosophy. In this way he acquired the keenness and clearness of judgment, delicacy of diction, skill in exposition, and fine sense of the aesthetic which distinguish all his writings and discourses. Soon, the theological faculty at Tübingen offered him the head of the theological faculty (in 1825). His aim was to prepare for which he visited the leading German and Austrian universities, meeting there the best-known Catholic and Protestant theologians and pedagogues—Niemeyer, Gesenius, Planck, Schleiermacher, Marheinecke, and in particular Neander, who made a powerful impression on the young man. Thus equipped, he began his lectures, and soon published his first book under the title "Die Einheit in der Kirche oder das Prinzip des Katholizismus, dargestellt im Geiste der Kirchenväter der drei ersten Jahrhunderte" (Tübingen, 1825). It was hailed with enthusiasm, and gave brilliant evidence of the profound knowledge and the remarkable penetration of the young scholar. He was indeed a child of his time, and betrayed certain Febronian views and some sympathy with the pseudo-reformism of the day, which the Hermesians later cast up to him, and which he often regretted. His book, nevertheless, was not merely a highly intellectual, but also a highly moral act, and that for many readers, like Chateaubriand’s "Sévigné," formed the starting point of their religious work there breathe, as it were, a new spirit, "which seems to herald a rejuvenescence of the Church and of theological science." There is here no shallowness or special pleading; one hears the accents of fresh, living, full Christianity, such as the author’s profound study of the church Fathers had revealed to him. For him, the church’s unity is twofold in character: a unity of spirit and a unity of body. The former is, first, the mystical unity in the Holy Spirit, which binds all the faithful in one communion; then the mental unity of doctrine, i.e., the comprehensive expression of the Christian mind in opposition to the manifold forms of heresy, and finally unity in multiplicity, i.e., the preservation of individuality in the unity of all the faithful. The unity of the body of the Church reveals itself first in the bishop, in whom is visible the unity of the diocese; to this correspond the wider circles of the metropolitan system and the council of the entire episcopate, and finally the Roman primacy, whose gradual development Möhler illustrates in the history of Christian antiquity and of the Middle Ages. Immediately after the appearance of his book Möhler was offered a place in the University of Freiburg; he refused it, and as a result was appointed extraordinary professor at Tübingen in 1826. After he had, two years later, declined another offer from Breslau, he became at Tübingen ordinary professor in the theological faculty, which conferred on him the Doctorate of Theology. Not long before, he had published his second work: "Athenaeus der Große und die Kirche seiner Zeit im Kampfe mit dem Arianismus" (Mainz, 1827). It is a pleasing and lively portrait of the great bishop of Alexandria, the champion of orthodoxy amid the great ecclesiastical conflicts of the fourth century; for Möhler the hero of his time, with a character that contrasts favourably with the gloomy attitude of Arius and the vacillating weakness of Eusebius of Cesarea. About the same time (Tübingen theologische Quartalschrift, 1827–8) he depicted in a similar masterly way one of the great figures of the Middle Ages, St. Anselm of Canterbury, as monk, scholar, and defender of ecclesiastical liberty.

His study of ecclesiastical life in early and medieval times led naturally to an examination of the distinctive differences between Catholicism and Protestantism. The results of his investigation he published in "Betrachtungen über den Zustand der Kirche im fünfhundert und zu Anfang des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts" (Gesammelte Schriften, II, 1–34). He concludes that the Reformation, really necessary in the sixteenth century, did not take place in the right way, but took on rather the character of an entirely revolutionary movement, by which the tranquil development of the medieval Church, with all its good elements, was subordinated to ecclesiastical unity. In connexion with these investigations he began—as he had seen done in the North German universities and as his Protestant colleague at Tübingen, Professor Baur, had done—lectures on the antithesis between Protestantism and Catholicism, or, as is usually said, on symbolism. By this term are meant, in this connexion, the distinctive notes of a given ecclesiastical communion, also certain set formulae, legally consecrated, and in a general way expressive of Christian faith or of certain fundamental dogmatic ideas; or again, especially since the Reformation (or rather since the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries), the confessions of faith that constitute the form or rule of belief for the faithful of any religious denomination. In this way symbolism, being the science of creeds, is a theological science that compares one religious system with another on the basis of their creeds, and thus demonstrates the truth or falsity of a particular creed. While symbolism—or, as it is now usually called, comparative symbolism—has not long been recognized as having the same theoretical value as the church’s unity, there are traces of it even in earliest Christian times. The Reformation created the conditions amidst which it grew to maturity; and its first representative was probably the Protestant professor, Leonard Rechtenbach, in his "Encyclopädie symbolica" (Leipzig, 1612). It is true that, in his opinion, the office of symbolism is merely to make it clear, in connexion with one’s own symbolic books, without paying any attention to those of another denomination. The founder of scientific symbolism in its modern sense was the Göttinien professor Planck in his "Abriss einer historischen und vergleichenden Darstellung der dogmatischen Systeme unserer verschiedenen christlichen Hauptparteien" (Göttingen, 1790), the first edition of which contains an exhaustive comprehension of all Christian creeds in their distinctive characteristics. Marheinecke went farther in his "Christliche Symbolik oder historisch-kritische und dogmatische komparative Darstellung des katholischen, lutherischen, reformierten, und socinianischen Lehrbegriffes" (Heidelberg, 1819–19). Planck and Marheinecke have found important, who continue down to the most recent times to treat this from the Protestant standpoint. For Catholics such studies had naturally had less attraction. When a student at Tübingen, Möhler had heard lectures on symbolism, and had later met many Protestant theologians. He was the first Catholic writer to develop this idea, and became the
MÖHLER

Founder of this science among Catholics through his classical work, "Symbolik oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten nach ihrem offiziellen Lehrriscontrienschriften" (Mainz, 1832; 13th ed., 1904). He demonstrated that there could be no incompatibility between what was truly rational and what was truly Christian, both finding their sole, direct, and entirely adequate expression in Catholic dogma. He showed also how Catholic orthodoxy held the middle course between the extremes of Protestantism, e.g., between a supernaturalism and Pietism that denied the rights of reason, and a naturalism and rationalism that rejected absolutely the supernatural. With great clearness he exhibited the contradiction between Catholic and Protestant principles; for instance, in the doctrine of Christian divinity held by the latter as the perfection of the divine attributes, he showed how the other differences of doctrine regarding the Fall of Man, the Redemption, the sacraments, and even the Church, were only logical consequences of the anthropological views of the leaders of the Reformations. Contradictory as it may seem, it was Möhler's ironic nature that impelled him to publish this work. He was persuaded that a knowledge of the genuine and original documents, was a necessary preliminary to any definite appeal to the tribunal of truth. Such investigations seemed to him important, not only for theologians, but also for every true scholar, the truth being nowhere so important as in matters of faith. The work was accurately translated into English, German, and French within five editions in six years. An English translation by James Burton Robertson appeared in London in 1843 under the title "Symbolism; or, Exposition of Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants, as evidenced by their Symbolical Writings" (reprint, London and New York, 1894), and the work was also translated into Spanish. Möhler's book "What I had thought and felt, but could not clearly understand, much less adequately express, was brought out by Möhler with marvellous insight and in the clearest way" (Kihn). His German diction was also perfect. The "Symbolik" acted like an electric spark, and stirred up many both in and out of the Church. Naturally, Protestant theologians took up the gauntlet. Marheineke replied with moderation in his work, "Über Dr. J. A. Möhlers Symbolik" (Berlin, 1833), and Nitzsch in his "Eine protestantische Beantwortung der Symbolik Dr. Möhlers" (Hamburg, 1835). On the other hand his Tübingen colleague, Professor Benjamin Döllinger, wrote a protest against the German "Gegensatz des Katholizismus und Protestantismus". Both the Principen and Hauptdogmen der beiden Lehrbegriffe. Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Dr. Möhlers "Symbolik" (Tübingen, 1834). Möhler replied with "Neue Untersuchungen der Lehrgegensätze zwischen den Katholiken und Protestanten. Eine Vertheidigung meiner Symbolik gegen die Kritik des Herrn Prof. D. Baur" (Tübingen, 1834; 5th ed., with introduction and notes by Schanz, Ratisbon, 1900), to which Baur again replied in the same year. In his reply Möhler was able to state with greater clearness certain points of difference, and to deal more profoundly with certain doubts and criticisms. These additions were edited anew by Raich in "Ergänzungen zu Möhlers Symbolik aus dessen Schrift: Neue Untersuchungen" (Mainz, 1839; latest ed., 1906). This controversy with Baur made Tübingen disagreeable to Möhler, and he decided to seek some other academic centre. The Prussian Government sought to attract the celebrated theologian to the Catholic theological faculty of the University of the Christian religion, and Möhler was about to accept the Academy of the Catholic religion, and Möhler was not unwilling to go to Bonn. But Professor Hermes, who had Archbishop Spiegel on his side, prevented the execution of this design. Döllinger, his intimate friend, was meanwhile active in his behalf at Munich, and through his influence Möhler was appointed to the Catholic theological faculty at that university to lecture on the exegesis of the New Testament.

He began at Munich with lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, but in the next term he added lectures on Church history and patrology. His intercourse with professors of like mind raised his spirits, and his health, which had failed at Tübingen, improved. He devoted himself with fervour to the preparation of a history of the monasticism, with the intention of setting forth the immeasurably influential of the Benedictine Order on Western civilization. While he cherished a warm attachment for the sons of St. Benedict, he was of opinion that the suspension of the Society of Jesus was not, historically speaking, to be regretted. His plan, however, was never realized. After a mild attack of cholera in 1838, which followed the publication of a pulmonary alment which compelled him to cease lecturing and seek health or alleviation at Meran in the Tyrol. After the condemnation of Hermesianism by Gregory XVI, the Prussian Government sought again to secure Möhler for Bonn, hoping perhaps that this would help to allay the controversies that had arisen in Catholic dogma. His health, however, was such that the delicate health caused him to refuse. Early in 1838 the King of Bavaria bestowed on him the Order of St. Michael, and on 22 March made him dean of the cathedral of Würzburg. Möhler never took up this office, however, for he died a few weeks later in the prime of life, not yet forty-two years of age, deeply lamented by kindred and friends alike, and by all who knew him. A monument, subscribed for by almost all Catholic Germany, adorns his grave in the cemetery of Munich, with the inscription: "Defensor fidei, literarum decus, ecclesiae solamen" (Defender of the faith, ornament of letters, consolation of the Church). The clergy of Würtemberg erected another monument that bore the dedication of which in 1880 his disciple and successor in Tübingen, Bishop Hefele of Rottenburg, paid a noble tribute to his fame.

Möhler, as Kihn has well shown, had an uncommonly attractive personality. He was an ideal priest, almost perfect in stature and comeliness, deeply pious and of childlike modesty, with a heart full of affection and gentleness, penetrated with the desire for peace in personal intercourse and for the restoration of harmony between the different creeds. He exercised a peculiar fascination over all who approached him, and men of every belief and party confidently turned to him for all maxims and directions. He charmed his hearers by his dignified bearing, his kindly presence, his keen wit, his classic diction, and his ripe knowledge. It may be said that he gave new life to the science of theology; also, and this is greater praise, that he reawakened the religious spirit of the age. He was, in the judgment of a Protestant (Realeencyklopädie für prot. Theol., 2nd ed., IX, 665 sq.), an epoch-making mind and a brilliant light of the Catholic Church; while, according to the same writer, the Evangelical Church, to which he owed much, had to thank him for fresh stimulus and for what it learned from his keen exhibition of ecclesiastical development. After his death Döllinger edited most of his minor writings in "Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze" (2 vols., Ratisbon, 1839-40). They are numerous, the most noteworthy being "Beleuchtung der Dankschrift für die Aufhebung des katholischen Geistlichen vorge schriebenen Cölbates", in which he refutes with great earnestness the opponents of priestly celibacy, and proves the sublimity of the virginal life from the Christian religion, as opposed to the New Testament. Other important studies are: "Hieronymus und Augustin im Streit über Galater 2, 14" (I, 1 sqq.); "Über den Brief an Diognetus" (I, 19 sqq.); "Fragmente aus und über Pseudoisidor" (I, 283 sqq.), ripe fruits of his studies of the Fathers.
and Church history. He was always greatly devoted to such studies, and in his lectures often drew attention to the liturgical treasures of Christian antiquity. To him the study of the unknown series of witnesses to the doctrine, worship, and constitution of the Church—the successive evidences of her many victories, as he puts it in the introduction to his "Patrologie oder christlichen Literargeschichte"; the first volume of which, dealing with the first three centuries, was edited by Reimay after additions of his own (Ratisbon, 1840). Less important translations are the "Kommentar über den Römerbrief" (Ratisbon, 1845), also edited by Reimay after Möhler's death; it is difficult to say how much of it is Möhler's own work. The same may be said of the "Kirchengeschichte von J. A. Möhler" (3 vols., Ratisbon, 1867-8; index vol., 1870), laboriously compiled from class notes by the Benedictine Pius Gams, and later translated into French.

REIMAY, Biographical sketch in the fifth edition of the Symbolik; Ideen in Kirchenw. (1893), s. v.; KHN in RAUCH, Beiträge (latest ed., 1900), i-iv; FRIEDRICH, J. A. Möhler, der Symboliker (Munich, 1894); KNÖPFLER, Röm. Christl. Zeitschrift, Monatshefte (Lausanne, 1897); WAGENMANN-BACH in RAUCH, Beiträge, s. v.; GOYAU, Hist. (Paris, 1906); SCHUMANN, Die christl. Entwicklungsgeschichte der Liturgie (Munich, 1897), 22-56, 572-99.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Mohr, Christian b. at Andernach, 1823; d. at Cologne, 1888. He practised his profession of sculptor chiefly at Cologne under the cathedral architect Zwirner. After some early ornamental work at Mainz and Coblenz, Mohr settled in Cologne in 1845. He first executed the statuettes on the tomb of the bishop Conrad of Hochstaden, the founder of the cathedral. Of importance are his figures of Christ, the Evangelists, and fifty-nine angels on the south portal of the cathedral, where the rich variety of the added symbols excites admiration. On the commission of Emperor William I the eight statues in the middle hall were executed. The "St. Peter" for the collegiate church at Trier was executed for the cathedral at the Paris Exhibition of 1855. He also carved the statue of the first Cologne cathedral architect, Gerhard Riele, and that of the veteran painter of the Cologne school, Stephan Lochner. He undertook many commissions outside of Cologne: the panoramic figures for the assembly-hall at Dusseldorf, the thirty-four figures of the emperors for the Rathaus at Aachen, the equestrian statues for the Fürstenbergische Schloss at Herdinger, the portrait effigies of the princes of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, the figures for the fountain on the market-place at Lübeck, etc. For more than forty years he was thus engaged at Cologne, executing commissions of that city and other cities.

The cathedral is indebted to him for the best of its sculptural decoration; the Rathhaus for the statues of the emperors, and the Museum for the bust of Michelangelo, which in 1873 secured for Mohr the honour of being made a regular member of the K. K. Akademie of Vienna. Mohr was equally esteemed as an art-collector and connoisseur of classical and German antiquities. His household furniture represented the art of the Dürer period. That he was not opposed to the Renaissance is proved by a beautiful silver epergne in that style. Finally, he appears as a writer on art in the works "Kön in seiner Glanzzeit" and "Kölner Torburgen". For his knowledge and his achievements he was indebted for the most part to his personal exertions, since he was practically self-educated; and, even though in many cases he only executed the plans of Schneller, still numerous independent works display both talent and taste.

Zeitschr. für bildende Kunst, XXIV, 100 sqq.; Illustrierte Zeitung, no. 860 (1890).

G. GIEITMANN.

Mohr, Joseph b. at Siegburg, Rhine Province, 11 Jan., 1834; d. at Munich, 7 February, 1892. Father Mohr did more than any other within the last century towards restoring to general use, especially in German-speaking countries, those virile melodies and texts sung in the vernacular by the people prior to the Reformation—some dating from the twelfth century—which had been displaced by a sentimental class of hymns more in keeping with modern taste. While at first Father Mohr stood practically alone in the pioneer work of research, he later found powerful assistance in the labours of Rev. Dr. Wm. Bäumker and Rev. Guido Maria Dreyes, at that time a Jesuit, both of whom became famous specialists in this field. Among his many works may be mentioned: "Lasset uns beten"; "Treatise on Psalmody"; "Cácelia", a hymn-book and prayer-book; "Cantate", a hymn and prayer-book; "Psalmi Officii hebdomadis sanctae"; "Vesperbühlein"; "Laudate Dominum", a hymn-book and prayer-book intended more especially for institutions of higher education; "Manuale Cantorum", and "Psalterlein", a hymn-book and prayer-book. Most of these collections—model hymn-books as well as prayer-books—have had large circulations; the "Cantate" has had forty-two editions, and the thirty-third edition of the collection, "Cácelia", has recently appeared. Several of these hymn-books became the official hymn-books of certain dioceses; others served as the basis for the compilation of official diocesan hymn-books. Mohr had the gift, rare at the present time, of writing genuine hymntunes, some of which are in his collections.


Molino, François-Napoléon-Marie, physicist and author, b. at Guiméné (Morbihan), 15 April, 1804, d. at Saint-Denis (Seine), 14 July, 1884. He received his early education at the Jesuit college at Saint-Clément; entered the novitiate of the order 2 Sept., 1822. He made his theological studies at Montmorency, devoting his leisure to mathematics and physics in which he achieved much success. Upon the outbreak of the Revolution in 1830, he fled with his brethren to Brie in Switzerland. Here he continued his studies and, being endowed with a remarkable memory, acquired at the same time several foreign languages, including Hebrew and Arabic. In 1836 he was appointed professor of mathematics at the well-known college of Ste-Geneviève, Rue des Postes, in Paris. Here he became widely known not only as a scholar, but also as a preacher and writer of ability. He wrote numerous articles for the press and was much esteemed by the scientific men of the time, including Cauchy, Arago, Dumas, Ampère, etc. He was engaged on one of his best known works, "Lecons de calcul différentiel et de calcul intégral", based chiefly on Cauchy's methods, and had already published the first volume, when he left the Society in 1843. Shortly afterwards he undertook a tour of Europe, contributing numerous letters to the journal "L'Epopée". He acted as chairman of the Lycee Leconte from 1848 to 1851. He became scientific editor of the "Presse" in 1850 and of the "Pays" in 1851 and in 1852 founded the well-known scientific
journal "Cosmos". In 1862 he founded "Les Mondes" and became associated with the clergy of St-Germain des Prés. In 1873 he was appointed one of the canons of the chapter of Saint-Denis. Moigno was a man of great industry and throughout his long career was a prolific writer, being distinguished rather as an expert in the works of art and antiquities. He not only wrote a large number of scientific and apologetical works of merit but also translated numerous English and Italian memoirs on science into French. He also edited the "Actualités scientifiques". Among his more important works may be mentioned "Répertoire d'optique moderne" (Paris, 1847-50); "Traité de physique chimique et mécanique" (Paris, 1859); "Leçons de mécanique analytique" (Paris, 1868); "Sacharimétrie" (Paris, 1869); "Optique moléculaire" (Paris, 1873); "Les splendeurs de la foi" (Paris, 1879-83); "Les livres saints et la science" (Paris, 1884), etc., and numerous articles in the "Comptes Rendus", "Revue Scientifique", "Cosmos", etc.

Cosmos, 3rd series, VIII, 443. HENRY M. BROCK.

MOLESMME

Molai (MOLAY), Jacques de, b. at Rahon, Jura, about 1244; d. at Paris, 18 March, 1314. A Templar at Beaucaire since 1265, Molai is mentioned as Grand Master of the Templars as early as 1298. He was, as he described himself at his trial, an unlettered soldier, but well known to his order by his signal examples of courage and devotion to duty. He was present at the council of Lyons in 1274, a member of the commission appointed by the king to recover the temple property in England, and at the council of Mainz, 1313, he was present and a member of the commission appointed by the king to recover the property of the order. He was one of the leaders of the order, underwent a last interrogation in Paris before a new commission of cardinals, prelates, and theologians, authorized to pronounce sentence. He was condemned to imprisonment for life, and he continued to remain in prison until the last (see TEMPLES, KNIGHTS).


Molesme, Notre-Dame de, a celebrated Benedictine monastery in a village of the same name, Canton of Lavaux (Côte d'Or), ancient Burgundy, on the confines of the Dioceses of Langres and Troyes. St. Robert, Abbot of St-Michel de Tonnerre, not finding his monks disposed to observe the Rule of St. Benedict in its original simplicity, left them, accompanied by a few monks and hermits, and selected a spot on the seashore of the right bank of the River Leignes, where, having obtained a grant of land from Hugo de Laval, they built their monastery and cleared the woods of the surrounding country. They lived in extreme poverty until a certain bishop visited them, and, seeing their need, sent them a supply of food and clothing. Members of the noblest families, hearing of the saintly lives of these religious, soon hastened from all parts of the country to join them, bringing in many cases their flocks and all their worldly possessions, and the resulting benefactions enabled them to erect a church, the most beautiful in the country around, and suitable monastic buildings. The increase in numbers and possessions caused a temporary relaxation in fervour, in so far that the monks ceased to work the fields, being willing to live on the alms given them. Matters having gone even so far as open rebellion, St. Robert and the most fervent religious left Molesme (1098) and founded Citeaux, which, though intended as a Benedictine monastery, became the first and mother-house of the Cistercian Order. The monks of Molesme, repenting of their faults, begged Urban II to obligate St. Robert to return to them, and this request was accorded to (1099); Robert returned to Molesme until his death (1110). Besides Citeaux, Molesme founded seven or eight other monasteries, and had about as many monasteries of Benedictine nuns under its jurisdiction. The church and monastery were destroyed and their possessions confiscated in 1472 during the war between France and Burgundy. The buildings were again burned by the hands of the Huguenots at the close of the sixteenth century. In the seventeenth century the fervour of the monastery was renewed on the introduction of the reform of St. Maur (1648). All the glory of Molesme has now vanished. The magnificent church is razed to the ground, and the monastic buildings are used, a small part as a church, and the rest as common buildings.
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Moliflette, Terlizzi, and Giovanni, Diocese of (Melphictensis, Terlittensis et Juvenacensis).—Moliflette is a city of the province of Bari, in Apulia, on the Adriatic Sea. Its history is unknown, but many objects of the neolithic, bronze, and the Mycenae epoch have been found at a place called Pulo, which shows that the site of Moliflette was inhabited in prehistoric times. The town has a beautiful cathedral, and beyond its limits is the sanctuary of the Virgin of the Martyrs containing an image brought by Crusaders in 1188. The first bishop of this city of whom there is any record was John, whose incumbency is referred to the year 1136. The see was at first suffragan of Bari, but in 1484 it became immediately dependent upon Rome. In 1818, it was enlarged with the territory of the suppressed sees of Giovinazzo and Terlizzi, which were re-established in 1835, remaining united, except principal. In the opinion of some people, Giovinazzo is the ancient Egnatie; it has been an ecclesiastical sees since 1071. Terlizzi was a city in the Diocese of Giovinazzo, and in 1731, to put an end to certain questions of its independence, it was declared an ecclesiastical sees, but united with Giovinazzo. The city was for a time the residence of the Emperors of the Aragonese.

The Diocese of Moliflette contains 4 parishes; 80 secular and 6 regular priests; 42,000 Catholics. Terlizzi contains 3 parishes; 40 secular and 6 regular priests; 24,100 Catholics. Giovinazzo contains 2 parishes; 57 secular and 3 regular priests; 12,150 Catholics. In the united dioceses there are 6 convents for women, 2 schools for boys, and 4 for girls.

A. Benigni.

Molière (properly, Jean-Baptiste Poquelin, the name by which he became known to fame was assumed when he went on the stage, to avoid embarrassing his family), French comic poet; b. at Paris, 15 Jan., 1622; d. there 17 Feb., 1673. He was the son of a Paris furniture dealer who was also a valet-de-chambre to the king, and succeeded his father in the latter capacity 12 years after marriage. After many studies with the Jesuits at the Collège de Clermont, he seems to have studied law in some provincial town—perhaps Orleans. It is not known, however, if he ever took his licentiate. The stage very soon attracted him and absorbed him. At twenty-one he entered the theatrical company, organized under the name of "L'Illustre Théâtre," in which were Madeleine Béjart and her brothers. The troupe engaged a band of four musicians at the cost of one livre per day, and a dancer, who was to receive Thirty-five sols per day and five sols extra for every day when there was a performance. The business started with a deficit, and Molière, who appears to have then been chosen president by his associates, was arrested for debt. He was imprisoned in the Châtelet, but released on his own recognizances.

In the course of the subsequent wanderings through different parts of France, Molière composed some small comic pieces of no importance, of which two have been preserved—"Le Jalousie de Barbouillé" and "Le Médecin Volant." Afterwards, about 1650 on 1855, he began to use the language of fine comedy which Corneille had created ten or twelve years before. "Le Désert Amoureux," produced at Béziers in 1656, should also be mentioned here. Before long the "Illustré Théâtre" regained confidence to face the Parisian public; we find it in Paris in 1656. Next year, "Le Mariage de Miséricorde de Monsieur, Frère du Roi" performed "Les Précieuses Ridicules." In this comedy Molière declared war against the spirit of refined humbuggery (l'Esprit précieux), and he never ceased to be its enemy, as witness "Les Femmes Savantes" (1672), one of his last pieces. The last twelve years of his life saw the culmination of his most famous works. "L'École des Marias" (1661) shows the beauty of a confiding and gentle character in a man; "Les Fâcheux" (also 1661) was written in fifteen days; "L'École des Femmes" (1662) gives another lesson to husbands—this was very creditable to the playwright, for he himself, at the age of forty, had just married a girl of twenty; Madeleine Béjart's sister, the volatile Armande who was to give him so much trouble. The "Critique de L'École des Femmes" and the "Impromptu de Versailles" (1663) are two little prose pieces in which the writer defends his comedy of the preceding year and attacks his critics. "Tartufe" (1664), the famous comedy, at first in three acts, afterwards five, deals trenchant blows at hypocrisy, unfortuntately, however, often striking true virtue at the same time. After its first production the public performance of this piece was forbidden, and the ban was not removed for five years.

In the interval Molière wrote: "Don Juan" (or "Le Festin de Pierre") (1665), apparently intended as a preface for the suppression of "Tartuffe," "Le Misanthrope" (1669) a great comedy of character; "Amphitryon" (1668), three acts in verse of various measures, where Jupiter assumes the form of the Theban general, Amphitryon, in order to betray his wife, Alcmene; lastly, "L'Avare" (1668). Excepting "Les Femmes Savantes," already mentioned, the comedies of his last five years form a great deal of gaiety, but not so much breadth—"Monsieur de Pourceaugnac" and "Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme," in 1669, "Les Fourberies de Scapin," in 1671 and "Le Malade Imaginaire" (1673). While on the stage playing in "Le Malade Imaginaire," the author was seized with a violent hemorrhage; he was carried home, and died.

In his lifetime the greatest of the comic poets whom her history has produced. Judging Molière exclusively from a literary point of view, it must be admitted that he does not owe his reputation to the quantity of dramatic entanglement in his plays; he owes it above all to the truth of his portraits. His friend Boileau called him "the looker-on" (le contre-amateur) of his period. He has a natural talent to note its vices and its failings, and his genius had the power of combining what he saw, melting all his observations together, adding to them, and thus creating beings who are no longer particular individuals, but are recognizable as men of their whole period—often of all periods of humanity. Moreover, the characters are his chief concern; with him, as with Racine, the characters carry the whole piece, they are its soul. His art may at times fail in other points—as in his dénouements, which are often ill contrived—but in that one respect he is always admirable. His plays, then, present a portrait of the heart of man, but a profile portrait drawn from the most varied angles. The satire which is a vital part of his art is implied in its very method of attack. His gaiety is always wholesome, his method is always deft and skillful, his dramatic business is to emphasize certain lines. This
verisimilitude—or, as his friend La Fontaine expressed it, carelessness "not to go one step away from nature"—is found in all Molière's works. It is particularly visible in his style. Good critics, it is true, have found fault with Molière's style, particularly in his verse; Boileau, Pénelon, and La Bruyère did so in the seventeenth century; Vauvenargues relieved his lines of the eighteenth; Théophile Gautier and others, in the nineteenth. On the other hand, a whole school has arisen in the last fifty years to extol this writer: for the Molériïsts, as they have been called, Molière is above all criticism; they preach a sort of cultus of Molière. To be more judicious, we must be more moderate. As Voltaire points out in his preface to the Lettres de Cato and the Discours sur l'Esprit de Conventions, there is need of some just balance. That of familiar conversations, permits him certain liberties, which he cannot be fairly blamed for using, still, making all due allowance for the nature of his medium, there is no denying that his style suffers from real carelessness—useless repetitions, incoherent metaphors, heavy and entangled phrases. Molière was obliged to write quickly; he was an improviser, but a genius of improvisation. For his style, in spite of its faults, is still, as Boileau said to Louis XIV, a "rare" style. Fram and natural, he excels in making reason and good sense talk. It is the style of a poet, too—warm, highly coloured, brilliant. Lastly, one finds in him striking words and striking touches, which could have been borrowed from Shakespeare.

As for morality, it owes Molière much less than literature does. Although he gave out, in his prefaces, that it was his wish and duty as a dramatic poet, to be of service to morality, he has been severely censured in this regard, from Bossuet to Jean-Jacques Rousseau. While he never put on the stage—as is so often charged of these days—a woman guilty of violating her marriage vows, or about to violate them, yet he has been reproached with the presentation of other dangerous pictures. Furthermore, he is always on the side of the young people, who surely need no encouragement in their evil propensities. All his sermons, all his satires, are for parents; all the unpleasant failings depicted by his comedies reside in the fathers and the old people; the laugh is always at their expense, except when their egoism excites horror. It must be confessed that, while the passions of the young king, Louis XIV, had only too much reason to be pleased with the author of "Amphitryon," religion had no cause to approve the author of "Tartuffe." For, while the former was not as pernicious as that of Corneille, Racine, Boileau, and nearly all the illustrious writers of his time. And yet, when there was question of his being given Christian burial, and the curé hesitated, on the ground that the priest had arrived too late to give absolution to the comedian, who, it may almost be said, passed from the stage to the tribunal of God; his widow proved that he had received the sacraments in the last previous season.

See the edition of Molière by DESMOS AND MERNARD in the Collection des grands écrivains (Paris, 1873-1900), also an English translation of his works with French text by walker, vol. 8, (London, 1905-7), and English version with memoir by Wall in Black's Library (3 vols., London, 1876-77); Lachaux, Bibliographie, moléresque (Paris, 1873); Velliot, Molière et Bourdaloue (Paris, 1877); Luchaire, Histoire de la litt. fran. au XVIIe siècle (Paris, 1862-78); Carlota y Celaya, Poesías liturgicas (Madrid, 1870), 317; Matthews, Molière (New York, 1910).

GEORGES BERTRIN.

Molina, Alonso de, Franciscan friar, b. probably 1511 or 1512, at Escalon, province of Toledo, Spain; d. 1584, in the city of Mexico. In 1523 his parents came to New Spain, where he learned the Natural, or Mexican language. His kindred was of Basque origin. When he arrived in 1524, seeing how thoroughly versed he was in the language of the natives, begged Cortés to use his influence with the child's mother that he might be allowed to help them in their preaching and catechizing. The mother readily consented, and young Alonso became so attached to the fathers that he never left them. When he reached the required age he joined the Franciscan order, and for fifty years was indefatigable in his work among the Indians, devoting also some time to the numerous works which he left. In order to allow him to follow uninterruptedly his chosen work, his superiors retired him to the convent of Téxoco, in 1555. Although no great actions mark the life of Molina, he is nevertheless remarkable for his untiring zeal, and for the wonderful constancy with which, for half a century, he continued his work, resisting its monotony, overcoming all difficulties. He left a long series of works, the following unpublished: "Traducción mexicana de las Epístolas y Evangelios de todo el año"; "Horas de Ntra. Sra. en mexicano"; many prayers and devotions for the Indians; "De Contemptu Mundi"; also a treatise on the sacraments. The following have been published: "Doctrina breve mexicana" (1571); "Vocabulario castellano-mexicano" (1555); "Confesionario menor" (1565); "Confesionario mayor" (1565); "Doctrina Cristiana" (1578); "Arte mexicano" (1571); and "Vocabulario castellano-mexicano y mexicano castellano" (1571, reprinted, Leipzig, 1880), the most important of his works.

The first encyclopedic hispano-americano, III (Barcelona, 1893); YETANCURT, Menologio franciscano (Mexico, 1871); MOLINA, Vocabulario de la lengua castellana mexicana (Mexico, 1871); MAECHL, Dictionnaire de la langue aya (Paris, 1885); Obras de D. J. Garcia Isaacbaloza (Mexico, 1896), III.

Camillo Crivelli.

Molina, Antonio de, a Spanish Carthusian and celebrated ascetical writer, b. about 1560, at Villanueva de los Infantes; d. at Miraflores, 21 September, 1612 or 1619. In 1575 he entered the Order of Augustinian Hermits, was elected superior at one of their houses in Spain, and for some time took part in the discussions on the question of whether to join an order of stricter discipline, by which he became a Carthusian at Miraflores, where he died prior of the monastery. He wrote in Spanish a few ascetical works, especially adapted for priests, which became the most popular books of their kind in Spain, and were translated into various foreign languages. The most famous of these is a manual for priests and cloistered nuns, under the title: "Instrucción de Sacerdotes, en que se da doctrina muy importante para conocer la alzada del sagrado oficio Sacerdotal, y para exercitarla debidamente." Twenty editions of this work are known to have been published, among them a Latin translation by the Belgian Dominical Nicolas Janssen Boy, which received five editions in Antwerp, 1623; Cologne, 1636, 1711, and 1712, and an Italian translation (Turin, 1685). It was severely attacked by the Jansenist Antoine Arnauld (De la fréquence Communion, 1643) but ably defended against him by Petavius ("Dogmata theologiae, De Penitentia", lib. III, cap. vi; new ed., Paris, 1855-7, VIII, 286-8). He is also the author of two ascetical works adapted to lay people, "Exercícios para personas ocupadas de coisas de sua salvacao," was published at Burgos in 1613; the other, "Exercícios espirituais de la excelência, provecho y necesidade de la oracion mental," etc., was first published at Burgos in 1615, and was translated into Latin.

ANTONIO, Bibliotheca Hispanic (Madrid, 1783-8), II, 145; HUNTER, Nomencal, 3rd ed., II, 608-9. MICHAEL OTT.

Molina (Mol. of Molina), Juan Ignacio, naturalist and scientist; b. 20 July, 1740, at Quaronen near Talca (Chile); d. 22 Oct. (12 Sept?), 1782, at Imola (Italy). Molina first studied in Santiago and became a Jesuit when only fifteen. The young scholar excelled in languages (he composed a number of poems), and in the natural sciences. In 1767 he was sent to Italy which grew to be his second home; he was ordained at Imola soon after, and then lived as
a tutor in Bologna. In his leisure time he devoted himself especially to the study of the natural sciences, alchemy, and the art of making water into gold, having in these studies the most prominent historian and geographer of his native American home. Molina published his works in Italian; they all appeared at Bologna, the first one anonymously. He treats of Chile in: (1) “Compendio della storia geografica, naturale e civile del regno del Chile” (1776), 8vo, 245 pp., 1 map, 10 tables; (2) “Saggio sulla storia naturale del Chile” (1827), 8vo, 365 pp., 1 map, 2nd enlarged edition (1810), 4to, 436 pp. These three works have been translated into German (Leipzig, 1786–91); French (Paris); Spanish (2 vols., Madrid, 1788–95); the most complete edition in English (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1898; London, 1909, 1925). The original and several of the translations contain Molina’s portrait. As an expression of her gratitude Chile named the town of Molina after him. If these works evidence his learning as a student of natural history, this is equally true of his “Memorie di storia naturale lette in Bologna” (Bologna, 1781, 1782, 8vo), in which Molina was a member laid before the Instituto Pontificio. Another work, “Analoga de los tres reinos de la naturalezza”, is of considerable interest, as it was written by Molina in Spanish, and because it was not published, although Mezzofanti procured the imprimatur in 1820. Molina was highly esteemed by the School of Jerosol, the “genius of the Gramineae, well known throughout Europe, Molinia; and Jussieu in the same year classified the genus Molinia; other generic names (as Molina) are no longer used.

Joseph Rompel.

Molina, Luis de, one of the most learned and renowned theologians of the Society of Jesus, b. of noble parentage at Cuenca, New Castile, Spain, in 1555; d. at Madrid, 12 October, 1600. At the age of eighteen, he entered the Society of Jesus at Alcalá, and, on finishing his novitiate, was sent to take up his philosophical and theological studies at Coimbra in Portugal. So successful was he at the close of his course, he was installed as professor of philosophy at Coimbra, and promoted a few years later to the chair of theology at the flourishing University of Evora. For twenty years, marked by untiring labour and devotion, he expounded with great success the system of St. Thomas Aquinas to eager students. In 1590 he was invited to his native city of Cuenca to devote himself exclusively to writing and preparing for print the results of his long continued studies. Two years later, however, the Society of Jesus opened a special school for the science of moral philosophy at Madrid, and the renowned professor was called from his solitude and appointed to the newly established chair. Here, on his death, he was buried before he had held his new post for half a year. By a strange coincidence on the same day (12 Oct., 1600) the “Congregatio de auxilia”, which had been instituted at Rome to investigate Molina’s new system of grace, after a second examination of his “Concordia”, reported adversely on its contents to Clement VIII. Molina, far from being disheartened, was roused to a profound and original thinker. To him we are indebted for important contributions in speculative, dogmatic and moral theology as well as in jurisprudence. The originality of his mind is shown quite as much by his novel treatment of the old scholastic subjects as by his labours along new lines of theological study.

Molina’s chief contribution to the science of theology is the “Concordia”, on which he spent thirty years of the most assiduous labour. The publication of this work was facilitated by the valuable assistance of Cardinal Albert, Grand Inquisitor of Portugal and librarian of the Order of T. E., having given the new famous work reads: “Concordia liberi arborum gratiae donis, divina praeacientia, providentia, praedestinatione et reprobatione” (Lisbon, 1588). As the title indicates, the work is primarily concerned with the difficult problem of reconciling grace and free will. In view of its purpose and principal contents, the book may also be described as a scientific vindication of the Tridentine doctrine on the permanence of man’s free will under the influence of efficacious grace (Sess. VI, cap. v-vi; can., iv-v). It is also the first attempt to offer a strictly logical explanation of the great problems of grace and free will, foreknowledge and providence, and predestination to glory or reprobation, upon an entirely new basis with the meeting of seemingly obvious objections. This new basis, on which the entire Molinist system rests, is the Divine scientia media. To make clear its intrinsic connexion with the traditional teachings, the work takes the form of a commentary upon several portions of the “Summa” of St. Thomas (I, Q. xiv, a. 13; Q. xix, a. 16; QQ. xxii.
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MOLINISM

ing parties, and in 1596 demanded that the documents be sent to the Vatican. To settle the controversy he instituted in 1598 a special “Congregatio de Auxiliis.” He was a man of great mortification to the very end of his life.

A biography and bibliography together with a portrait of Molina may be found in the Cologne edition of his De justitia et jure, i (1755). It bears the title E. Molina, S.J. vita morumque brevis, ad omnem utique addombrato autque operum Catalogus. There is no modern critical biography. See MODERNE IN Kirchens., v. v.; SOMMENVOLGIZED, ossentia et coeminentia de J. C. J., v. 1107-79; H. HENZL, Influenzator, I (2nd ed.), 47 sqq.

J. POHLE.

Molinism, the name used to denote one of the systems which purpose to reconcile grace and free will. This system was first developed by Luis de Molina, and was adopted in its essential points by the Society of Jesus. It is opposed by the Thomistic doctrine of grace—the term Thomism has a somewhat indifferent meaning—whose chief exponent is the Dominican Bañez. Along lines totally different from those of Molina, this subtle theologian endeavours to harmonize grace and free will on principles derived from St. Thomas. Whereas Molinism tries to clear up the mysterious relation between grace and free will by starting from the rather clear concept of freedom, the Thomist, in turn, endeavours to dispel the important misgivings and accusations of his adversaries. This edition bears the title: “Liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis etc. concordia, aliers sui parte auctori” (Antwerp, 1695, 1699, 1705; new edition, Paris, 1876). To-day this is the only standard edition. After the lapse of nearly a century, the Dominican Fr. Hyacinth Serry, in his “Historia Congregationis de auxiliiis” (Louvain, 1700; Antwerp, 1709) accused Molina of having omitted many assertions from his Antwerp edition of the “Concordia,” which were parts of the Lisbon edition. But Father Liviens de Meyer, S.J., subjected the two editions to a critical comparison, and supplemented the “Concordia.” For that reason there were only of secondary moment, and that Serry’s accusation was thus groundless. Meyer’s work bears the title, “Historia controversiarum de auxiliiis” (Antwerp, 1708). De Molina was not less eminent as a moralist and jurist than as a speculative theologian.

A proof of this is his work “De Justitia et jure” (Cologne, 1583; 2 vols., Venice, 1614; 5 vols., Cologne, 1733). On broad lines Molina not only develops therein the theory of law in general and the special juridical questions arising out of the political economy of his time (e.g., the law of exchange, the law of property), but also at length and in full detail questions concerning the juridical relations between Church and State, pope and prince, and the like. It is a sad fact, that, in order to justify the brutal persecution of the Jesuits in France, the Benedictine Clémence (Extrait des assertions portueuses etc., Paris, 1672) ransacked even this solid work and contributed to make of it a mere collection of blemishes. This is but one of the many misfortunes which at that time of unrest fell so heavily, and as a rule so undeservedly, on the Society of Jesus (cf. Dollinger, “Moralcreatigkeiten”, Munich, 1889, p. 337).

The work “De Hispanorum primigeniiori origine et natura” (Alcalá, 1573; Cologne, 1588) is often attributed to Molina; in reality it is the work of another jurist of the same name, who was born at Uraso in Andalusia.

As a man, priest, and religious, Molina commanded the respect and esteem of his bitterest adversaries. During his whole life his virtues were a source of edification to all who knew him. To prompt obedience he contributed to make of it a virtue; in reality it is the work of another jurist of the same name, who was born at Uraso in Andalusia.

As a man, priest, and religious, Molina commanded the respect and esteem of his bitterest adversaries. During his whole life his virtues were a source of edification to all who knew him. To prompt obedience he contributed to make of it a virtue; it was of the highest moral purity and dignity, and being well known for having been asked what he wished done with his writings, he answered in all simplicity: “The Society of Jesus may do with them what it wishes”. His love for evangelical poverty was most remarkable; in spite of his bodily infirmity, brought on by overwork, he never sought any mitigation in the matter of either clothing or food. This system was first developed by Luis de Molina, and was adopted in its essential points by the Society of Jesus. It is opposed by the Thomistic doctrine of grace—the term Thomism has a somewhat indifferent meaning—whose chief exponent is the Dominican Bañez. Along lines totally different from those of Molina, this subtle theologian endeavours to harmonize grace and free will on principles derived from St. Thomas. Whereas Molinism tries to clear up the mysterious relation between grace and free will by starting from the rather clear concept of freedom, the Thomist, in turn, endeavours to dispel the important misgivings and accusations of his adversaries. This edition bears the title: “Liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis etc. concordia, aliers sui parte auctori” (Antwerp, 1695, 1699, 1705; new edition, Paris, 1876). To-day this is the only standard edition. After the lapse of nearly a century, the Dominican Fr. Hyacinth Serry, in his “Historia Congregationis de auxiliiis” (Louvain, 1700; Antwerp, 1709) accused Molina of having omitted many assertions from his Antwerp edition of the “Concordia,” which were parts of the Lisbon edition. But Father Liviens de Meyer, S.J., subjected the two editions to a critical comparison, and supplemented the “Concordia.” For that reason there were only of secondary moment, and that Serry’s accusation was thus groundless. Meyer’s work bears the title, “Historia controversiarum de auxiliiis” (Antwerp, 1708). De Molina was not less eminent as a moralist and jurist than as a speculative theologian. A proof of this is his work “De Justitia et jure” (Cologne, 1583; 2 vols., Venice, 1614; 5 vols., Cologne, 1733). On broad lines Molina not only develops therein the theory of law in general and the special juridical questions arising out of the political economy of his time (e.g., the law of exchange, the law of property), but also at length and in full detail questions concerning the juridical relations between Church and State, pope and prince, and the like. It is a sad fact, that, in order to justify the brutal persecution of the Jesuits in France, the Benedictine Clémence (Extrait des assertions portueuses etc., Paris, 1672) ransacked even this solid work and contributed to make of it a mere collection of blemishes. This is but one of the many misfortunes which at that time of unrest fell so heavily, and as a rule so undeservedly, on the Society of Jesus (cf. Dollinger, “Moralcreatigkeiten”, Munich, 1889, p. 337).

The work “De Hispanorum primigeniiori origine et natura” (Alcalá, 1573; Cologne, 1588) is often attributed to Molina; in reality it is the work of another jurist of the same name, who was born at Uraso in Andalusia.
ment which he can never lose without annihilating his own nature. Man must of necessity be free in every state of life, actual or possible, whether that state be the purely natural (status pura nature), or the state of original justice in paradise (status justitiae originalis), or the state of fallen nature (status naturae lapsa), or the state of regeneration (status naturae regeneratae), so that the will chosen to be the instrument of God's will, he would necessarily degenerate in his nature and sink to the level of the animal. Since the purely natural state, devoid of supernatural grace and lacking a supernatural justice, never existed, and since the state of original justice has not been re-established by Christ's Redemption, man's present state alone is to be considered. But how can we determine the relation between grace and free will? In spite of original sin and concupiscence man is still free, not only with reference to ethical good and evil in his natural actions, but also in his supernatural salutary works in which Divine grace co-operates with his will. Molinism escaped every suspicion of Pelagianism by laying down at the outset that the soul with its faculties (the intellect and will) must be first constituted by prevenient grace a supernatural principle of operation in actus primo, before it can, in conjunction with the help of the supernatural concursus of God, elicit a salutary act in actus secundo. Thus, the salutary act is itself an act of grace rather than of the will; it is the co-action of God and man, and not, as the supernatural element of the act is due to God and its vitality and freedom to man. It must not be imagined, however, that the will has such an influence on grace that its consent conditions or strengthens the power of grace; the fact is rather that the supernatural principle of grace is first transformed into the vital energy of the will, as a supernatural concursus, excites and accompanies the free and salutary act. In other words, as a helping or co-operating grace (gratia adiuvans seu cooperans), it produces the act conjointly with the will. According to this explanation, not only does Divine grace make a supernatural act possible, but the act itself, though free, is wholly dependent on grace, because it is grace which makes the salutary act possible and which stimulates and assists in producing it. Thus the act is produced entirely by God as First Cause (Causa prima), and also entirely by the will as second cause (causa secunda). The unprejudiced mind must acknowledge that this exposition of the question incurring the suspicion of Pelagianism or Semi-pelagianism.

When the Thomists propound the subtiler question, through what agency does the will, under the influence and impulse of grace, cease to be a mere natural faculty (actus primus) and produce a salutary act (actus secundus), or (according to Aristotelian terminology) pass from potency into actuality, the Molinists answer without hesitation that it is no way due to the Thomistic predetermination (predeterminatio sive praemotio physica) of the will of God. For such a causal predetermination, coming from a will other than our own, is a denial of self-determination on the part of our own will and destroys its freedom. It is rather the will itself which holds the key, under the restrictions mentioned above, renders the prevenient grace (gratia praevieniens) co-operative and the completely sufficient grace (gratia vere sufficient) efficacious; for, to produce the salutary act, the free will need only consent to the prevenient and sufficient grace, which it has received from God. This theory reveals further the paradoxical fact that in the act of the will, God enters into the salutary act itself (actus secundus) only by means of a concomitant supernatural concursus (concursus simulaneous, gratia cooperans). The act, in so far as it is free, must come from the will; but the concursus praevius of the Thomists, which is ultimately identical with God's predestination of the free act, makes illusory the free self-determination of the will, whether in giving or withholding its consent to the grace. The two elements of the free act are thus to be understood as the concomitant grace and of efficacious grace (gratia efficax). Whereas Thomism derives the invariable success of efficacious grace from the very nature of this grace, and assumes consequently the grace to be efficacious intrinsically (gratia efficax sive cooperans), Molinism insists that the efficacy of grace to the free co-operation of the will and consequently admits a grace which is merely extrinsically efficacious (gratia efficax ab extrinsico). It is the free will that by the extrinsic circumstance of its consent makes efficacious the grace offered by God. If the will gives its consent, the grace which in itself is sufficient becomes efficacious: if it withheld its consent, the grace remains inefficacious (gratia ineficac), and it is due—not to God, but solely to the will that the grace it reduced to one which is merely sufficient (gratia minores sufficient). This explanation gave the Molinists an advantage over the Thomists, and that is, that they have safeguarded thereby the freedom of the will under the influence of grace, but especially because they offered a clearer account of the important truth that the grace, which is merely sufficient and therefore remains inefficacious, is nevertheless always really sufficient (gratia vere sufficient). Thus it would undoubtedly produce the salutary act for which it was given, if on the will could consent to concursus. Thomism, on the other hand, is confronted by the following dilemma: Either the grace which is merely sufficient (gratia minores sufficient) is able by its own nature and without the help of an entirely different and new grace to produce the salutary act for which it was given, or it is not: if it is not able, then this sufficient grace is in reality insufficient (gratia ineficac), since it must be supplemented by another; if it is able to produce the act by itself, then sufficient and efficacious grace do not differ in nature, but by reason of something extrinsic, namely in that the will gives its consent in one case and withholds it in the other. If then, when possessed of absolutely the same grace, one may be predeterminable and another remain obdurate, the inefficacy of the grace in the case of the obdurate sinner is due, not to the nature of the grace given, but to the sinful resistance of his free will, which refuses to avail itself of God's assistance. But for Thomism, which assumes an intrinsic and essential difference between sufficient and efficacious grace, so that sufficient grace become efficacious must be supplemented by a new grace, the explanation is by no means so easy and simple. It cannot free itself from the difficulty, as is possible for Molinism, by saying that, be it the refractory attitude of the will, God would have bestowed this supplementary grace. For, since the sinful resistance of the will, which is inherent in the act, is to be referred to a physical premotion on the part of God, as well as the free co-operation with grace, the will, which is predetermined ad unum, is placed in a hopeless predicament. On the one hand the physical premotion in the form of an efficacious grace, which is necessary to produce the salutary act, is lacking to the will, and, on the other, the entity of the past, free and efficacious act of Molinism, placed by God as the Prime Mover (Motor primus). Whence then is the will to derive the impulse to accept or to reject the one premotion rather than the other? Therefore, the Thomists conclude that the Thomists cannot lay down the sinful resistance of the will as the cause of the inefficacy of the grace, which is merely sufficient.
At this stage of the controversy the Thomists urge with great emphasis the grave accusation that the Molinists, by their undue exaltation of man's freedom of will, seriously circumscribe and diminish the supremacy of God. But this is contrary to the warning of St. Paul, that we must not glory in the work of our salvation as though it were our own (I Cor. iv, 7), and to his teaching that it is Divine grace which does not only give us the power to act, but "worketh also in us to will and to accomplish" (Phil. ii, 13); it is contrary also to the constant doctrine of St. Augustine, according to whom our free salutary acts are not our own work, but the work of grace.

The consideration of these serious difficulties leads us to the very heart of Molina's system, and reveals the real Gordan knot of the whole controversy. For Molinism attempts to meet the objections just mentioned by the doctrine of the Divine scientia media. Every one and the chief object that the idea of efficacious grace includes the free consent of the will, and also that the decree of God to bestow an efficacious grace upon a man involves with metaphysical certainty the free co-operation of the will. From this it follows that God must possess some infallible source of knowledge by means of which he knows from all eternity with metaphysical certainty, whether in the future the will is going to co-operate with a given grace or to resist it. When the question has assumed this form, it is easy to see that the whole controversy resolves itself into a discussion on the foreknowledge which God has of the free future acts; and thus the two opposing systems on grace are ultimately founded upon a priori logical grounds. Both systems are confronted with the wider and deeper question: What is the medium of knowledge (medium in quo) in which God foresees the (absolute or conditioned) free operations of His rational creatures? That there must be such a medium of Divine foreknowledge is evident. The Thomists answer: God foresees all future events (and by possibility) freely, and man in the eternal decrees of His Own will, which with absolute certainty produce praeveniendo as definite prae-determinaciones ad unum, all (absolute and conditional) free operations. With the same absolute certainty with which He knows His own will; He also foresees clearly and distinctly in the decrees of His will all future acts of man. However, the Molinists maintain that, since, as we remarked above, the predetermining decrees of the Divine Will must logically and necessarily destroy freedom and lead to Determinism, they cannot possibly be the medium in which God infallibly foresees future free acts. Rather these decrees must presuppose a special knowledge (scientia media) of the state of affairs, which at all times what attitude man's will would in any conceivable combination of circumstances assume if this or that particular grace were offered it. And it is only when guided by His infallible foreknowledge that God determines the kind of grace He shall give to man. If, for example, He foresees by means of the scientia media that St. Peter, after his denial of Christ, shall freely co-operate with a certain grace, He decrees to give him this particular grace and none other; the grace thus conferred becomes efficacious in bringing about his repentance. In the case of Judas, on the other hand, God, foreseeing the future resistance of this Apostle to a certain grace of conversion, decrees to give another grace which in itself was really sufficient, but remained inefficacious solely on account of the refractory disposition of the Apostle's will. Guided by this scientia media God is left entirely free in the disposition and distribution of grace. On His good pleasure alone it depends to whom He will give the supreme gift of final perseverance, to whom He will send a grace that He cannot withdraw, and to whom He will receive into Heaven, whom He will exclude from His sight for ever. This doctrine is in perfect harmony with the dogmas of the gratuity of grace, the unequal distribution of efficacious grace, the wise and inscrutable operations of Divine Providence, the absolute impossibility to merit final perseverance, and lastly the immutable decrees to glory or damnation; nay, more, it brings these very dogmas into harmony, not only with the infallible foreknowledge of God, but also with the freedom of the created will. The scientia media is thus in reality the cardinal point of Molinism; with it Molinism stands or falls. This doctrine of the scientia media is the battle-field of the two theological schools; the Jesuits were striving to maintain and fortify it, while the Dominicans are ever putting forth their best efforts to capture or turn the position. The theologians who have come after them, unhampered by the traditions of either order, have followed some the doctrine of the Jesuites, some the Dominican system.

The conviction directed against Molinism at its rise was, that its shibboleth, the scientia media, was a sheer invention of Molina and therefore a suspicious innovation. The Molinists on the other hand did not hesitate to hurl back at the Thomists this same objection with regard to their promotio physica. In reality both accusations were equally unfounded. As long as there is an historical element of the dogmas, it is natural that, in the course of time and under the supernatural guidance of the Holy Ghost, new ideas and new terms should gain currency. The deposit of faith, which is unchangeable in substance but admits of development, contains these ideas from the beginning, and they are brought to their full development by the inspired labors of a Pascal, Molina, or Fesquet. The idea of the scientia media Molina had borrowed from his celebrated professor, Pedro da Fonseca, S.J. ("Commentar. in Metaphys. Aristotelis", Cologne, 1615, III), who called it scientia mixta. The justification for this name Molina found in the consideration that, in addition to the Divine knowledge of the existing state of affairs (scientia visionis), there must be a third kind of "intermediate knowledge", which embraces all objects that are found neither in the region of pure possibility nor strictly in that of actuality, but partake equally of both extremes and in some sort belong to both kinds of knowledge. In this class are numbered especially those free actions, which, though never destined to be realized in historical fact, would come into existence if certain conditions were fulfilled. A hypothetical occurrence of this kind the theologians call a conditional future occurrence (actus liber conditionatus futuro seu futuribilis). In virtue of this particular kind of Divine knowledge of the state of affairs, it was possible for the Holy Ghost to instruct his hearers that the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon would have done penance in sackcloth and ashes, if they had witnessed the signs and miracles which were wrought in Corozain and Bethsaida (cf. Matt., xi, 21 sq.). We know, however, that such signs and miracles were not wrought and that the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon were not converted. Yet God had infallibly foreseen from all eternity that this conversion would have taken place if the condition (which never was realized) of Christ's mission to these cities had been fulfilled. Who will doubt that God in His omniscience foresaw distinctly what any inhabitant of New York would do throughout the day, if he were now in his situation? It is true that a number of Thomists, for example Lemastra ("De div. gratia auxilii"), Salamancus, 1611,
pp. 574 sqq.), denied, if not the existence, at least the infallibility of God’s knowledge concerning the conditioned free future, and attributed to it only great probability. But, from the time that such eminent theologians as Alvarez, Gonet, Gotti, and Billuart succeeded in harmonizing the infallibility of this Divine knowledge with the freedom of man, by the subtle theory of hypothetical Divine decrees, there has been no Thomist who does not uphold the omniscience of God also with regard to conditioned events. But have they not then become supporters of the scientia media? By no means. For it is precisely the Molinists who most sternly repudiate these Divine decrees with rigidity and absoluteness, as the deathknell of man’s freedom. For the very purpose of securing the freedom of the will and in no way to do violence to it by a physical premonition of any sort, the Molinists insisted all along that the knowledge of God precedes the decrees of His will. They thus kept this knowledge free and uninfluenced by any antecedent absolute or conditioned decree of God’s will. Molinism is pleaded to the following principle: The knowledge of God precedes as a guiding light the decree of His will, and His will is in no way the source of His knowledge. It was because by their scientia media they understood a knowledge independent of any decrees, that they were most sharply assailed by their opponents.

II. LATER DEVELOPMENT OF MOLINISM.—Thus far we have learned that the central idea of Molinism lies in the principle that the infallible success of efficacious grace is not to be ascribed to its own intrinsic nature, but to the Divine scientia media. The Society of Jesus has ever since clung tenaciously to this principle, but with the inward admitting itself bound to manifest all the assertions and arguments of Molina’s “Concordia”, on many points of secondary importance its teachers are allowed perfect freedom of opinion.

First of all it was clear to the Jesuits from the beginning and the disputations before the Congregatio de Auxilia (q. v.) did but strengthen the conviction, that a more perfect, more fully developed, and more accurate exposition of the Molinistic system on grace was both possible and desirable. As a modification of Molinism we are usually referred in the first place to that expansion and development, which afterwards took the name of Congrism (q. v.), and which owes its formal form to the joint labours of Bellarmine, Suarez, and Leses. As Congrism shows in detail, the system received its name from the gratia congrua, i.e. a grace accommodated to circumstances. By such is understood a grace which, owing to its internal relationship and adaptation to the state of the recipient (his character, disposition, education, place, time, etc.), produces its effect in the light of the scientia media with infallible certainty, and thus is objectively identical with efficacious grace. The expression is borrowed from St. Augustine, as when he says: “Cujus autem misericert, sic eum vocat, quomodo sit ei congruere, ut vocantem non respuit” (Ad Simplicianum, I, Q. ii, n. 13). Consistently then with this terminology, the grace which is merely sufficient in itself, is called gratia media with infallible certainty, which has not a congruity with the circumstances, and is therefore inefficacious. This term also is sanctioned by St. Augustine (l. c.), for he says: “Illi enim electi, qui congruerunt vocati; illi autem, qui non congruente neque contemperabantur vocationi, non electi, quia non securi, quamvis vocati”. This doctrine soon was advanced by Molina to this extent, that inefficacious grace and merely sufficient grace are made to differ even in acto primo—not indeed in their internal nature and physical entity, but in their moral worth and ethical nature—inasmuch as the bestowal of an ever so weak gratia congrua is an incomparably greater benefit of God than that of an ever so powerful gratia incongrua, the actual inefficacy of which God foresees from all eternity. Though Molina himself had taught this doctrine (“Concordia”, Paris, 1876, pp. 450, 466, 522, etc.), it seems that among his followers some extreme Molinists unduly emphasized the power of the will over grace, thus drawing upon themselves the suspicion of Semipelagianism. As a last Caneta of Belledonne, who advocated such one-sided Molinistic views, and who cannot have been mere imaginary adversaries; against them he skillfully strengthened the tenets of Congrism by numerous quotations from St. Augustine.

As was natural the later Molinism underwent considerable changes, and was improved by the unwearying labours of its authors. The scientia media—the most important factor in the whole system—on a deeper philosophical and theological basis, and to demonstrate its worth from a dogmatic point of view. The task was a very difficult one. The theory of the Thomistic decrees of the Divine will having been eliminated as the infallible source of God’s knowledge of free acts belonging to the divine future, some other theory had to be substituted. Molina’s doctrine, which Bellarmine and Becanus had made their own, was soon abandoned as savouring of Determinism. Molina (Concordia, p. 290, 303) transferred the medium of God’s infallible knowledge to the supercomprehensio cordis (supernaturalis, the searching of hearts). This supercomprehension, God knows the most secret inclinations and penetrates the most hidden recesses of man’s heart, and is thus enabled to foresee with mathematical certainty the free resolves latent in man’s will. This unsatisfactory explanation, however, met with the natural objection that the mathematically certain foreknowledge is an effect from its side, nothing more or less than the knowledge of a necessary effect; consequently the will would no longer be free (cf. Kleutgen, “De Deo Uno”, Rome, 1881, p. 322 sqq.). Therefore, the opinion, gradually adopted since the time of Suarez (but repudiated in Molina’s work), maintains that, by the scientia media, God sees the conditioned future acts in themselves, i.e. in their own (formal or objective) truth. For, since every free act must be absolutely determined in its being, even before it becomes actual or at least conditionally possible, it is from all eternity a definite truth (determinata veritas), and must consequently be knowable as such by the omnipotent God with metaphysical certainty. Ratzinger (“De Particul. e vocatione” in a society beyond his fellows, laid a deeper foundation for the theory, and succeeded in getting it permanently adopted by the Molinists. Further proofs for the scientia media may be found in Pohle’s “Dogmatik”, 4th ed., (1908), pp. 206 sq. However, when further investigations were made, so great and well-nigh innumerable were the difficulties which arose against the establishing of the absolute independence of the scientia media in regard to the Divine Will, that the greater number of the modern Molinists either give up the attempt to indicate a medium of Divine knowledge (medium in quo), or positively declare it to be superfluous; nevertheless, there are a few (e.g. Kleutgen, Condordi, Ratzinger) who make a distinction between the question of the actual existence of the scientia media and that of its process. While vigorously maintaining the existence of the scientia media, they frankly acknowledge their ignorance with regard to its process of operation. Thus, the scientia media, which was meant to solve all the mysteries concerning grace, seems to hold the greatest mystery of all. The most favourite statement of all, which may be made in its favour is that it is a necessary postulate in any doctrine of grace in which the freedom of the will is to be safeguarded; in itself it is but a theologoumenon. If we then consider that the Thomists also, with Billuart (De Deo dissert., Vili, art. iv, § 2 ad 6) at their head, call the reconciliation of their propòto
physica with the freedom of the will a "mystery," it would seem that man is not capable of solving the problem of the harmony between grace and free will. Another phrase, the development of his system, is the reason in the case of some of the Molinists have made concessions to the Thomists in the question regarding predestination, without however abandoning the essentials of Molinism. The theory of the *prae tensio physica* agrees admirably with the idea of an absolute predestination to glory irrespective of foreseen merits (prae tensio ante pravisa merita). This is the reason that they appear, except in the case of a few theologians, as a characteristic feature of the Thomistic doctrine on grace. Now, absolute predestination to glory necessarily involves the rather harsh doctrine of reprobation, which, though only negative, is nevertheless equally absolute. For, if God determines to bestow efficacious graces only upon those from whom He takes all eternity from post- to glory, those not contained in his decree of predestination are a priori and necessarily damned.

Some leading Molinists like Bellarmine and Suáres may possibly have been tempted to show the practical possibility of reconciling Molinism with the eternal and unchangeable decree of predestination by sidering with the doctrine of the probability in his questions. Consideration, without, however, sacrificing their allegiance to the *scientia media*. But the majority of Molina's followers, under the lead of Lessius and Vasques, most consistently held to the opposite view. For they admitted only a conditioned predestination to glory which becomes absolute only conditionally upon the foreseen merit of the elect (prae tensio propere—prae tensio merita), and rationally condemned negative reprobation on the ground that it not only limited but even ran counter to the salvific will of God. To-day there is scarcely a convinced Molinist who does not take along this reasonable standpoint. A modification of Molinism of minor importance arose with the new way of thinking in the Dominican schools, the *prae definitio bonorum operum* (by definition, in contradistinction to predestination to glory, theologians understand the absolute, positive, and efficacious decree of God from all eternity, that certain persons shall at some time in the future perform certain good works (cf. Francelin, "De Deo Uno", Paris, 1619). Thus, the Molinist work is either formal or virtual, according as God's decree governing these works and the bestowal of efficacious grace is either formal or merely virtual: Molina, Vasques, and Gregory of Valeriana defended virtual works, while Suárez, Tanner, Silvestre Maurus, and others upheld formal predestination. (See *Concordium;* Geneva, 1746.)
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MOLINOS, Miguel de, founder of Quietism, b. at Muni-

mesta, 21 Dec., 1640; d. at Rome, 28 Dec., 1696. In his youth he went to Valencia, where, having been ordained priest and received the degree of doctor, he held a benefice in the church of Santo Tomás and was confessor to a community of nuns. He pretended to be a disciple of the Jesuits and quoted them as his authorities. In 1661 he went to Rome as procurator in the cause of the beatification of Venerable Jerónimo Simón. Here, after residing in various other places, he finally took up his abode at the church of Sant' Alfonso which belonged to the Spanish Discalced Augustinians. The Jesuits and Dominicans having accused him of pernici- ous teachings, the Inquisition ordered his books to be examined. He defended himself well and was acquit-

ted; but again Cardinal d'Estrees, French ambassador at Rome, acting on instructions from Paris, denounced him to the authorities. In May, 1885, the Holy Office formulated charges against him and ordered his arrest. The report of the process was read on 3 September, 1695. After the Cross was shown, the books of Minerva, in the presence of an immense concourse of people gathered for the occasion by means of grants of indulgences; he was declared a heretic, sentenced to life imprisonment, to be perpetually clothed in the penitential garb, to recite the Credo and one hundred of the Rosary, and to make confession four times every year. He died of the effects on his deathbed. He taught interior annihilation, asserting that this is the means of attaining purity of soul, perfect contemplation, and the rich treasure of interior peace; hence follows the licentiousness of impure carnal acts, inasmuch as only the lower, sensual man, instigated by the demon, is concerned in them. In the case of ignorant and simple persons he excused their lascivious acts, and claimed that those committed by himself were not blameworthy, as free will had no part in them.

Innocent XI, in the Bull "Ceclestis Pastor" (2 November, 1687), condemned as heretical, suspect, erroneous, scandalous, etc., sixty-eight propositions to which Molinos had been accused, among which were:

1. Having inserted them in speech and in writing, communicated them to others, and believed them—propositions which are not those of the "Guia Espiritual" alone. Moreover, the pope prohibited and condemned all his works, printed or in manuscript. Molinos had followers in abundance; when he was arrested, it is said that twelve thousand letters from persons who identified him were found in his possession. More than two hundred persons at Rome found themselves implicated in the affair; several communities of nuns practised the "prayer of quiet", while the Inquisitorial proceedings in Italy lasted until the eighteenth century. In Spain, the Bishop of Oviedo, taken to Rome and imprisoned in the Castles of the Angel, the priest Juan de Caudallas, and the Carmelite lay brother Juan de Longas, who corrupted a convent of religious women, were all punished as disciples of
Molinism. In France, the semi-mysticism of Fénélon and Jeanne Guyon (q. v.) took from Molinos only the technique of "La divinazione," for the writing of mirrorGRADE

Molinos may be mentioned the following: (1) "La devoción de la buena muerte" (published at Valencia, 1662, under the name of Juan Bautista Calatalá); (2) "La Guia espiritual" (published first in Italian, at Rome, 1675, then, in Spanish, at Madrid, 1676), approved by various theologians and by ecclesiastical authority, so much so that twenty editions appeared in twelve years, in Latin (1687), French, English (1685), German (1699), etc.; (3) "Tratado de la Comunión eutodiana" (1687).

MENÉNDEZ PELAYO, Heterodoxos españoles, II (Madrid, 1880), 284. He was also a writer of "La devoción de la buena muerte" (Madrid, 1676), and one of the most famous of the "La Guia espiritual." His works were published in Amsterdam (1688), Schrâbel, Jahrbuch für Gesch. theologische, XXIV, XXV (Hamburg and Gota, 1855); RÁFEL URBANO, Guía devoción, ed. by J. Reina, Clarín, apuntar errores Michaelis Molinos (Mossina, 1697); GÓMEZ, Biblioteca antiqua et nova of esrmores escoceses de lasa... en forma de Diccionario biblódico-biográfico, II (Salamanca, 1885), 328.

ANTONIO PÉREZ GÓYENA.

Molitor, Wilhelm (pseudonym, Ulric Rießler and Benno Bronner), poet, novelist, and publicist, born in the Rhine Palatinate, 24 August, 1819; d. at Speyer, 11 January, 1880. After studying philosophy and jurisprudence in Munich and Heidelberg (1836-40), he held various juridical positions in the service of the State from 1843-9. But feeling himself called to the priesthood, the pious young jurist studied theology at Bonn (1849-51) and was ordained on 15 March, 1851. In the same year he became secretary to Bishop Weis of Speyer; on 11 November, 1857, he was elected canon of the cathedral chapter and, soon after, appointed custos of the cathedral, and professor of archaeology and homiletics at the episcopal seminary. He took part in the consultations of the German bishops at Bamberg (1861), and Seligmann (1863), and fulfills (1869) and in 1871 Pius IX summoned him to Rome as a consultant in the labour preparatory to the Vatican Council. From 1875-7 he was a member of the Bavarian Landtag. He was the chief promoter of the Catholic movement in the Palatinate, and advanced the Catholic cause especially by founding of the "Hälscher Presseverein," the daily paper "Rheinpfalz" and the "Katholische Vereindruckerei." His pronounced ultramontane principles made him unacceptable to the Bavarian Government, which in consequence repeatedly prevented his election to the See of Speyer. He is the author of numerous poems, dramas, novels, sketches, on the questions of the day, and a few juridical treatises. A complete bibliography of his works was published in 1881 in Speyer under the title "Domlieder," in 1846. His dramas are: "Kynast" (1844); "Maria Magdalena" (1863, 1874); "Das alte deutsche Handwerk" (1864); "Die Freigelaessene Nero" (1865); "Claudia Procula" (1867); "Julian der Apostat" (1867); "Des Kaisers Gueinstling," a tragedy of the times of the martyr (1874); "Die Blume von Siena" (1873), "Die künstlerische Spiele," containing the dramatic legend "Sankt Ursula Rheinsfahrten," the comedy "Die Villa bei Amalfi," the dramatic tale "Schön Gundel" (1875), and his three festive plays, -"Weihnachtsbaum" (1867), "Das Haus zu Nazareth" (1872), and "Die Weisen des Morgenlandes" (1877). His novels are: "Die Schone Zweierlei" (2 vols. (1844); "Der Jesuit" (1873); "Herr von Syllaubus" (1873); "Memoiren eines Todtenkopfs," 2 vols. (1875); "Der Caplan von Friedlingen" (1877); "Der Gast im Kyffhäuser" (1880). His juridical works are: "Ueber kanonisches Gerichtsverfahren gegen Cleriker" (1873); "Die Immunität des Domes zu Speyer" (1879); "Die Diöze des Rheinpfalzes" (2 vols. (1844); "Das Theater in seiner Bedeutung und seiner gegenwärtigen Stellung" (1866); "Ueber Goethes Faust" (1869); "Brennende Fragen" (1874); "Die Grossmacht der Presse" and "Die Organisation der Katholischen Press" (1866); and a few other works of minor importance. In 1890, the writer wrote "Papst Pius IX in seinen Leben und Wirken," 4th ed. (1875) and in collaboration with Witthäuser "Rom, Wegweiser durch die ewige Stadt" (1866, 1870).


MICHAEL OTT.

Molloy (O'MOLLOY), Francis, theologian, grammarian, b. in King's County, Ireland, at the beginning of the seventeenth century; d. at St. Isidore's, Rome, about 1684. At an early age he entered the Franciscan Order, and was afterwards appointed lecturer in philosophy at the college of Klosternueberg, near Vienna, and in 1645 passed to the chair of theology at Gratz. Here he published a Scotist work on the Incarnation.

About 1650 he was called to Rome and appointed primary professor of theology in the College of St. Isidore. During his residence in Rome he wrote several works on theological subjects and a long Latin poem on Prince Prosper Philip of Spain. In 1676 he published an Irish catechism under the title of "Lúcerna Fidelium seu Fasciculus deceptus de Doctrina Christiann." This work, in the Irish language and characters, was printed at the office of the Congregation of the Propaganda, and was translated into French by the Jesuit, Protector of Ireland. Father Molloy is best known as the author of the first Latin-Irish printed grammar (Grammatica Latina-Hibernica). This book also came from the press of the Propaganda (1677), and is dedicated to Cardinal Massimi, a great friend of the Irish. It is highly esteemed by writers on the Celtic languages, and is largely drawn upon by modern writers on Irish grammar.

WADDINGTON, Scripture Ord. Min. (Rome, 1806); O'NEILL, Irish Writers (Dublin, 1820); BRENNAN, Ecc. History of Ireland; RYAN, Worthies of Ireland (London, 1841); ANDER-SON, Historical Sketches of the Native Irish (London, 1846); DOUGLAS HUTCH, Literary History of Ireland (London, 1863); O'MOLLOY, Irish Proverbs, LT. OF L'AGNEAULX (Dublin, 1868).

GREGORY CLEARY.

Molloy, Gerald, theologian and scientist, b. at Mount Tallant House, near Dublin, 10 Sept., 1834; d. at Aberdeen, 1 Oct., 1906. Monsignor Molloy was a distinguished Irish priest and for many years a very popular and much admired figure in the intellectual life of Ireland. He was educated at Castleknock College, where he was very successful in his studies, and subsequently was ordained in 1857. He then he applied himself with enthusiasm to the study of theology and the physical sciences. In both departments his record was a brilliant one. He was barely twenty-three years of age when in 1857 he became professor of theology at Maynooth, and continued to hold that chair until 1874, when he accepted the presidency of natural philosophy at the Catholic University of Ireland. In 1883 he succeeded Dean Neville of Cork as Rector of the Catholic University, which office he occupied up to the day of his death. The varied nature of Monsignor Molloy's work in connexion with Irish education is very striking. He acted on the commission on manual training in primary schools, and filled the post of assistant commissioner under the Educational Endowment Act. As early as 1880 he became a member of the Senate of the Royal University of Ireland, and remained so till 1882, when he was appointed to a fellowship in the same university. In 1890 he became a member of the governing board of that institution, and in 1897 he was appointed vice-chancellor. He was also a member of the Board of Intermediate Education. As a lecturer and skilled experimentalist, Molloy was very successful in dealing with difficult scientific subjects and rendering them
easily intelligible and interesting to his hearers. Under the auspices of the Royal Dublin Society, of whose council he was a member, he delivered a series of lectures on natural science, and in particular on electricity, in which he was an acknowledged expert. On one occasion he joined issue on the subject of lightning conductors with no less an adversary than Sir Oliver Lodge. Among his works are: "Geology and Revelation" (1870), a fuller and matured treat- ment of a series of papers on geology in its relation with revealed religion, which appeared from time to time in the "Irish Ecclesiastical Record", and dealt with the supposed conflict between geology and revelation, solving the problem of reconciliation; "Outlines of a Course of Natural Philosophy" (1880); "Wonders in Science" (1888), an interesting collection of popular lectures on scientific subjects; "The Irish Difficulty, Shall and Will" (1897). He also translated a number of passages from Dante's "Purgatorio", wrote of the Passion Play at Oberammergau, and was a frequent contributor to several magazines. At the time of his sudden death, due to heart failure, Father Molloy was representing the then University of Aberdeen, and was one of those on whom the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred by the latter university a few days before. His career is another striking contradiction of the theory that a Catholic clergyman must necessarily be an object of persecution.

**Freeman's Journal** (Dublin, 2 Oct., 1900); **Molloy, Geology and Revelation; Idem, Glannings in Science; Dublin Review** (1872) and **Irish Ecclesiastical Record** (1880-9).

**PETER F. CUSICK.**

**Molo, Gasparo** (he wrote his name also Mola and Molo.), skilful Italian goldsmith and planisher, chiefly known as a medalist. (b. (according to Forrer) in Lucca, and d. in Lugano, date of death unknown). He was first active in Milan, then at Mantua, from 1608 at Florence, from which latter period we possess his first signed medal. Here he was maestro delle stampe della moneta. In 1609 he became well known by his medals commemorating the marriage and the ascension of Charles II. In 1609 to 1610 he cast the dies for the talers and the "medals of merit" conferred by the grand duke. According to Kenyon, it is not necessary to suppose that he gave up his connection with the Florentine court at this time, because, in the following years, he struck medals for the court in Mantua, and at Florence. In the Southern Tyrol and Campania, he was especially busy in 1612, 1616 he was again working in Florence in 1614 (certainly in 1615). The medals also, which he made after 1620 for Prince Vincenzo II of Mantua, may very well have been struck at Florence. His further sojourn in Tuscany seems to have been rendered distasteful to him by intrigues. About 1623 he moved to Rome, where he became a die-cutter at the papal mint in place of J. A. Moro, who died in 1623. Here he made a great many coins and medals for Urban VIII (1632-44), Innocent X (1644-55), and Alexander VII (1655-57). His last works date from 1634. As it seems strange that Molo should, at the age of eighty-four, still continue working with unabated strength, it is thought that another artist of his name—perhaps his son—continued Gasparo's work. Indeed, we find in 1639 a G. D. Molo, who might have been a son of Gasparo and who apparently died young; but it is more likely that Gasparo founded a school in Rome, and that his engravers worked according to his instructions and signed themselves with unabated strength, it is thought that another artist of his name—perhaps his son—continued Gasparo's work. Indeed, we find in 1639 a G. D. Molo, who might have been a son of Gasparo and who apparently died young; but it is more likely that Gasparo founded a school in Rome, and that his engravers worked according to his instructions and signed themselves with unabated strength, it is thought that another artist of his name—perhaps his son—continued Gasparo's work. Indeed, we find in 1639 a G. D. Molo, who might have been a son of Gasparo and who apparently died young; but it is more likely that Gasparo founded a school in Rome, and that his engravers worked according to his instructions and signed themselves with unabated strength, it is thought that another artist of his name—perhaps his son—continued Gasparo's work. Indeed, we find in 1639 a G. D. Molo, who might have been a son of Gasparo and who apparently died young; but it is more likely that Gasparo founded a school in Rome, and that his engravers worked according to his instructions and signed themselves with unabated strength, it is thought that another artist of his name—perhaps his son—continued Gasparo's work. Indeed, we find in 1639 a G. D. Molo, who might have been a son of Gasparo and who apparently died young; but it is more likely that Gasparo founded a school in Rome, and that his engravers worked according to his instructions and signed themselves with unabated strength, it is thought that another artist of his name—perhaps his son—continued Gasparo's work.
Molokai as foreign and as an apostasy from the worship of the true God. The offerings by fire, the probable identity of Moloch with Baal, and the fact that in Assyria and Babylonia Malik, and at Palmyra Malach-bel, were sun-gods, have suggested to many that Moloch was a fire- or sun-god.


FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Molokai, an interesting island, one of the North Pacific group formerly known as the Sandwich Islands, or as the Kingdom of Hawaii, then as the Republic of Hawaii, and since annexation by the United States of America as the Territory of Hawaii. This annexation was determined by joint resolution of Congress, signed by the President 7 July, 1898, the completed organization taking effect 14 June, 1900. Of the eight principal islands, Molokai is the fifth in size, 261 sq. miles; also fifth in population (2504, Census of 1900). Its location is between the islands of Oahu and Maui, separated from the latter by a channel only eight miles in width, and having no great depth. Molokai is about thirty-eight miles in length from east to west, and its average width is about seven miles. The island, however, was larger in its original volcanic formation. The mountain backbone was split or displaced, the northern part being submerged in the ocean; and there now remains a line of majestic cliffs and noble headlands that for unique grandeur can hardly be surpassed, the great ocean beating at their base except where the few valleys or gulches form open places and where the cliffs recede like Naomi. The irregular line of bold mountain face varies in height from 2200 feet in the central part of the island to 3500 feet towards the east. Some higher peaks lie farther back in the eastern part, the highest being almost 5000 feet. All of these highlands are strangely seamed by erosion; verdure has crept in, covering the protected parts, and in some places good-sized trees are growing. Except in the very dry times, many riviètes appear, disappear, come again to the surface or in the open places in kaleidoscopic variety. After heavy rains these little streams become torrents and from overhanging places leap into the open, and are caught and carried away by the winds. In the mountains back of the open-faced northern coast, many wild deer are found. A coral reef, about half a mile in width, fringes the southern coast. The slopes to the south and lower-lying parts are used for grazing. Owing to the uncertainty of the supply of water, the island is not well adapted to agriculture. Honey is an important export. Some attempt has been made at sugar planting, without much success. This picturesque and lovely island is favored in being out of the cyclone belt, and in having no snakes.

LEPER SETTLEMENT.—The entire northern coast of Molokai has but one projection of land. The gulches are merely open places, like the mouth of a pocket, but just about in the central part of the coast, where the cliff is 2200 feet, there is at its base the Leper Settlement Peninsula (52 miles from Honolulu, 47 miles from the mouth of a horseshoe shape, about two miles wide near the cliff (pali), and projecting about two miles into the ocean. Around the extreme point this new coast line is from 100 to 150 feet high; nearer the pali it is not so much; at Kalawao, the eastern side, about fifty feet only; and at Kalaupapa, the western side, it is even less. An old and very difficult trail over the pali has been improved so that carrying the mails twice a week to and from the steamer landing of Kaluakalakai, on the southern side of the island, is practicable, and occasionally a passenger (usually an official) comes or goes that way. The steamer comes around to the landing at Kalaupapa once a week. This peninsula has been formed by the action of a local volcano, and the main island was formed. The dead crater, Kauhako, occupies a central part of the peninsula, and has a will of blackish water, up the surface keeping on a level with the ocean, its greatest depth being 570 feet. The entire formation is very porous, with many cavernous cavities. Just off Kalawao, and fronting the mouth of Waikalo Valley, are two masses of rock projecting from the sea, one known as Pilikana, the other Ola. Leprosy first appeared in the Hawaiian Islands in 1853. In 1864 its spread had become so alarming that 3 Jan., 1865, in the reign of Kamehameha V, the Legislarate passed "An act to prevent the spread of leprosy", the execution of the law being in the hands of the Board of Health. In 1868-69, there were 274 persons on the islands reported to be lepers. Under the act of 3 Jan., 1865, segregation was begun, and plans were made for a separate island for the lepers. This island was purchased for this in Palolo Valley, Island of Oahu, but when it became known in the neighbourhood, objections were so strong that the effort was abandoned. A site was then secured at Kalihi, near Honolulu, well separated from the other habitations, and in November, 1865, the hospital was established here. This was for retention, examination, and to some extent medical treatment of the lepers or suspects. This was indeed good; but the need was felt of a larger and more permanent settlement, isolated for those declared to be lepers, to be operated in connexion with the Kalihi Hospital, where efforts would continue for the cure of cases in the early stages. In locating a leper settlement the search was soon directed to the Molokai Peninsula, so well protected by the sea in front and by the towering cliff behind. Favored as it is by the wholesome trade-winds from the northeast, a place better adapted could hardly have been found. The Board of Health established its authority here on 6 Jan., 1886. Waikalo Valley, connected with the peninsula on the eastern side, becomes visible from other directions, was first selected, as the rich land there could be cultivated, and the little colony might become self-supporting. This attempt did not succeed, the deep valley being rather moist for habitaa-
tion. Therefore, a good part of the holdings upon the eastern and middle portions of the peninsula were secured and improvements were rapidly made. Hinalo Valley has not been useless, however, but has been used for cultivation of taro. The non-leper residents still remained at Kaluapapa, the steamer landing. In the time of these beginnings (1863-68) Dr. F. W. Hutchinson was President of the Board of Health, and was Minister and Improvement Commissioner from 26 April, 1865, until 11 Dec., 1872. Mr. R. W. Meyer, a resident of the mountain-top above the settlement, was Board of Health Agent and attended to the business. He continued as agent, the practical and very efficient business manager of the Leper Settlement until his death, 12 June, 1897.

The physician at Kalihi Hospital reported 2 March, 1866, having received 158 lepers, 57 of whom were sent to Molokai Asylum, 101 remaining at Kalihi Hospital for treatment. In sending to Molokai, some difficulty attended the separating of relatives. Therefore, a few non-leper relatives were allowed to go along as helpers or Kokuas. Some cattle and sheep were also sent to Molokai. For Kalihi Hospital, and Molokai Asylum (for settlement, as it generally became known later), the total amount of expenses in 1866 was $10,012.48.

Matters went on pretty well at first, but after some time an ugly spirit developed at Molokai. Drunken and lewd conduct prevailed. The easy-going, good-natured people seemed wholly changed. Thus the President of the Board of Health reported at some length in 1868; but he was able to state that a change for the better had come. Improvements had been made at Molokai, including the building of an hospital. Mr. and Mrs. Walsh had been employed to take charge in February, 1867, relieving Mr. Leparat, who had resigned. Mr. and Mrs. Walsh to act as schoolmaster and magistrate. Mrs. Walsh as nurse. This 1868 report gives the number of lepers received at Molokai as 179, the number remaining at the Kalihi Hospital as 43, the total amount of expenses for Kalihi Hospital and Molokai Settlement since 1866 amounting to $24,803.60.

From this time on, efforts were continually made to render the segregation and treatment of lepers more effective. Many difficulties were met and overcome. To keep good order in those early years was always difficult. The lepers were increasing in number. Nearly all who came to the settlement were located at Kalawao, on the eastern side of the peninsula, the leper settlement practically continuing there for many years. In 1890 a better supply of water was brought from Waikaloa and the settlement was extended to Kalapapa, the steamer landing. A reservoir was constructed midway on the ridge between Kalawao and Kalapapa. Previous to that time a pipe was laid from a small reservoir in Waialea Valley, between Waikaloa and Kalawao, and extended only partly through Kalawao. At Kalapapa, two miles distant, the water was pumped up into the Waialua Valley in containers upon horses and donkeys. The people at Kalapapa were chiefly non-lepers who lived there before settlement times. Their holdings (kuleanas) had not yet been secured for the lepers as those at Kalawao had been. This was done, however, in 1894, since, after the waterpipe was laid to Kalapapa, the people had begun to drift to that way, and the public buildings also, the shops, etc., had gradually been moved to that place. Therefore it was wisely determined that, in the interest of good order, as well as for convenience, the Government should own and control the entire peninsula and all of its approaches, the non-lepers being so accommodated. This was quite thoroughly accomplished in 1894.

**FATHER DAMIEN AND THE FRANCISCAN SISTERS.**

It is the name of Father Damien, however, that has made Molokai known throughout the whole world. He came to the Molokai Settlement to remain, 11 May, 1873. Good order in the settlement was somewhat precarious. Damien's determined character proved to be of great value. Besides his priestly offices, there was opportunity for his efforts at every turn. With a hungry zeal for work, he accomplished many things for the good of the place; he helped the authorities, and brought about a good spirit among the people. Ten years later (1883) the Franciscan Sisters came to Honolulu from St. Mary's, N. Y., having been engaged by the Hawaiian Government. They expected coming to the settlement at once, but the authorities concluded that conditions there were unsuitable, that better order must be secured, and some improvements made in buildings, etc. So the sisters remained at Kakaako Branch Hospital, near Honolulu, for about six years, a certain number of newly gathered lepers being retained there. This hospital was given up when the sisters came to Molokai. At the settlement in 1883 conditions would indeed have been intolerable for the sisters, and the same was true in 1886 when the writer joined Father Damien; but matters were being gradually improved. At last three sisters came to Kalapapa 15 Nov., 1888. Bishop Home for girls and women had been built. Two more sisters came 6 May, 1889, Robert Louis Stevenson coming by the same boat for a visit. Father Damien died 15 April, 1889. His death, after such a life, arrested the world's attention. A spontaneous outburst of applause from everywhere at once followed. The sixteen years of labour on Molokai made a record that seemed unique to the world at large. The world knew very little about lepers, and Father Damien's life came as a startling revelation of heroic self-sacrifice. He is acknowledged the Apostle of the lepers, and whatever others may do in the same field will help to perpetuate his fame and honour. A monument was offered by the people of England, and accepted by the Hawaiian Board of Health. It was given a place at Kalapapa, not far from the steamer landing, near the public road now called "Damien Road", adjoining the sisters' place at Bishop Home. The monument in itself is interesting, being an antique cross, fashioned and adapted from stone cutting of about the sixth century, such as was found in the ruins of the Seven Churches of Clonmacnoise on the river Shannon, Ireland. It was transferred by the Board of Health to the Catholic Mission on 11 Sept., 1893, the Bishop coming to receive and bless it. Two miles away, at the other end of the Damien Road, in Kalawao, the body of Father Damien lies, close by the church, where the Pandanus tree stood that sheltered him on his arrival in 1873. Over this grave stands a simple cross with the inscription on one side, "Father Damien", on the other,
"Damien Deveuster". The strong wooden coffin was placed in an excavation, and imbedded in a solid block of concrete. Since Father Damien's time, two men have usually been on duty at the settlement, one at Kalawao, the other at Kalaupapa. Father Pamphile Deveuster, Damien's brother, was here in 1895-7; he returned to Belgium, and died there 29 July, 1898.

GOVERNMENT AND THE LEPERS. — Public sentiment over the islands has always supported the Government in carrying out the law concerning lepers; official activity, although somewhat varying, has on the whole made fair progress; at times political interests have not been entirely favourable.

The first home at Kalawao, for orphan boys and helpless men, was begun in 1886 under Father Damien, with a few old cabins at the first, two large buildings being added in 1887-8, all irregular and provisional. The Government, however, recognized it as a home 1 January, 1889. Three Franciscan Sisters came to this Kalawao Home, 15 May, 1890, and the mother-superior visited it occasionally. In 1892-4 the present Baldwin Home was constructed, and put into use in May and June of 1893. The sisters were replaced 1 November, 1895, by four Brothers of the Picpus Order. Up to the present time (1910) the home has had, including those still living, 976 inmates. The Board of Health has always employed an experienced physician and other officials for the settlement. For many years the Hawaiians had strange ideas about regular physicians; now they would call on one and this continued at the settlement up to about 1902. They would, however, always take medicine from the brothers or sisters, and have had a friendly feeling for the Japanese treatment. It has been put in use, dropped, and revived many times. The elder Dr. Goto introduced it at Kakaako in 1886. Good order and favourable conditions were especially noteworthy in 1893. A glance over the records of the next ten years shows continued improvements in the water supply, enlarging of medical service, etc. Total expenses for segregation, support, and treatment of lepers for six years, ending 31 December, 1903, were $575,888.86.

In 1906 the buildings owned by the Government numbered 298; those owned by private parties numbered 150. In 1908 the lepers at Molokai numbered 791: of these, 693 were Hawaiians, 42 Chinese, 26 Portuguese, 6 Americans, 5 Japanese, 6 Germans, 2 South Sea Islanders, 1 Dane, 1 French Canadian, 1 Swede, 2 Porto Ricans, 1 Filipino, 1 Tahitian, 1 Russian, 1 Corean, 1 British Negro, 1 Hollander. The number of lepers at the settlement on 31 December was 115; it kept increasing until in 1890 the number reached 1213. Since then there has been a decrease until, 31 December, 1908, the number was 771. In 1908 the plan adopted in the earliest days (1865-69), of attempting to cure new cases, or any that seemed promising, before being sent to Molokai, has been abandoned. This new work could be more effective than in the early time because of the great advancements science has made in the past forty years. This new work is now carried on at Kalalau as it was over forty years ago, but in better buildings and under far greater advantages.

The general outfit at the Molokai Settlement is about complete: establishments for the medical department, hospital, dispensary, nursery, etc. There are bath houses and drug departments at the homes, and special houses for the sick. At Kalaupapa there are the poʻi factory, the shops, and warehouses, and the residences of the officials pleasantly located and well supplied with conveniences. A large building is used for outpatients, for white lepers, the furniture being furnished by generous friends throughout the islands. There are two Catholic churches, and several of other denominations. At Kalawao the most prominent features are Baldwin Home and the U.S. Leprosarium. This leprosarium is probably the greatest institution of its kind in the world. The appropriation by Congress was generous. The buildings are extensive, and the local improvements are based on scientific policy and latest invention, and everything in fact that present-day science can provide. Another new addition recently added by the U.S. Government is a fine lighthouse, a pyramidal concrete structure, the height of which is visible for about twenty-four miles.

Dr. Quinlan, Damien of Molokai, by the Way. The Water Resources of Molokai (Govt. Printing Office, Wash. D. C., 1903); Maio, Hawaiian Antiquities (Honolulu, 1905); Quinlan, Volcanoes in Hawaii (N.Y., 1904); Idem, Hawaiian Volcanoes (London, 1904); Alexander, A Brief History of the Hawaiian People (New York, 1901-99); Hiram, Hawaiian Annals (Honolulu, 1914-15); Herring, Hawaii and Its Volcanoes (Honolulu, 1910); Blackman, The Making of Hawaii (London, 1901); Bank, Around the World with Leopold (Chicago, 1901); Interior (Honolulu, 1904); Fremont, Report to Soc. of Nat. (Honolulu, 1867); Office of Immigration Board (Honolulu, 1886, 1888, 1904, 1909-10); Boethke, etc., Damien in the Catholic Encyclopedia.

Joseph Dutton.
ever, did not affect its industry. His literary im-
portance lies especially in his editions of ancient writ-
ing. The following may be mentioned: "Chronica
Eusebei, Hieronymi, Prosperi et Matthaei Palmerii"
(Milan, 1475); "Scriptores rei Augustae" (1475);
"Papiae Glossarium" (1476): "Mirabilia mundi" of
Solinus (s. a. s.). A very notable contribution to
hagiography, some of which were published in his
martyro-
logies, and lives of saints, which appeared un-
tilled by the title: "Sanctuarium" (2 folio vols., s. a. s.),
probably printed in 1480, and recently edited (Paris, 1910) by
the Benedictines of Solesmes (Boninus Mombritius,
Sanctuarium seu vitae Sanctorum. Novum editionem
cur. monachi Solesmeses. 2 tomi). He also com-
piled the "Scriptores rei Augustae" (1475), and in his editor-
ship of the ancient writings, and some printed sepa-
ately. Of the latter may be particularly mentioned
"De passione Domini" (reprinted, Leipzig, 1499).

De salu et operibus Bononis Mombritii testimonia selecta in the
above-mentioned new edition of the Sanctuarium, I (Paris, 1910),
xiii–xxii; FARNHUR, Biblioth. lat. V (Hamburg, 1736), 257;
Bibl.-script. Mediolan. I (Milan, 1754), ex-libri eii; HUNTER,

J. P. KIRSCH.

MONACO, PRINCIPALITY AND DIocese OF, situated
on the Mediterranean Sea, on the skirts of the Turbie
and the Tete de Chien mountains, is surrounded on
all sides by the French department of the Maritime
Alps. It possesses something inimitable. With its
beautiful climate, it is one of the most popular win-
ter resorts in Europe. Its principal resources are
the fishery of the gulf, the cultivation of fruit trees (olive,
orange, lemon), and the Casino of Monte Carlo, es-
established in 1856, whose revenues are sufficient to free
the inhabitants of the principality from the burden of
taxation.
The capital consists of two large bor-
oughs: the old Monaco, which is built on a promon-
ty that extends 875 yards into the sea and encloses
the harbour; the other two are Condamine and Monte
Carlo. From ancient times until the nineteenth cen-
tury the port of Monaco was among the most im-
portant of the French Mediterranean coast, but now
it has lost all commercial significance. Among the
notable constructions of the principality are the an-
cient fortifications, the old ducal palace which contains
beautiful frescoes by Annibale Carracci, Orazio Fer-
rari, and Carlone, the cathedral, built (1884–87) in the
Byzantine style, by Prince Albert III, the Casino of
Monte Carlo, and the monumental fountain of the
pulchra viridescens. It has been important to the Phœnicians, who, on the promontory upon which the
town is built, erected a temple to the god Mel-
kart, called Monocô, solitary, that is, not con-
ected with the cult of Ashtoreth; whence the town
derived its name, which is Moneque, in Provençal.
In the early Middle Ages the neighbouring lords often
contended with each other for the possession of this
important port, which later was occupied by the Sara-
cenas; it was taken from them in the tenth century by
Count Grimaldi, in whose family the principality re-
 mains to this day. Formerly, it comprised Mentone
and Roquebrune. The Grimaldi often had to defend
themselves against Spanish or Genoese fleets; the most
famous block of this port was the town of Perpignan,
which failed. In 1619 Prince Honoreus II, with the
assistance of the French, drove the Spaniards from
Monaco, and since that time the principality has been
under the protection of France. During the Revolu-
tion, Monaco was annexed to France, but the prin-
cipality was re-established in 1814. A revolution
broke out in 1848, and the resistance of the Prince
Honoreus V, who lost Mentone and Roque-
brune, these cities declaring themselves free republics,
and (1860) voting for their annexation to France.

Monaco belonged to the Diocese of Nice, but, in
1868, it became an abbey nullius, and at the instance
of Prince Charles III, Leo XIII raised it to a diocese,
immediately dependent upon the Holy See, making the
abbot, Mgr Bonaventure Theuret, its first bishop.

De Royer de Sainte-Susanne, La Principauté de Monaco
(Paris, 1884).

U. BENIGNI.

Monad (from the Greek word, μονάς), in the
sense of ultimate, indivisible unit, appears very early
in the history of Greek philosophy. In the ancient
accounts of the doctrines of Pythagoras, it occurs as
the name of the unity from which, as from a principle
(ἀρχή), all number and multiplicity are derived. In
the Platonic "Dialogues" it is used in the plural
(μοναί) as a synonym for the Ideas. In Aristotle,
"Metaphysics" It occurs as the principle of number, itself being devoid of quantity, indivisible and
unchangeable. The word monad is used by the neo-
Platonists to signify the One; for instance, in the
letters of the Christian Platonist Synesius, God is
described as the Monad of Monads. It occurs both in
ancient and medieval philosophy as a synonym for
atom, and is a favourite term with such writers as Gi-
diano Bruno, who speak in a rather indefinite manner
of the minima, or minutely small substances which
constitute all reality. In general, it may be affirmed
that while the term atom, not only in its physical, but
also in its metaphysical meaning, implies merely cor-
poral, or material attributes, the monad, as a rule,
unites mental, spiritual, and material or vital.
The term monad is, however, generally under-
stood in reference to the philosophy of Leibniz, in
which the doctrine of monadism occupies a position
of paramount importance. In order to understand his
disciple (see Leibniz) on this point, it is necessary to
recall that he was actuated by a twofold motive in his
attempt to define a new system of philosophy, in
harmony with the substance and style of his philos-
ophy. He endeavoured to reconcile the doctrine
of the atomists with the scholastic theory of
matter and form, and besides he wished to avoid on
the one hand the extreme mechanism of Descartes,
who taught that all matter is inert, and on the other
the monism of Spinoza, who taught that there is but
one substance, God. All this he hoped to accomplish
by means of his doctrine of monads. Descartes had
defined substance in terms of independent existence,
and Spinoza was merely inferring what was implicitly
contained in Descartes's definition when he concluded
that therefore there is only one substance, the
supremely independent Being, who is God. Leibniz pre-
sents to us a new theory of universal substance, or
monadism, and thus escapes Descartes's doctrine that
matter is by nature inert. At the same time, since the
sources of independent action may be manifold, he es-
capes Spinoza's pantheistic monism. The atomists
had maintained the existence of a multiplicity of mi-
nute substances, but had invariably drifted into a
materialistic denial of the existence of spirits and spir-
Itual forces. The scholastics had rejected this mate-
rialistic consequence of atomism and, by so doing, had
seemed to put themselves in opposition to the current
of modern scientific thought. Leibniz thinks he sees
a way to reconcile the atomists with the scholastics.
He teaches that all substances are composed of minute
particles which, in every case, in the lowest materials,
as well as in the highest spiritual beings, are partly
material and partly immaterial. Thus, he imagines,
the sharp contrast between atomistic materialism and
scholastic spiritualism disappears in presence of the
decision that all differences are merely differences of
degree.

The monads are, therefore, simple, unextended sub-
stances, if by substance we understand a centre of
force. They cannot begin or end except by creation
or annihilation. They are capable of internal activ-
ity, but cannot be influenced in a physical manner by
anything outside themselves. In this sense they are
independent. Moreover, each monad is unique; that
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is, there are no two monads alike. At the same time the monads must have qualities; "otherwise," says Leibniz (Monadol., n. 8), "they would not even be entities". There must, therefore, be in each monad the power of representation, by which it reflects all other monads in such a manner that an all-seeing eye could, by looking into one monad, observe the whole universe mirrored therein. This power of representation is different in different monads. In the lowest kind of substances it is unconscious—Leibniz finds fault with the Cartesians because they overlooked the existence of unconscious perception. In the highest kind it is fully conscious. We may, in fact, distinguish in every monad a zone of obscure representation and a zone of clear representation. In the monad of the greatest of dust, for example, the zone of clear representation is very restricted, the monad manifesting no higher activity than that of attraction and repulsion. In the monad of the human soul the region of clear representation is at its maximum, this kind of monad, the "queen monad", being characterised by the power of intellectual thought. Between these two extremes range all the monads, mineral, vegetable, and animal, each being differentiated from the monad below it by possessing a larger area of clear representation, and each being separated from the monad above it by having a larger area of obscure representation. There is then in every created monad a material element, the region of obscure representation, and an intellectual element, the region of clear representation. Everything in the created world is partly material and partly immaterial, and there are no abrupt differences among things, but only differences in the extent of the immaterial as compared with the material. Minerals shade off insensibly (in the case of crystals) into living things, plant life, animal life, and animal consciousness into intellectual thought. All created monads may be called souls. But, as feeling is sometimes more than simple perception, I am willing that the general name monads, or entelechies, shall suffice for those simple substances which have perception only, and that the term souls shall be confined to those in which perceptions are distinct, and accompanied by memory" (Monadol., n. 19). "We ascribe action to the monad in so far as it has distinct perceptions, and passivity, in so far as its perceptions are confused" (ibid., n. 49). If this is the only kind of activity that the monad possesses, how are we to account for the order and harmony everywhere in the universe? Leibniz answers by introducing the notion of Pre-established Harmony. There is no real action or reaction. No monad can influence another physically. At the beginning, however, God so pre-arranged the evolution of the activity of the monads that according as the body evolves its own activity, the soul evolves its activity in such a way as to correspond to the evolution of the body. "Bodies act as if there were no souls, and souls act as if there were no bodies; and yet both act as if one influenced the other" (ibid., n. 81). This pre-established harmony makes the world to be a cosmos, not a chaos. The principle extends, however, beyond the physical universe, and applies in a special manner to rational souls, or spirits. In the realm of spirits there is a subordination of souls to the beneficial rule of Divine Providence, and from this subordination results the "system of souls", which constitutes the City of God. There is, therefore, a moral world within the natural world. In the former God is ruler and legislator, in the latter He is merely architect. The architekton of the City of God is legislator and architect" (ibid., n. 89), because even in the natural world no good deed goes without its recompense, and no evil deed escapes its punishment. Order among monads is thus ultimately moral.

Since Leibniz' time the term monad has been used by various philosophers to designate indivisible centres of force, but as a general rule these units are not understood to possess the power of representation or perception, which is the distinguishing characteristic of the Leibnizian monad. Exception should, however, be made in the case of Renouvier, who, in his "Nouvelle monadologie", teaches that the monad has not only internal activity but also the power of perception.

Leibniz, Monadology, tr., in Journal of Spec. Phil. (1867), I. 129 sq.; Idem. tr. by DUCAN in Leibniz Philosophical Works (New Haven, 1890); Idem. tr. V. LATTES (Oxford, 1938) original in Opera Philos. ed. EHRMANN (Berlin, 1840); Idem, with notes, ed. PLAT (Paris, 1900); JASPER, Leibniz u. die Scholastik (Leipzig, 1889); MCFARLAND, Leibniz in Blackwood's Magazine (London, 1884); RENOUVIER ET PLAT, La nouvelle monadologie (Paris, 1890).

WILLIAM TURNER.

Monaghan, John James. See Wilmington, Diocese of.

Monarchians, heretics of the second and third centuries. The word, Monarchians, was first used by Tertullian as a nickname for the Patripassian group (adv. Prax., x.), and was seldom used by the ancients. In modern times it has been extended to an earlier group of heretics, who are distinguished as Dynamistic, or Adoptionist, Monarchians from the Modalist Monarchians, or Patripassians.

I. DYNAMISTS, OR ADOPTIONISTS.—All Christians hold the unity (necessary) of God as a fundamental doctrine. By that, the Baptist used to deny the Trinity, and they are with some reason called Monarchians. But the Adoptionists, or Dynamists, have no claim to the title, for they did not start from the monarchy of God, and their error is strictly Christological. An account of them must, however, be given here simply because the name Monarchian has been adhered to in spite of the repeated protests of historians of dogma. But their ancient and accurate name was Theodotians. The founder of the sect was a leather-seller of Byzantium named Theodotus. He came to Rome under Pope Victor (c. 190-200) or earlier. He taught (Philosophumena, VII, xxxv) that Jesus was a man born of a virgin according to the counsel of the Father, that He lived like other men, and was most pious; that at His baptism in the Jordan the Christ came down upon Him in the likeness of a dove, and therefore wonders (Svndimai) were not wrought in Him until the Spirit (which Theodotus called Christ) came down and was manifested in Him. They did not admit that this made Him God, but as He ascended to Heaven (cf. Eph. 4:10) and was thereafter Resurrection. It was reported that Theodotus had been seized, with others, at Byzantium as a Christian, and that he had denied Christ, whereas his companions had been martyred; he had fled to Rome, and had invented his heresy in order to excuse his fall, saying that it was but a man and not God that he had denied. Pope had had less objection to the study of Plato or the Stoics, and that he disliked their purely literal exegesis, which neglected the allegorical sense. They also emended the text of Scripture, but their versions differed, that of Aselepiodotus was different from that of Theodotus, and again from that of Hermophilus; and the copies of Apolloniades did not even tally with those of Theodotus. In another article, The Prophets", that is to say, they followed Marcion in rejecting the Old Testament.

The only disciple of the leather-seller of whom we know anything definite is his namesake Theodotus the banker (οι τραπεζης). He added to his master's doc-
to visit Rome was probably Praxeas, who went on to Carthage some time before 206-208; but he was apparently not in reality a heresarch, and the arguments refuted by Tertullian somewhat later in his book "Adversus Praxeum" were probably those of the Roman Monarchians (see Praxeas).

A. History.—Noetus (from whom the Noetians) was a Smyrnaean (Epiphanius, by a slip, says an Ephyrian). He called himself Moses, and his brother Aaron. When accused before the presbyterate of teaching that the Father suffered, he denied it; but after having made a few discourses he was again interrogated, and expelled from the Church. He died soon after, and did not receive Christain burial. Hippolytus mockingly declares him to have been a follower of Heraclius, on account of the union of opposites which he taught when he called God both visible and invisible, possible and impassible. His pupil Epiphanus came to Rome. As he was not mentioned in the "Syntagma" of Hippolytus, which was written in one of the first five years of the third century, he was not then well known in Rome, or had not yet arrived. According to Hippolytus (Philos., IX, 7), Cleomenes, a follower of Epiphanus, was allowed by Pope Zephyrus to establish a school, which flourished under his approbation and that of Callistus. Hage- gogus, one of his most noted students, was not a Noetian at all, and that he was an orthodox opponent of the incorrect theology of Hippolytus. The same writer gives most ingenious and interesting (though hardly convincing) reasons for identifying Praxeas with Callistus; he proves that the Monarchians attacked in Tertullian's "Contra Praxeum" and "Philosophumena" were not necessarily heretical; he denies that Tertullian means us to understand that Praxeas came to Carthage, and he explains the nameless refuter of Praxeas to be, not Tertullian himself, but Hippolytus. It is true that it is easy to suppose Tertullian and Hippolytus to have misrepresented the opinions of their opponents, but it cannot be said that Sabellius was not a follower of the heretical Noetus, and that Sabellius did not issue from his school; further, it is not obvious that Tertullian would attack Callistus under a nickname.

Sabellius soon became the leader of the Monarchians in Rome, perhaps even before the death of Zephy- rus (208). He is said to have had a brother named Theophilus. He said he was the first to found his views on the Gospel according to the Egyptians, and the fragments of that apocryphon support this statement. Hippolytus hoped to convert Sabellius to his own views, and attributed his failure in this to the influence of Callistus. That pope, however, excommunicated Sabellius c. 220 ("fearing me", says Hippolytus). Hippolytus accuses Callistus of now inventing a new heresy by combining the views of the Monarchians with those of Sabellius, although he excommunicated them both (see CALLISTUS I, POPE). Sabellius was apparently still in Rome when Hippolytus wrote the Philosophumena (between 230 and 235). Of his earlier and later history nothing is known. St. Irenaeus (Against Heresies, II, 1, 1) says that Sabellius was not a follower of Zephyrus, but this seems to rest on the fact that Pentapolis was found to be full of Sabellianism by Dionysius of Alexandria, c. 260. A number of Montanists led by Eshines became Modalists (unless Harmack is right in making Modalism the original belief of the Monta- nists and in regarding Eshines as a conservative).

Irenaeus (or at least his recension) most probably amplified the original Noetianism. There was still Sabellianism to be found in the fourth century. Marcellus of Ancyra developed a Monarchianism of his own, which was carried much further by his disciple, Photinus. Priscillian was an extreme Monarchian and so was Commodian ("Carmen Apol."). 269, 277, 711. The "Monarchian Prologues" to the Gospels found in most old MSS. of the Vulgate, were attrib-

trine the view that Melchisedech was a celestial power, who was the advocate for the angels in heaven. As Jesus Christ was for men upon earth (a view found among later sects.—See MELCHISEDECHANS). This teaching was expressed by the Hebrews and Romans, 3, and refuted at length by St. Epiphanius as Heresy 55, "Melchisedechans", after he has attacked the leather-seller under Heresy 54, "Theodotians". As he meets a series of arguments of both hereticians, it is probable that some writings of the sect had been before Hippolytus, whose lost "Syntagma against all heresies" supplied St. Epiphanius with all his information. After the death of Pope Victor, Theodotus, the banker, and Aselepiodotus designed to raise their sect from the position of a mere school like those of the Gnostics to the rank of a Church like that of Marcion. They held to a certain confessor named Natalius, and persuaded him to be called their bishop at a salary of 150 denarii (34 dollars) a month. Natalius thus became the first antipope. But after he had joined them, he was frequently warned in visions by the Lord, Who did not wish His martyr to be lost outside the Church. He neglected the visions, for the sake of the honour and gain, but finally was scourged all night by the holy angels, so that in the morning with haste and tears he betook himself in sackcloth and ashes to Paphos. From this he urges that the episcopal and clerical, and even of the laity, showing the seals of the blows, and was after some difficulty restored to communion. This story is quoted by Eusebius II (VI, xxviii) from the "Little Labyrinth" of the contemporary Hippolytus, a work composed against Artemon, a late leader of the sect (perhaps c. 225-30), whom he did not mention in the "Philosophumena". Our knowledge of Artemon, or Artemes, is limited to the reference to him made at the end of the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata (about 266-268), where that heretic was said to have followed Artemon, and in fact the teaching of Paul is but a more learned and theological development of Theodotion (see Samosata). The sect probably died out about the middle of the third century, and can never have been numerous. All our knowledge of it goes back to Hippolytus. His "Syntagma" (c. 205) is epitomized in Pseudo-Tertullian (Præscript., iii) and Philostratus, and is developed by Epiphanius (Her., liv. iv); his "Little Labyrinth" (with a fragment in V, 28) and "Philosophumena" are still extant. See also his "Contra Noetum" 3, and a fragment "On the Melchis- edechians and Theodotians and Athingani", published by Caspari (Tidskr. für der Evangel. Luth. Kirke, Ny Raekke, VII, 3, p. 307). But the Athingani are a later sect, for which see MELCHISEDECHANS. The Monarchianism of Photinus (q. v.) seems to have been akin to that of the Theodotians. All speculations as to the origin of the theories of Theodo- tians are fanciful. At any rate he is not connected with the Ebonites. The Alogi have sometimes been classed with the Monarchians. Litus in his "Quel- lenkritik der Epiphanius" supposed them to be even more than his "Philosophumena" and others made Logos, and Epiphanius in fact calls Theodotus an ἀναρτωμα of the Alogi; but this is only a guess, and is not derived by him from Hippolytus. As a fact, Epiphanius assures us (Her., 51) that the Alogi (that is, Gaius and his party) were orthodox in their Christ- ology (see MONTANISTS).

Monarchians properly so-called (Modalists) exaggerated the oneness of the Father and the Son so as to make them but one Person; thus the distinctions in the Holy Trinity are energies or modes, not Persons: God the Father appears on earth as Son; hence it seemed to their opponents that Monarchians made the Father suffer and die. In the West they were called Patrocinians, whereas in the East they are usually called Sabellians. The first X.—29
Monarchians

By von Dobich, and P. Corssen to a Roman author of the time of Callistus, but they are almost certain to be the work of Priscillianus, Bishop of Bostra, is vaguely said by Eusebius (H. E., VI, 33) to have taught that the Saviour had no distinct pre-existence before the Incarnation, and had no Divinity of His own, but that the Divinity of the Father dwelt in Him. Origen disputed with him in a council and convinced him of his error. The minutes of the dispute were known to Eusebius and it is clear whether Priscillianus was a Modalist or a Dynamist.

B. Theology.—There was much that was unsatisfactory in the theology of the Trinity and in the Christology of orthodox writers of the Ante-Nicene period. The simple teaching of tradition was explained by philosophical ideas, which tended to obscure as well as to elucidate it. The distinction of the Son from the Father was so spoken of that the Son appeared to have functions of His own, apart from the Father, with regard to the creation and preservation of the world, and thus to be a derivative and secondary God. The unity of the Divinity was commonly guarded by a reference to the unity of origin. It was said that God from the beginning spoke through His Son (as Reason, in vulco cordis, λόγος ἑδιδότος), before the Word was spoken (ἐς ὑπὸ Πατρίς, λόγος πρὸς παροικίαν), or was generated and became Son for the purpose of creation. The Alexandrians alone insisted rightly on the generation of the Son from all eternity; but thus the Unity of God was even less manifest. The writers of the Ante-Nicene period held the traditional Unity in Trinity, but it hardly squares with the Platonism of their philosophy. The theologians were thus defending the doctrine of the Logos at the expense of the two fundamental doctrines of Christianity, the Unity of God and the Divinity of Christ. They seemed to make the Unity of the Godhead in some way inferior to or even something less than the supreme God the Father. This is eminently true of the chief opponents of the Monarchians, Hippolytus, and Novatian. (See Newman, “The Causes of Ariandianism”, in “Tracta theolog. eccl.).” Monarchianism was the protest against this learned philosophising, which, to the simplicity of the faithful looked too much like a mythology or a Gnostic emanationism. The Monarchians emphatically declared that God is one, wholly and perfectly one, and that Jesus Christ is God, wholly and perfectly God. This was right, and even most necessary, and whilst it is easy to see why the theologians like Tertullian and Hippolytus opposed those who held that the Spirit is a separate divine person, it is not easy to see why they opposed this Platonism in general, but it is not evident that they had grasped the principle that the works of God ad extra are common to the Three Persons as proceeding from the Divine Nature; and they seem to have said simply that God as Father is invisible and impassible, but becomes visible and possible as Son. This explanation brings them curiously into line with their adversaries. Both parties represented God as one and alone in His eternity. Both made the generation of the Son a subsequent development; only Tertullian and Hippolytus date it before the creation, and the Monarchians perhaps not until the Incarnation. Further, their identification of the Father and the Son against it, and the violence of the Incarnation. The very insistence on the unity of God emphasized also the distance of God from man, and was likely to end in making the union of God with man a mere indwelling or external union, after the fashion of that which was attributed to Nestorianism. They spoke of the Father as “Spirit” and the Son as “flesh,” and it is surely surprising that the Monarchism of Marcellus should have issued in the Theodotianism of Photinus.

It is impossible to arrive at the philosophical views of Sabellius. Hagemann thought that he started from the Stoic system as surely as his adversaries did from the Platonic. Dorner has drawn too much upon his imagination for the doctrine of Sabellius; Harnack is too fanciful with regard to its origin. In fact we know little of him but that he said the Son was the Father (so Novatian, “De Trin.” 12, and Pope Dionysius relate). St. Athanasius tells us that he said the Father is the Son and the Son is the Father, one in substance, and his teaching was that there are divisions of gifts, but the same Spirit, so that the Father is the same, but is developed into Son and Spirit” (Orat., IV, c. Ar., xxv). Theodoret says he spoke of one hypostasis and a threefold epistasis, whereas St. Basil says he willingly admitted three

Theologically identifying Christ with the one God. “What harm am I doing”, was the reply made by Novatian to those who reproved him for glorifying Christ? They replied: “We too know in truth one God; we know Christ; we know that the Son suffered even as He suffered, and died even as He died, and rose again on the third day, and is at the right hand of the Father, and cometh to judge the living and the dead; and what we have learned we declare” (Hippol., “Contra Naucrat.”). Here we are told that the Father and the Son were really identified, then no denial on their part could prevent the conclusion that the Father suffered and died, and sat at His own right hand. Hippolytus tells us that Pope Zephyrinus, whom he represents as a stupid old man, declared at the instance of Callistus: “I know one God the Father! I know Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and Who suffered”; but he added: “Not the Father died, but the Son”. The reporter is an unsympathetic adversary; but we can see why the aged pope was viewing the simple assertions of Sabellius in a favourable light. Hippolytus declares that Callistus said that the Father suffered with the Son, and that Tertullian was the first to be surprised that the Sabellians did not give to God the Son such essential distinctions as the Son was a man. Hagemann thinks Callistus-Praxeas especially attacked the doctrine of the Apologists and of Hippolytus and Tertullian, which assigned all such attributes as impassibility and invisibility to the Father and made the Son alone capable of becoming visible and manifest, ascribing to Him the work of creation, and all that is true of the Son is true of the Father, and who opposed this Platonizing in general, but it is not evident that they had grasped the principle that the works of God ad extra are common to the Three Persons as proceeding from the Divine Nature; and they seem to have said simply that God as Father is invisible and impassible, but becomes visible and possible as Son. This explanation brings them curiously into line with their adversaries. Both parties represented God as one and alone in His eternity. Both made the generation of the Son a subsequent development; only Tertullian and Hippolytus date it before the creation, and the Monarchians perhaps not until the Incarnation. Further, their identification of the Father and the Son against it, and the violence of the Incarnation. The very insistence on the unity of God emphasized also the distance of God from man, and was likely to end in making the union of God with man a mere indwelling or external union, after the fashion of that which was attributed to Nestorianism. They spoke of the Father as “Spirit” and the Son as “flesh,” and it is surely surprising that the Monarchism of Marcellus should have issued in the Theodotianism of Photinus.

It is impossible to arrive at the philosophical views of Sabellius. Hagemann thought that he started from the Stoic system as surely as his adversaries did from the Platonic. Dorner has drawn too much upon his imagination for the doctrine of Sabellius; Harnack is too fanciful with regard to its origin. In fact we know little of him but that he said the Son was the Father (so Novatian, “De Trin.” 12, and Pope Dionysius relate). St. Athanasius tells us that he said the Father is the Son and the Son is the Father, one in substance, and his teaching was that there are divisions of gifts, but the same Spirit, so that the Father is the same, but is developed into Son and Spirit” (Orat., IV, c. Ar., xxv). Theodoret says he spoke of one hypostasis and a threefold epistasis, whereas St. Basil says he willingly admitted three
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aphrodisia in one hypostasis. This is, so far as words go, exactly the famous formula of Tertullian, "tres personae, una substantia," but Sallustius seems to have meant "three modes or characters of one person." The Father is the Monad of whom the Son is a kind of manifestation; for the Father is in Himself silent, inactive (σωφρον, ἀπεργήτητος), and speaks, creates, works, as Son (Athanal., 1, c., 11). Here again we have a parallel to the teaching of the Athanasians: of the person of the Son to be, as it were, identified with the Apologiste to date Sonship from the creative action of God. But we have few texts to go upon, and it is quite uncertain whether Sallustius left any writings. Monarchianism is frequently combated by Origen. Dionysius of Alexandria fought Sallustianism with some imprudence. In the fourth century the Athanasian formula was professed much less than it was in Sallustius and Origen, and indeed the alliance of Pope Julius and Arius with Marcellus gave some colour to accusations against the Nicene formulas as opening the way to Sallustianism. The Fathers of the fourth century (as, for instance, St. Gregory of Nyssa, "Contra Sallustium," ed. Mai) seem to contemplate a more developed formula, as if they were asking for a definition of the "Noetum" and "Philosophumena" and through him, to Epiphanius: the consummation of creation is to consist in the return of the Ἀγγέλος from the humanity of Christ to the Father, so that the original unity of the Divine Nature is after all held to have been temporally compromised, and only in the end will it be restored, etc.

Our chief original authorities for early Monarchianism of the Modalist type are Tertullian, "Adversus Praxean," and Hipppolytus, "Contra Noetum" (fragments) and "Philosophumena." The "Contra Noetum" and the lost "Syntagma" were used by Epiphanius, Hær. 57 (Noetians), but the sources of Epiphanius's Hær. 62 (Sallustians) are less certain. The references by Origen, Novatian, and later Fathers are somewhat indefinite.

The best Catholic exposition of Monarchianism is by Hagerman, Doctrines of the Church (Freiburg, 1884); the best recent account, Harnack, Realencyclopadie s. v. Monarchianismus (1903); Dönhoff, Entwicklungs geschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi, ed. by E. Beyschlag, 1926; Schulte, "Doctrine of the Person of Christ" (5 vols., Edinburgh, 1881-93); Bornemann, Die Taufe Christi in der dogmatischen Beurteilung der vier ersten Jahrhunderte, Leipzig, 1883; Lassmann, "Philosophus Theologus et Calixtus" (1850); Tr. Hippolytus et Calixtus (Edinburgh, 1870); Salmen in Doctr. Christ. Begr. s. v. Sallustianism and Sallustianism; Fuchtrup in Kirchenlex., s. v. Sallustium, Ducelau, "Histoire ecclésiastique de l'Espagne," I (Paris, 1900); T. Early History of the Christian Church (London, 1899); Tremaunt, History of the Popes, I (Paris, 1903); and the History of Dogma by Schwabe, Harnack, etc.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Monarchia Sicula, a right exercised from the beginning of the sixteenth century by the secular rulers of Sicily, according to which they had final jurisdiction in purely religious matters, independent of the Holy See. This right they claimed on the ground of a papal privilege. The oldest document advanced in support of the claim is a Bull of 1071, 1117, addressed by Urban II to Count Roger I of Sicily (Jaffé, loc. cit., 6582), confirmed this privilege and defined it more clearly. He bestowed upon the same Roger 13 Gelati, a papal privilege to legislate be sent thither, that is a representative of the pope, you in your zeal shall secure the execution of what the legate is to perform (ea videlicet ratione, ut si quando ille ex latere nostrum legatur dirigatur, quem profecto vicarium intelligimus, quae ab eo gerenda sunt, per tuum indigamns effectus mancipientur). Urban II had this the same Roger (together with a papal legate) power to levy taxes by the secular rulers; according to the Bull of Paschal II this meant that, when a papal legate was sent to Sicily to exercise jurisdiction in certain ecclesiastical matters as the pope's representative, he must communicate the nature of his commission to the secular ruler, who would then execute in person the pope's orders. In place of Roger 1 in his absence there was a question not of a jurisdiction of the princes of Sicily independent of the Holy See, but only of the privilege of the secular rulers to execute the precepts of the supreme Church authorities; in other words, the sovereign of Sicily was privileged, but also bound, to carry out papal regulations in his kingdom. As a result of the feudal relationship between the princes of Sicily and the pope, ecclesiastical matters here took on a more pronouncedly political character than elsewhere, and the Church in Sicily was reduced to the greatest dependence upon the secular power. However, up to the beginning of the sixteenth century the privileges enjoyed by Urban II were never invoked or even mentioned. When Ferdinand II of Aragon became King of Sicily, his secretary, Luca Bar beri of Noto in Sicily, undertook to collect the official documents by which the rights of the kings of Sicily, both in ecclesiastical and in secular matters, were clearly determined. To this collection (Calabrosetto) obtained a collection in 1518, the "Libere Monarchiae," meant to prove that the secular rulers of Sicily had always exercised the spiritual power. In this "Libere Monarchiae" the privilege conferred by Urban II in regard to the legatine power was first published. The kings urged it to give a legal basis to the authority they had long exercised over the local Church. They also used it to extend their pretensions that, by virtue of an old papal privilege, they possessed ecclesiastical authority in spiritual matters to be exercised independently of the pope. Despite doubts expressed concerning the genuineness of the Urban document, Ferdinand declared on 22 January, 1518, "As for the Kingdom of Sicily, where we exercise the supervision over the men and the clergy, and the exercise of a number of ecclesiastical rights belonging to the bishops, so that papal jurisdiction was almost wholly excluded.

When Baroniun, in an excursus on the year 1097 in the eleventh volume of his "Annales ecclesiastici" (Rome, 1605), produced solid reasons against the genuineness of Urban II's Bull and especially against the legitimacy of the bull itself, ecclesiastical rights arose, and the Court of Madrid prohibited the eleventh volume from all countries of the Spanish Empire. Baronius omitted the excursus in the second edition of the "Annales" (Antwerp, 1608), but pub-
lished instead a special "Tractatus de Monarchia Sicula". During the War of the Spanish Succession another serious conflict arose between the Papal Curia and the Spanish court in regard to this alleged legitime power. The occasion of the dispute was a question of canon law, and the Spanish court obtained, after Count Victor Amadeus had been made King of Sicily by the Peace of Utrecht and had been crowned at Palermo (1713). On 20 February, 1715, Clement XI declared the Monarchia Sicula null and void, and revoked the privileges attached to it. This edict was not recognized by the monarchs of Sicily, and, when a few years later the island came under the rule of Charles VI of Austria (1711-1713) entered into negotiations with him with the result that the Decree of Clement XI was withdrawn, and the Monarchia Sicula restored, but in an altered form. The king, through the concession of the pope could now appoint the "Judex Monarchiae Sicula", who was at the same time to be the delegate of the Holy See and empowered to decide the most important ecclesiastical and religious matters. On the basis of this concession the kings of Sicily demanded more and more far reaching rights in ecclesiastical affairs, so that fresh struggles with the Holy See constantly arose. The situation grew ever more unbearable. Pius IX tried in vain by amicable adjustments to enforce the essential rights of the Holy See (1846-1878). Besides those who claimed the rights of the papal legate, and, during the service in the cathedral at Palermo, caused the charter of the province, caused the legatine honour to be claimed in the Bull "Suprema" of 28 January, 1864, which was not published with the prescriptions for its execution until 10 October, 1867, Pius IX revoked the Monarchia Sicula finally and formally in the government of Victor Emmanuel II. An ordinance of 1st June, 1868, and the "Judex Monarchiae Sicula", Rinaldi, refused to submit, for which he was excommunicated in 1868. Article 15 of the Italian law of guarantees (15 March, 1871) explicitly revoked the Monarchia Sicula, and the question was thus finally disposed of.

Secura. Die Monarchia Sicula. Eine historisch-anamnische Untersuchung (Freiburg, 1860), which contains the older literature (pp. 4-6); FORNIO, Storia della apostolica legazione annessa alla consolato di Napoli (Naples, 1809); SCIARDI, Storia del dottor Francesco Vanni, nazione Sicula (Palermo, 1826); GIANNONE, Il tribunale della Monarchia Sicula (Rome, 1892); CARFAR, Die Legatengewalt der normannisch-sizilischen Herrscher im 12. Jahrh. in Quellen und Forschungen aus Italien. Archiven u. Bibliotheken, VII (1904), 189-219.

J. P. KINDSCH

Monasteries, Double, religious houses comprising communities of both men and women, dwelling in contiguous establishments, united under the rule of one superior, and using one church in common for their liturgical offices. The reason for such an arrangement was that the spiritual needs of the nuns might be attended to by the priests of the male community, who were associated with them more closely than would have been possible in the case of entirely separate and independent monasteries. The system came into existence almost contemporaneously with monasticism itself, and like it had its origin in the East. Communities of women gathered around religious founders in Egypt and elsewhere, and from the life of the nuns under his rule and their relation to the male communities founded by him. Double monasteries, of which those of St. Basil and his sister, Macrina, may be cited as examples, were apparently numerous throughout the East during the early centuries of monasticism. It cannot be stated with any certainty when the system found its way into the West, though it seems probable that its introduction into Gaul may be roughly ascribed to the influence of Cassian, who did so much towards reconciling Eastern monasticism with Western ideas. St. Cassarius of Arles, St. Aurelian, his successor, and St. Radegundis, of Poitiers, founded double monasteries in the sixth century, and later on the system was propagated widely by St. Columbanus and his followers. Remiremont, Jouarre, Brie, Chelles, Andelys, and Soissons were other well-known examples of the seventh and eighth centuries. From Gaul the idea spread to Belgium and Germany and also to Spain, where it is said to have been introduced by St. Fructuoso in the middle of the seventh century. According to Veys there were in Spain altogether over two hundred double monasteries.

Ireland presents only one known example—Kildare—but probably there were others besides, of which all traces have since been lost. In England most of the early foundations were double; this has been wrongly attributed to the influence of the Anglo-Saxon nuns Educated in Gaul, where the system was then in vogue, but it seems more correct to ascribe it to the religious influence of the missionaries from Iona, since the first double monastery in England was that of St. Hilda at Whitby, established under the guidance of St. Aidan, and there is no evidence to show that either St. Aidan or St. Hilda was acquainted with the double organization in use elsewhere. Whitby was founded in the seventh century, and in a short time England became covered with similar dual establishments, of which Coldingham, Ely, Sheepway, Minster, Wimborne, and Barking are prominent examples. In Italy, the only other countries in which double monasteries are known to have existed, they were not numerous, but St. Gregory speaks of them as being found in Sardinia (Ep. xi), and St. Bede mentions one at Rome (Hist. Eccl., IV, 1). The Danish invasions of the ninth and tenth centuries destroyed the double monasteries of England, and, when they were restored, it was for one sex only, instead of the old community. The system seems to have died out also in other countries at about the same time, and it was not revived until the end of the eleventh century when Robert of Arbrissel inaugurated his reform at Fontevrault and gave the idea a fresh lease of life. It is not surprising to find that such a system was sometimes abused, and hence it was always an object of solicitude and strict legislation at the hands of ecclesiastical authority. Many synodal and conciliar decrees recognized its dangers, and ordered the strictest surveillance of all communications passing between monks and nuns. Too close proximity of buildings was frequently forbidden, and every precaution was taken to prevent any danger to the nuns. Probably it was this scant favour shown by the Church towards it that caused the gradual decline of the system about the tenth century.

In many double monasteries the supreme rule was in the hands of the abbess, and monks as well as nuns were subject to her authority. This was especially the case in England, e.g. in St. Hilda's at Whitby and St. Etheldrada's at Ely, though elsewhere, but more rarely, it was the abbot who ruled both men and women, and sometimes, more rarely still, each community had its own superior independent of the other. The justification for the anomalous position of a woman acting as the superior of a community of men was usually by the abbot that of the Cross, "Woman, behold thy son; Son, behold thy mother"; and it is still further urged that maternity is a form of authority derived from nature, whilst that which is paternal is merely legal. But, whatever may be its origin, the supreme rule of an abbess over both men and women was deliberately revived, and sanctioned by the Western Church, as a revival orders that consisted of double monasteries. At Fontevrault (founded 1099) and with the Bridgetines (1346), the abbess was the superior of monks as well as of nuns, though with the Gilbertines (1146) it was the prior who ruled over both. In the earlier double monasteries both monks and nuns observed the same rule mutatis mutandis; this example was fol-
followed by Fontevraud and the Bridgetines, the rule of the former being Benedictine, while the latter observed the Rule of St. Bridget. But with the Gilbertines, while the rule of the nuns was substantially Benedictine, that of the Augustinian Canons. (See Brightlines; Fontevraud; Gilbertines.) Little is known as to the buildings of the earlier double monasteries except that the church usually stood between the two conventual establishments, so as to be accessible from both. From excavations made on the site of Watton Priory, a Gilbertine house in Yorkshire, it appeared that the separation of nuns from canons was effected by means of a substantial wall, several feet high, which traversed the church lengthways, and it is probable that some similar arrangement was adopted in other double monasteries. No such communities exist at the present day in the Western Church.


G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Monasteries, Suppression of.—Under this title will be treated only the suppressions of religious houses (whether monastic in the strict sense or houses of the mendicant orders) since the Reformation. The somewhat more general subject of state encroachments on church property is found treated under such titles as LICITATION; CONDEMMATORY ABBOT; INVESTITURES, CONFLICT OF. The economic motives of state opposition to the tenure of lands by religious corporations (dating from the thirteenth century) are explained under MORTMAIN. The countries dealt with in the present article are: I. Germany, the Iberian Peninsula, and France; II. England and the British Isles; and III. Switzerland, Austria, and Bohemia.

I. Germany, Spain and Portugal, Italy.—A. Germany (including all Austrian Dominions).—The confiscation of religious property following upon the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) had been for the benefit of the state according to experience of previous conquests. Monasteries and innumerable pious foundations disappeared at this time. Towards the middle of the eighteenth century a new movement tended to the destruction of monastic institutions swept over those portions of the German Empire which had remained attached to the Catholic Faith. "Josephinism", as this political and religious movement was afterwards called, taking its name from its foster-father, the Emperor Joseph II, made the Church subservient to the State. The supernatural character of the religious life was ignored; abbeys and convents could be permitted to exist only on giving proof of their material utility. A plan was formulated for the transformation of all religious houses into foundations of a purely ecclesiastical property for the profit of the Catholic Governments in Germany. This was part of a general plan for a redistribution of territory. Frederick II (the Great) of Prussia had taken the initiative and had won over England and France to his idea. The opposition of Maria Theresa, of the Prince Bishop of Mainz, and of the French cardinal, had made the project to fail. The Holy See kept the diplomacy of Prussia in check for some years. To counteract the action of Rome on public sentiment, the partisans of secularization encouraged in Germany the spread of those philosophical errors—Materialism and Rationalism—which were then gaining ground in France (see ENCYCLOPEDIA). The secularization of the universities from Roman influence, withdrawing the universities from Roman influence.

Meanwhile the princes approached the task directly. The Elector Maximilian (Joseph) III (1745-77) began in Bavaria a work of destruction which was carried on by his successors down to the Elector Maximilian Joseph IV. Napoleon's ally, who became King Maximilian I of Bavaria in 1836 (d. 1852). Measures were taken first against the mendicant orders; the secular power began to meddle in the government of the monasteries, a commission being appointed by the civil authorities for that purpose. In the meantime (1773) the suppression of the Jesuits was decreed. About the year 1782 the Elector Charles Theodore (1778-99) obtained the assent of Pope Pius VI to a project for the extinction of several religious foundations. The Elector Maximilian Joseph IV (King Maximilian I) of Bavaria completed the work of destruction, influenced by the policy of his ally, Napoleon I, and assisted by the Count de Montgelas, his chief minister. A rescript of 9 September, 1800, deprived the religious orders in Bavaria of all property rights and prohibited them to receive novices. The convents of the mendicant orders (Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians, Carmelites) and the religious houses of women were the first to fall. Then came the turn of the Canons Regular and the Benedictines. The cathedral monasteries were not spared. Among the abbeys that disappeared in Bavaria was the famous Hofkloster, dedicated to St. Blasien of the Black Forest (the community, however, being admitted, in 1809, to the monastery of St. Paul), St. Emmeran of Ratisbon, Andechs, St. Ulrich of Augsburg, Michaelsberg, Benedictbeuren, Ettal, Kempten, Metten, Oberaltach, Ottobeuren, Scheyern, Tegernsee, Wessobrunn.

The monasteries of North Germany met with the common fate of all church property. On the left bank of the Rhine they were suppressed when that territory was annexed to France by the Peace of Lunéville, 9 February, 1801. Their property was disposed of by the Diet of Ratisbon (3 March, 1801—February, 1803), the deplorable business having been left to the provincial diet which, however, in the exception of novices was forbidden. In the Netherlands, the Principality of Liège, and the portions of Switzerland annexed by France, the religious houses disappeared completely.

In the territories immediately subject to the House of Hapsburg, the secularization of monastic houses had begun more than thirty years before this. In pursuance of the policy with which his name has been especially associated, the Emperor Joseph II (d. 1790) forbade the teaching of theology in monasteries, even to the young religious, and also the reception of novices. Intercourse with the Holy See was placed under imperial control. It was forbidden to receive any irregularly elected abbots or abbesses, or to concede the regular discipline of communities. Commandatory abbots were appointed. Monasteries were deprived of the parishes belonging to them. Superiors had to account to the emperor's representatives for the disposition of their incomes. Theological works printed outside the Empire could not be used. Such were the principal lines of action of the humiliation, of which Kaunitz was the minister. All this, however, was but the prelude to a decree of suppression which was issued on 17 March, 1783.

This decree applied to all monasteries, whether of women or of men, judged useless by the standards of Josephinism; their revenues were taken to increase the secular treasures of the secular establishments useful to religion and humanity. The dioceses of the Low Countries (then subject to the House of
Hapsburg) lost one hundred and sixty-eight convents, abbeys, or priories. In all, 738 religious houses were suppressed, among them the temples of Jehovah and the Virgin.

In anticipation of this disaster, Pius VI had conferred on the bishops extensive privileges. They had power to dispense expelled religious, both men and women, from wearing their habit, and, in case of necessity, to dispense them from the simple vows. They were to secure for them a pension—but, as this was generally insufficient, many of them were reduced to poverty. The government transformed the monasteries into hospitals, colleges, or barracks. The victims of the persecution remained faithful to their religious obligations. Their ordinances took great care of them, Cardinal de Frankenberg, Archbishop of Mechlin, affording a particularly brilliant example in this respect. The Abbey of Molen (near Liége) was spared; discreet of the sufferings of the monks, the houses were even affiliated to it; but on the death of Abbot Urban I (1783), the emperor placed over the monks a religious of the Pious Schools as commendatory abbot. The monasteries of Styria were soon closed, though some houses—e.g., Kremmen, Lambach, Admont—escaped the devastation. All the other religious houses of Bohemia had not yet recovered from the ravages caused by the wars of Frederick II and Maria Theresa, when they had to encounter this fresh tempest. Breunau, Emmaus of Prague, and Raigern, with a few monasteries of Cistercians and Premonstratensians, escaped complete ruin. The emperor abdicated in 1792. The government, going to Verona in 1793, restored the monastery of St. Martin of Pannonia and its dependencies. In Hungary the Benedictines were entirely wiped out. The death of Joseph II put an end to this violence, without, however, stopping the spread of those opinions which had incited it. His brother, Leopold II (d. 1792) allowed things to remain as he found them; but the revolution of 1792 and the reign of Joseph II undertook to repair some of the ruin, permitting religious to pronounce solemn vows at the age of twenty-one. The Hungarian Abbey of St. Martin of Pannonia was the first to profit by this benevolence, but its monks had to open the gymnasia in it and its dependencies. The monasteries of the Tyrol and Salzburg had escaped the ruin. These countries were attached to Austria by the Congress of Vienna (Sept., 1814—June, 1815). The monks were allowed to re-enter. The celebrated Abbey of Reichenschau alone did not arise from its ruins. The princely Abbey of St. Gall, too, had been dissolved during the Wars of Revolution and the Empire, though there was a project, at the Congress of Vienna, to re-establish it, but without giving it back its lands: the abbot would not accept the conditions thus imposed, and the matter went no further.

The Swiss monasteries were exposed to pillage and ruin during the wars of the Revolution. The government of the Helvetian Republic was hostile to them, they recovered a little liberty after the Act of Mediation, in 1803. But the situation changed after 1832. The Federal Constitution, revised at that time, suppressed the guarantees granted to convents and religious foundations. During the long period of persecution and confiscation in Switzerland, from 1835 to 1848 (for which see Lucerne), the monks of Mariastein sought refuge in Germany, and then in France and Austria; those of Mury were sheltered at Griess (Tyrol), others, like Disentis, fell into utter ruin. The Swiss Benedictines then went to the United States, where they founded the Swiss-American congregation.

B. The Iberian Peninsula. The constitution of the 12th of May, 1808, by which Napoleon imposed on it suppressed all religious congregations and confiscated their property, in accordance with the conqueror's general policy. They were re-established in 1814 by King Ferdinand, whom the War of Independence had restored to the Throne. Their existence was again threatened by the Revolution of 1820, when the Cortes decreed the suppression of religious orders, leaving only a few houses to shelter the aged and infirm. It must be said that, in this case, the effect of the generally anti-religious principles actuating the revolutionaries was reinforced by the impoverishment of the nation by the Napoleonic wars, by the revolt of its American colonies, and by changed economic conditions. Ferdinand VII, who was restored to the throne by the French Army, hastened to annul the decrees of the Cortes (1823). The monasteries and their property were given back to the religious, who were enabled once more to live in community. But in October, 1835, a decree of the government, inspired by Juan de Mendi- sabal, minister of finance, again suppressed all the religious foundations of Catalonia, which had not been consulted, approved of this measure next year, and promulgated a law abolishing vows of religion. All the movable and immovable property was confiscated and the income assigned to the sinking fund. Objects of art and books were, in general, reserved for the museums and public libraries, though some of the churches were secularized. The religious orders were dispersed. Large quantities of furniture and other objects were sold, the lands and rights of each house alienated, while speculators realized large fortunes. Certain monasteries were transformed into barracks or devoted to public purposes. Others were sold or abandoned to pillage. In 1859 the government gave to the bishops those religious houses which had not already been disposed of. Numerous conventual churches were turned over for parish use.

The religious were promised a pension not to exceed one franc a day, but it was never paid. No mercy was shown even to the aged and the infirm, who were not allowed to wait for death in their beds. Some of them were forced to sell their valuables in order to get the small change that would restore them their religious liberty, as had happened twice before, but the event proved otherwise. The destruction was irrevocable, some religious sought a refuge in Italy and in France. The greater number either petitioned the bishops to incorporate them in their dioceses or went to live with their families. The people of the Northern provinces, who are very devoted to Catholicism, did not associate themselves directly with the measures taken against the religious; so much cannot be said for those of the South and of the large towns, where the expulsion of religious sometimes took the appearance of a popular insurrection: convents were pillaged and burned, reli- gious arrested and often treated less humanely: here the authorities contented themselves with confiscating property and suppressing privileges; but the nuns continued to live in community. With time the passion and hatred of the persecutors diminished somewhat. The monks of the Abbey of Montserrat in Catalonia were able to come together again. The religious orders which escaped the clergy for the Spanish colonies, such as the Dominicans, Augustinians, and Franciscans, were authorized to retain some houses.

The monasteries in Portugal met the same fate as those in Spain, and at about the same time (1833). Only the Franciscans charged with religious duties in the Portuguese colonies were spared.

C. Italy.—During the eighteenth century, while Josephinism was rampant in Catholic Germany, Leopold, afterwards the Emperor Leopold II, tried to emulate in some degree the emperor's anti-monastic policy. But the general persecution of religious orders, which began with the wars of the Rev- olution and the Empire had effected a complete transformation in that country. France inspired with her anti-religious tendencies the new governments established by Napoleon, Church property was confiscated; monasteries and convents were suppressed,
though congregations devoted to the care of the sick and to the instruction of poor children were tolerated here and there as, for instance, in the Kingdom of Italy, founded in 1835. The repressive measures could not be enforced in other localities. In Tunisia the duke made a grant to the monasteries, in exchange for the lands that they had lost. In the Pontifical States things reverted to the ancient order: 1824 houses for men and 612 for women were re-established. In Naples the religious had diminished by at least one-half.

The period of peace, however, was not destined to endure: the establishment of Italian unity was fatal to the religious orders. The persecution was resumed in the constitutional Kingdom of Sardinia, which was about to become the agent and the type of united Italy. Cavour imposed this anti-religious policy on King Victor Emmanuel. He proposed first to secularize the monastic property; the money thus obtained would be used for the payment of the diocesan clergy. The king finally gave his sanction to a law which suppressed, in his own states alone, 334 convents and monasteries, containing 4280 religious men and 1200 nuns. This ruin and depredation proceeded uniformly with the cause of Italian unity, since the Piedmontese constitution and legislation did not go beyond the equal severities of the religious orders and benefices not charged with cures of souls were declared useless, and suppressed; the buildings and lands were confiscated and sold (1866). The Government paid allowances to the surviving religious. In some abbeys—as at Monte Cassino—the members of the community were allowed to remain as care-takers. The Papal States were subjected to the same policy after 1870. The Italian authorities contented themselves with depriving the religious of their legal existence and all they possessed, without raising any obstacles to a possible reconstruction of regular communities. A certain number of monasteries have thus been able to exist and carry on their work, owing something to the activity of a community of zealous missionaries, who, though the survival of the religious existence is precarious, and an arbitrary measure of the Government might at any time suppress them. After the general dissolution, some Italian religious—for instance, the Olivetans and the Canons Regular of St. John Lateran—crossed the Alps and established houses of their respective orders in France. J. M. Basses.

Suppression of Monasteries in England under Henry VIII.—From any point of view the destruction of the English monasteries by Henry VIII must be regarded as one of the great events of the sixteenth century. They were looked upon, in England, at the time of Henry's breach with Rome, as one of the great burdens which were consequently removed. They were called "the great standing army of Rome". One of the first practical results of the assumption of the highest spiritual powers by the king was the supervision by royal decree of the ordinary episcopal visitations, and the appointment of a layman—Thomas Cromwell—as the king's vicar-general in spirituals, with special authority to visit the monastic houses, and to bring them into line with the new order of things. This was in 1534; and, some time prior to the December of that year, arrangements were already being made for a systematic visitation. A document, dated 21 January, 1535, allows Cromwell to conduct the visit through "commissaries"—rather than persons named as commissaries, to be busy with "the affairs of the whole kingdom". It is now practically admitted that, even prior to the issue of these commissions of visitation, the project of suppressing some, if indeed not all, of the monastic establishments in the country, had been not only broached, but had become part of Henry's practical policies. It is well to remember this, to the advantage of an unexpected light upon the first dissolutions: the monasteries were doomed prior to these visitations, and not in consequence of them, as we have been asked to believe according to the traditional story. Parliament was to meet early in the following year, 1536, and, with the twofold object of replenishing an exhausted exchequer and of anticipating opposition on the part of the religious to the proposed ecclesiastical changes, according to the royal design, the Commons were to be asked to grant Henry the possessions of at least the smaller monasteries. It must have been felt, however, by the astute Cromwell, who is credited with the first conception of the design, that to succeed, a project such as this must be sustained by strong yet simple reasons calculated to appeal to the popular mind. Some decent pretext had to be found for presenting the proposed measure of suppression and confiscation to the nation, and it can hardly now be doubted that the device of blackening the characters of the monks and nuns was deliberately resorted to. The Act of Supremacy was passed on June 1533, although the visitatorial powers of the bishops were not suspended until the eighteenth of the following September. Preachers were moreover commissioned to go over the country in the early autumn, in order, by their invectives, to educate public opinion against the monks. "These pulpit orators were of three sorts, first, the "squealers"; who denounced the monks and nuns to the face, and called them "hypocrites, sorcerers, and idle drones, etc."; (2) "preachers", who said the monks "made the land unprofitable"; and (3) those who told the people that, "if the abbeys went down, the king would never want any taxes again". This last was a favourable argument of Cranmer, in his sermons at St. Paul's Cross. The men employed by the Government were distrusted with the task of getting up the required evidence—were chiefly four, Layton, Leigh, Aprice, and London. They were well fitted for their work; and the charges brought against the good name of some at least of the monasteries, by these chosen emissaries of Cromwell are, it must be confessed, sufficiently striking to bear out the modern notion of wholesale corruption.

The visitation seems to have been conducted systematically, and to have passed through three clearly defined stages. During the summer the houses in the west of England were subjected to examination; and this portion of the work came to an end in September, when Layton and Leigh arrived at Oxford and Cambridge respectively. In October and November the visitors changed the field of their labours to the eastern and southeastern districts; and in December we find Layton advancing through the midland counties to Lichfield, where he met Leigh, who had finished his work in the religious houses of Huntingdon and Lincolnshire. Thence they proceeded to the north, and the city of York was reached on 11 January, 1536. But with all their haste, to which they were urged by Cromwell, they had not proceeded very far in the work of their northern inspection before the meeting of Parliament.

From time to time, whilst on their work of inspection, the visitors, and principally London and Leigh, sent brief written reports to their employers. Practically all the accusations made against the good name of the monks and nuns are contained in the letters sent in this way by the visitors, and in the document, or documents, known as the "Comptera Monastica", which were drawn up at the time by the same visitors and forwarded to their employers. Other evidence as to the state of the monasteries at this time is forthcoming, and the inquirer into the truth of
these accusations is driven back ultimately upon the worth of these visitors’ words. It is easy, of course, to dismiss inconvenient witnesses as being unworthy of credit, but in this case a mere study of these letters and documents is quite sufficient to cast considerable doubt upon their testimony, whilst an examination into the subsequent careers of these royal inquisitors will more than justify the rejection of their testimony and render it wholly unworthy of belief. (G. J. F. de Gay, “Henry VIII and the English Monasteries,” 1, xi.)

It is of course impossible to enter into the details of the visitation. We must, therefore, pass to the second step in the dissolution. Parliament met on 4 February, 1536, and the chief business it was called upon to transact was the consideration and passing of the bill for the dissolution of the monastic houses. It may be well to state exactly what is known about this matter. We know for certain that the king’s proposal to suppress the smaller religious houses gave rise to a long debate in the Lower House, and that Parliament passed the measure with great reluctance. It is more than remarkable, moreover, that in the preamble of the Act itself Parliament is careful to throw the entire responsibility for the measure upon the king, and to declare, if words mean anything at all, that they took the truth of the charges against the good name of the religious, solely upon the king’s “declaration” that he knew the charges to be true. It must be remembered, too, that one simple fact prevents us from assuming that the king actually knew whether in the form of the visitors’ notes, or of the mythical “Black-book”—could have been placed before Parliament for its consideration in detail, still less for its critical examination and judgment. We have the “Compters” documents—the findings of the visitors, whatever they may be worth, with their accompanying statements andadvice, and it may be easily seen that no distinction whatever is made in them between the greater and lesser houses. All are, to use a common expression, “tarred with the same brush”; all, that is, are equally smirched by the filthy suggestions of Layton and Leigh, of London and Apsley. “The idea that the smaller monasteries rather than the larger were particular abodes of vice,” writes Dr. Gairdner, the editor of the State papers of this period, “is not borne out by the ‘Compters’.” Yet the preamble of the very Act, which suppressed the smaller monasteries because of their vicious living, declares positively that “in the great and solemn Monasteries of the realm, religion was well observed and provided for, and all that the king desired was, that the state of the monastic houses in the counties be such as to be presented to the king’s satisfaction.”

As early as April, 1536 (less than a month from the passing of the measure), we find mixed commissions of officials and country gentlemen appointed in consequence to make surveys of the religious houses, and instructions issued for their guidance. The returns made by these commissioners are of the highest importance in determining the moral state of the religious houses at the time of their dissolution. It is now beyond dispute that the accusations of Layton and Leigh, and Cromwell’s visitors were made prior to the passing of the Act of Suppression of 1536, and therefore prior to, not after (as most writers have erroneously supposed), the constitution of these mixed commissions of gentry and officials. The main purpose for which the commissioners were nominated was of course to find out what was the true condition of the monastic houses, and to take over such in the king’s name, as now by the late Act legally belonging to His Majesty. The gentry and officials were however instructed to find out and report upon “the conversation of the lives” of the religious, or in other words they were specially directed to examine into the moral state of the houses visited. Unfortunately, comparatively few of the returns of these mixed commissions are now known to exist; although some have been discovered, which were unknown to Dr. Gairdner when he made his “Calendar” of the documents of 1536. Fortunately, however, the extant reports deal expressly with some of the very houses against which Layton and Leigh have made their partialcriptures: in the first place, those in which the suppression was resolved upon and made legal, it did not matter to Henry or Cromwell that the inmates should be described as “evil livers”; and so the new commissioners returned the religious of these same houses as being really “of good and virtuous conversation”, and this, not in the case of one house or district only, but generally, among all the monasteries visited. They found that the inmates given of the houses are almost uniformly good.”

To prepare for the reception of the expected spoils what was known as the Augustmentation Office was established, and Sir Thomas Pope was made its first treasurer, 24 April, 1536. On this same day instructions were issued for the guidance of the mixed commissions in the work of dissolving the monasteries. According to these directions, the commissioners, having interviewed the superior and shown him the “Act of Dissolution”, were to make all the officials of the house swear to answer truthfully any questions put to them. They were then to examine into the moral and financial state of the establishment, and to report upon the land granted, the estate of the religious and “the conversation of their lives.” After that, an inventory of all the goods, chattels, and plate was to be taken, and an “indenture” or counterpart of the same was to be left with the superior, dating from 1 March, 1536, because from that date all had passed into the possession of the king. These documents were to be in the keeping of the king, and, if necessary, for the safe custody of the king’s property. At the same time the commissioners were to issue their commands to the heads of the houses not to receive any more rents in the name of the convent, nor to spend any money, except for necessary expenses, until the king’s pleasure should be known. They were, however, to be strictly enjoined to continue their care over the lands, and “to sow and cultivate” as before, until such time as some king’s farmer should be appointed and relieve them of this duty. As for the monks, the officer was told “to send those that will remain in religion to other houses with letters to the governors, and those that wish to go to the world to my lord of Canterbury and the lord chancellor that they may have their benefices or livings when such could be found for them.”

One curious fact about the dissolution of the smaller monasteries deserves special notice. No sooner had the king obtained possession of these houses under the money value of £200 a year, than he commenced to
refounded some "in perpetuity" under a new charter. In this way no fewer than fifty-two religious houses in various parts of England gained a temporary respite from extinction. The cost, however, was considerable, as the various sums of money, due to the property was again confiscated and the religious were finally swept away, before they had been able to repay the sums borrowed in order to purchase this very slender favour at the hands of the royal legal possessor. In hard cash the treasurer of the Court of Augmentation acknowledges to have received, as merely "part payment of the various sums of money, due to the king for fines or compositions for the toleration and continuance" of only thirty-three of these refounded monasteries, some £5948 6s. 8d. or hardly less, probably, than £60,000 of present-day money. Sir Thomas Pope, the treasurer of the Court of Augmentation, ingeniously adds that he has not counted the value of the new plate, all the vessels and ornaments of the houses, and each of the said monasteries, before the close of the account, have come into the King's hands by surrender, or by the authority of Parliament have been added to the augmentation of the royal revenues". "For this reason, therefore," he adds, "the King has allowed all sums of money still due to him, as the residue of their plate, to him, as a part payment of the new foundations "in perpetuity", which in reality as the event showed meant only the respite of a couple of years or so, varied considerably. As a rule they represented about three times the annual revenue of the house; but sometimes, as in the case of St. Mary's, Winchester, which was fined £333 6s. 8d. in 1537, it was re-established with the loss of some of its richest possessions.

It is somewhat difficult to estimate correctly the number of religious houses which passed into the king's possession in virtue of the Act of Parliament of 1536. Stowe's estimate is generally deemed sufficiently near the mark, and he says: "the number of the houses which suppressed was 469". In respect to the value of the property, Stowe's estimate would also appear to be substantially correct when he gives £30,000, or some £300,000 of present-day money, as the yearly income derived from the confiscated lands. There can be no doubt, however, that subsequently the promises of large annual receipts from the old religious estates proved illusory, and that, in spite of the efforts of the Crown farmers, the monastic acres furnished far less money for the royal purse than they had previously done under the thrifty management and personal supervision of their former owners.

As to the value of the spoils which came from the wrecked and dismantled houses, where the waste was everywhere so great, it is naturally difficult to appraise the value of the property, but it was a waste where the money was sent in kind into the king's treasury, and the proceeds from the sales of the lead, bells, stock, furniture, and even the conventual buildings. It is, however, reasonably certain that Lord Herbert, following Stowe, has placed the amount actually received at too high a figure. Not, of course, that these goods were not worth what Sir Thomas Pope supposed them to be. But the possession of the possessions might be plundered in the process of transfer, and the possessor, it may be not much beyond the mark to put these "Robin Hood's pennyworths", as Stowe calls them, at about £1,000,000 of present-day money.

Something must necessarily be said of the actual process which was followed by the Crown agents in dissolving these lesser monasteries. It was much the same in every case, and it was a somewhat long process, since the work was not all done in a day. The rolls of accounts, sent into the Augmentation Office by the commissioners, show that it was frequently a matter of six to ten weeks before any house was finally dissolved. The agent appointed to the task, was to sell the property and the goods in the buildings; to demolish the various buildings; to sell the plate and vestments; and to make up the accounts. The chief commissioners paid two official visits to the scene of operations during the progress of the work. On the first they assembled the superior and his subjects in the Chapter House, announced to the community and its dependents their impending doom; called for and defaced the convent seal, the symbol of corporate existence, while the King's business could be transacted; desecrated the church; took possession of the best plate and vestments "unto the King's use"; measured the lead upon the roof and calculated its value when melted; counted the bells; and appraised the goods and chattels of the community.

Then they turned to the scene of their next operation, leaving behind them the agents and workmen to carry out the designed destruction by stripping the roofs and pulling down the gutters and rain pipes; melting the lead into pigs and founders, throwing down the bells, breaking them with sledgehammers and packing the metal into barrels ready for the visit of the speculator and his bid for the spoils. This was followed by the work of collecting the furniture and selling it with the aid of the townsmen, the wainwrights, shutters, and doors by public auction or private tender. When all this had been done, the commissioners returned to audit the accounts and to satisfy themselves generally that the work of devastation had been accomplished to the king's contentment—that the nest had been destroyed and the birds scattered. What had been a monument of architectural beauty in the past was now a "bare roofless choir, where late the sweet birds sang".

No sooner had the process of destruction begun simultaneously all over the country than the people began at last to realize that the benefits likely to accrue to them out of the plunder were most illusory. What this was understood to mean, it is now too late to present a petition to the king from the Lords and Commons, pointing out the evident damage which must be done to the country at large if the measure were carried out fully; and asking that the process of suppression should be at once stopped, and that the lesser houses, which had not yet been dissolved under the authority of the king, should be allowed to stand. Nothing, of course, came of this attempt. Henry's appetite was but whetted by what had come to him, and he only hungered for more of the spoils of the Church and the poor. The action of the Parliament in 1536 in permitting the first measure to become law made it in reality much more difficult for Henry to draw back; and in mere terms of time it paved the way for the general dissolution. Here and there in the country active resistance to the work of destruction was organized, and in the case of Lincolnshire, Yorkshire, and the North generally, the popular rising of the "Pilgrimage of Grace" was caused in the main, or at least in great measure, by the desire of the people at large to save the royal house from ruthless destruction. The failure of the insurrection of the "Pilgrimage of Grace" was celebrated by the execution of twelve abbots and, to use Henry's own words, by a wholesale "tying-up" of monks. By a new and ingenious process, appropriately called "Dissolution by Attainder" an abbey was considered by the royal advisers to fall into the king's hands by the disappearance or constituting the death of the abbot. In this way several of the larger abbeys, with all their revenues and possessions, came into Henry's hands as a consequence of the "Pilgrimage of Grace".

The Parliament of 1536, it will be remembered, had granted Henry the possession only of the houses the annual value of which was less than £200. What happened in the three years that followed the passing
of the Act was briefly this: the king was ill satisfied with the actual results of what he had thought would prove a veritable gold mine. Personally, perhaps, he had not gone to the trouble of setting himself against the larger abbeys, in which, according to the Act of 1536, religion was "right well kept and observed". Not having received any mandate from Parliament to authorize the extension of their proceedings, the royal agents, eager to win a place in his favour, were busy up and down the country, caressing, coercing, commanding, and threatening the members of the various houses in order to force them to give up their monasteries unto the King's Majesty. As Dr. Gairdner puts it: "by various arts and means the heads of these establishments were induced to surrender, and occasionally when an abbey was found, as in the case of Woburn, to have committed treason in the sense of the recent statutes, the stretch of the Great Seal that had been forfeited to the king by his attainder. But attainders were certainly the exception, surrenderers being the general rule".

The autumn of 1537 saw the beginning of the fall of the friaries in England. For some reason, possibly because of their poverty, they had not been brought using "some or other of the grandeur of Grace" few dissolutions of houses, other than those which came to the king by the attainder of their superiors, are recorded. With the feast of St. Michael, 1537, however, besides the convents of friars the work of securing, by some means or other, the surrender of the greater houses went on rapidly. The inquisitors to the royal staff were, by all methods known to them, to get the religious "willingly to consent and agree" to their own extinction. It was only when they found "any of the said heads and convents, so appointed to be dissolved, so willful and obstinate that they would in no wise agree to sign and seal their own death-warrant, that the commissioners were authorized by Henry's instructions to 'take possession of the house' and property by force. And, whilst thus engaged, the royal agents were ordered to declare that the king had no design whatsoever upon the monastic property or system as such, or any desire to secure the total suppression of the religious houses. They were instructed at all events to stop to such rumours, 35 that naturally rife all over the country at this time. This they did; and the unscrupulous Dr. Layton declared that he had told the people everywhere that in this they utterly slandered the King their natural lord". He bade them not to believe such reports; and he "commanded the abbots and priors to set in the stocks" such as claimed such retreats, he was, however, only to be imagined, hard enough to suppress the rumour whilst the actual thing was going on. In 1538 and 1539 some 150 monasteries of men appear to have signed away their corporate existence and their property, and by a formal deed handed over all rights to the king.

When the work had progressed sufficiently the new Parliament, which met in April, 1539, after observing the General Act of 1536, had added up their houses to the king, "without constraint, coercion, or compulsion", confirmed these surrenders and vested all monastic property thus obtained in the Crown. Finally, in the autumn of that year, Henry's triumph over the monastic orders was completed by the horrid act of constructive treason of the great Abbots of Glastonbury, Colchester, and Reading. And so, as one writer has said, "before the win-
MONASTICISM

Monasticism.—Monasticism or monachism, literally the act of "dwelling alone" (Greek, μοναχία, μοναχός), has come to denote the mode of life pertaining to persons living in seclusion from the world, under religious vows and subject to a fixed rule, as monks, nuns, cenobites, etc. The basic idea of monasticism in all its varieties is seclusion or withdrawal from the world or society. The object of this is to achieve a life whose ideal is different from and largely at variance with that pursued by the majority of mankind; and the method adopted, no matter what its precise details may be, is always self-denial or renunciation. Taken in this broad sense monachism may be found in every religious system which has attained to a high degree of ethical development, such as the Brahmin, Buddhist, Jewish, Christian, and Moslem religions, and even in the system of those modern communistic societies, often antithetical in theory, which are a special feature of recent social development especially in America. Hence it is claimed that a form of life which flourishes in environments so diverse must be the expression of a principle inherent in human nature and rooted therein no less deeply than the principle of domesticity, though obviously limited to a far smaller portion of mankind. This article and its two ensuing sections, "Abbot and Cenobitic Rule" and "Wesiran Rule," deal with the monastic order strictly so called as distinct from the "religious orders" such as the friars, monks regular, clerics regular, and the more recent congregations. For information as to these see Religious Orders, and the article on the particular order or congregation required.

I. Its Growth. A. Morrow. — Origin.—Any discussion of pre-Christian asceticism is outside the scope of this article, but readers who wish to study this portion of the subject may be referred to Part I, of Dr. Zockler's "Askebe u.l. Mön. btrm." (Frankfort, 1897), which deals with the prevalence of the ascetic idea among races of the most diverse characters. It has already been pointed out that the monastic ideal is not an ascetic one, but it would be wrong to say that the earliest Christian asceticism was monastic. Any such thing was rendered impossible by the circumstances in which the early Christians were placed, for in the first century or so of the Church's existence the idea of living apart from the congregation of the faithful, or of renouncing the world, was not in common use. While admitting this however it is equally certain that monasticism, when it came, was little more than a precipitation of ideas previously in solution among Christians. For asceticism is the struggle against worldly principles, even with such as are merely worldly with a certain element of being sinful, and it is not, however, applicable to countries where the "Romanum Pontificum" is in force. For the transfer of a monastery from one site to another in the same locality, no permission of the Holy See is required, as this is translation, not renunciation. There was an ancient law that a new monastery could not be erected within a certain distance of an older one, but this has gone into abeyance. As regards convents of religious women, the consent of the ordinary is required, but not that of the Holy See. The same holds for the erection of houses of pious congregations and institutes.
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Advent of Christ (cf. I Cor., vii, 29-31; I Pet., IV, 7, etc.). That this belief was widespread is admitted on all hands, and obviously it would afford a strong motive for renunciation since a man who expects this present order of things to end at any moment, will lose keen interest in many raters commonly held to be important. This belief however had ceased to be of any great influence by the fourth century, and it cannot be regarded as a determining factor in the origin of monasticism which then took visible shape. A second cause more operative in leading men to renounce the world was the vividness of their belief in evil spirits. The first Christians saw the kingdom of Satan actually realized in the political and social life of heaven around them. In their eyes the gods whose temples stood in every city, the deities by which men lived, and to participate in their rites was to join in devil worship. When Christianity first came in touch with the Gentiles the Council of Jerusalem by its decree about meat offered to idols (Acts, xvi, 20) made clear the line to be followed. Consequently certain professions were pratically closed to believers since a soldier, schoolmaster, or state official of any kind might be called upon at a moment's notice to participate in some act of the state religion. But the difficulty existed for private individuals also. There were gods who presided over every moment of a man's life, gods of house and garden, of food and drink, of health and sickness, and if one would be left at peace in these, they would attract inquiry and possibly persecution. And so when, to men placed in this dilemma, St. John wrote, "Keep yourselves from idols" (I John, v, 21) he said in effect "Keep yourselves from public life, from society, from politics, from intercourse of any kind with the heathen", in short "renounce the world".

By certain writers the communistic element seen in the Church of Jerusalem during the first years of its existence (Acts, iv, 32) has sometimes been pointed to as indicating a monastic element in its constitution, but no such conclusion is justified. Probably the community of goods was simply a natural continuation of the practice begun by Jesus and the Apostles, where one of the band kept the common purse and acted as steward. There is no indication that such a custom was ever instituted elsewhere and even at Jerusalem it seems to have collapsed at an early period. It must be recognized also that influences such as the above were merely contributory and of comparatively minor importance. The chief factor which got monachism was simply the desire to fulful Christ's law literally, to imitate Him in all simplicity, following in His footsteps whose "kingdom is not of this world". So we find monachism at first instinctive, informal, unorganized, sporadic; the expression of the same force working differently in different places, persons, and circumstances; developing with the natural growth of a plant according to the environment in which it finds itself and the character of the individual listener who heard in his soul the call of "Follow Me".

(2) Means to the End.-It must be clearly understood that, in the case of the monk, asceticism is not an end in itself. For him, as for all men, the end of life is to love God. Monastic asceticism then means the removal of obstacles to loving God, and that these obstacles are is clear from the nature of love itself. Love is the union of wills. If the creature is to love God, he can do it in one way only; by sinking his own will in God's, by doing the will of God in all things: "if ye love Me keep my commandments". Nor is this better than the mon; those words of the beloved disciple, "greater love hath no man than this that a man lay down his life", for in his case life has come to mean renunciation. Broadly speaking this renunciation has three great branches corresponding to the three evangelical counsels of poverty, chastity, and obedience.

(a) Poverty.—There are few subjects, if any, upon which more sayings of Jesus have been preserved than upon the superiority of poverty over wealth in His kingdom (cf. Matt., v, 3; iii, 22; xii, 21 sq.; Mark, x, 23 sq.; Luke, vi, 20; xvii, 24 sq., etc.), and the fact of their preservation would indicate that such words were frequently quoted and presumably frequently acted upon. That argument based upon such passages as Matt., xix, 21 sq., may be put briefly thus: If a man wish to attain eternal life it is better for him to renounce his possessions than to retain them. Jesus said, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God", the reason being no doubt that it is difficult to prevent the affections from becoming attached to things and so attach them to Christ's kingdom. As St. Augustine points out, the disciples evidently understood Jesus to include all who covet riches in the number of "the rich", otherwise, considering the small number of the wealthy compared with the vast multitude of the poor, they would not have asked, "Who then shall be saved?" "You cannot serve God and Mammon" is an obvious truth to a man who knows by experience the difficulty of a whole-hearted service of God; for the spiritual and material good are in immediate antithesis, and where one is the other cannot be. Man cannot sate his nature with the temporal and yet retain an appetite for the eternal; and if the one would grow, the other must go. He would find the lust of the earth and keep his heart detached from what is of its very nature unspiritual. The extent to which this voluntary poverty is practised has varied greatly in the monachism of different ages and lands. In Egypt the first teachers of monks taught that the renunciation should be made as absolute as possible. As Athanath used to say, "I would rather beize the soul would give you to give to another". St. Macarius once, on returning to his cell, found a robber carrying off his scanty furniture. He thereupon pretended to be a stranger, harnessed the robber's horse for him and helped him to get his spoil away. Another monk had so stripped himself of all things that he possessed nothing save a copy of the Gospels. After a while he sold this also and gave the price away saying, "I have sold the very book that made me sell all I had".

As the monastic institute became more organized legislation appeared in the various codes to regulate this point among others. That the principle remained the same however is clear from the strong way in which St. Gregory the Great causes the punished to make special allowance for the needs of the infirm, etc. (Reg. Ben., xxxiii). "Above everything the vice of private ownership is to be cut off by the roots from the monastery. Let no one presume either to give or to receive anything without leave of the abbot, nor to keep anything as his own, neither book, nor writing tablets, nor pen, nor money, the ultimate proprietorship in these things can never be permitted to him. (See Poverty; Mendicant Friars; Vow.)"
cannot be my disciple" (Luke, xiv, 26). It is obvious that all of the ties which bind the human heart to this world the possession of wife and children is the strongest of these, not only these but in accordance with the strictest teaching of Jesus all sexual relations or emotion arising therefrom. The monastic idea of chastity is a life like that of the angels. Hence the phrases, "angelicus ordo", "angelica conversatio", which have been adopted from Origen to describe the life of the monk, no doubt in reference to Mark, ch. vii, 25. It is primarily as a means to this end that fasting takes such an important place in the monastic life. Among the early Egyptian and Syrian monks in particular fasting was carried to such lengths that some modern writers have been led to regard it almost as an end in itself, instead of being merely a means and a subordinate one at that. This error of course is confined to writers about monasticism, it has never been countenanced by any monastic teacher. (See CEBELACIY OF THE CLERGY; CHERITY; CONTINENCE; FAST; VOW.)

(c) Obedience—"The first step in humility is obedience without delay. This befits those who cannot receive more than Christ, and that of a holy service which they have undertaken... without doubt such as these follow that thought of the Lord when He said, I came not to do my own will but the will of Him that sent me" (Reg. Ben., v.). Of all the steps in the process of renunciation, the denial of a man's own will is clearly the most difficult. At the same time, it is the most essential as such in the making of the monk. (Matt., xvi, 24), "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me". The most difficult because self-interest, self-protection, self-regard of all kinds are absolutely a part of man's nature, so that to master such instincts requires a supernatural strength. The most essential because it is the monk's own liberty which is only to be found where is the Spirit of the Lord. It was Seneca who wrote, "parere debis libertas est", and the pagan philosopher's dictum is confirmed and testified to on every page of the Gospel. In Egypt at the dawn of monasticism the custom was for a young monk to put himself under the guidance of a senior whom he obeyed in all things. Although the bond between them was wholly voluntary the system seems to have worked perfectly and the commands of the senior were obeyed without hesitation. "Obedience is the mother of all the virtues"; "obedience is that which openeth heaven and raiseth man from the earth"; "obedience is the food of all the saints... all the words of the saint have been written to come to perfection"; such sayings illustrate sufficiently the view held on this point by the fathers of the desert. As the monastic life came to be organized by rule, the insistence on obedience remained the same, but its practice was legislated for. Thus St. Benedict at the very outset, in the Prologue to his Rule, requires that of the Benedictine, "that thou mayest return by the labour of obedience to Him from whom thou hast departed by the sloth of disobedience". Later he devotes the whole of his fifth chapter to this subject and again, in detailing the vows his monks must take, while poverty and chastity are presumed as implicitly included, obedience is one of the three things explicitly promised.

Indeed the saint even legislates for the circum stance of a monk being ordered to do something impossible. "Let him seasonably and with patience lay before his superior the reasons of his incapacity to obey, without showing pride, resistance or contradiction. If, however, after this the superior still persists in his command, let the abbot be present for him, and let him obey for the love of God trusting in his assistance" (Reg. Ben., lviii). Moreover "what is commanded is to be done not fearfully, tardily, nor coldly, nor with murmuring, nor with an answer showing unwillingness, for the obedience which is given to another is given to God, since he hath said, "He that heareth me heareth Me" (Reg. Ben., iv). It is not hard to see why so much emphasis is laid on this point. The object of monasticism is to love God in the highest degree possible in this life. In true obedience the will of the servant is one with that of his master, and the union of wills is love. Wherefore, that the obedience of the monk's will to that of God may be as simple and direct as possible, St. Benedict writes (ch. ii) "the abbot is considered to hold in the monastery the place of Christ Himself, since he is called by His name" (see OBEDIENCE; VOW). St. Thomas, in chapter xi of his Opusculum "On the Perfection of the Spiritual Life", points out that the three means of perfection, poverty, chastity, and obedience, belong peculiarly to the religious state. For religion means the worship of God alone, which consists in offering sacrifice, and of sacrifices the holocaust is the most perfect. Consequently, when a man dedicates to God all that he has, all that he takes pleasure in, and all that he is, he offers a holocaust; and this he does pre-eminently by the three religious vows.

The Desert of the Monks. The Desert of the Monks has clearly understood that the monastic order properly so-called differs from the friars, clerks regular, and other later developments of the religious life in one fundamental point. The latter have essentially some special work or aim, such as preaching, teaching, liberating captives, etc., which occupies a large place in their activities, whereas the aim of the monastic life have to give way. This is not so in the case of the monk. He lives a special kind of life for the sake of the life and its consequences to himself. In a later section we shall see that monks have actually undertaken external labours of the most varied character, but in every case this work is extrinsic to the essence of the desert, which has remained always the same. Monasticism has varied greatly in its external forms, but, broadly speaking, it has two main species (a) the eremitical or solitary, (b) the cenobitical or family types. St. Anthony (q. v.) may be called the founder of the first and St. Pachomius (q. v.) of the second.

(a) The Eremitical Type of Monasticism—This way of life took its rise among the monks who settled around St. Anthony's mountain at Piæpir and whom he organized and guided. In consequence it prevailed chiefly in northern Egypt from Lycopolis (Asyut) to the Mediterranean, but most of our information about it deals with Nitria and Seète. Caesian (q. v.) and Palladius (q. v.) give us full details of its working and from their work we derive our knowledge of the life of the hermit of the desert. This type is that of a personal kind, their position and influence being in proportion to their reputation for greater wisdom. The monks would visit each other often and discourse, several together, on Holy Scripture and on the spiritual life. General conferences in which a large number took part were not uncommon. Gradually the purely eremitical life tended to die out (Caesian, "Conf.", xix) but a semi-eremitical form continued to be common for a long period, and has never ceased entirely either in East or West where the Carthusians and Camaldolese still practise it. It is needless here to trace its developments in detail as all its varieties are dealt with in special articles (see ANCONYER, CARTHUSIAN, CARMALDESE; CARTHUSIANS; HERMIT; LAURA; MONASTICISM, EASTERN; SYLLABITE OR PILLAR SAINTS; PAUL THE HERMIT, ST.).
(b) The Cenobitical Type of Monasticism.—This type began in Egypt at a somewhat later date than the eremitical form. It was about the year 318 that St. Pachomius, still a young man, founded his first monastery at Tabennisi near Denderah. The institute spread with surprising rapidity, and by the date of St. Pachomius's death (c. 345) it counted eight monasteries and several hundred monks. Most remarkable of all is the fact that it immediately took shape as a fully organised congregation or order, with a superior general, a system of visitations and general chapters, and all the machinery of a centralised government such as does not again appear in the monastic world until the rise of the Cistercians and Mendicant Orders some eight or nine centuries later. As regards the monastery itself, it is clear that the Pachomian monasteries had nothing of the family ideal. The numbers were too great for this and everything was done on a military or barrack system. In each monastery there were numerous separate houses, each with its own propositus, cellarer, and other officials, the monks being grouped in these according to the particular trade they followed. Thus the fullers were gathered in one house, the carpenters in another, and so on; an arrangement the more desirable because in the Pachomian monasteries regular organized work was an integral part of the system, a feature in which it differed from the Antonian way of life. In point of austerity however the Antonian monks far surpassed the Pachomian. They did not sit or lie down to eat, but went about clad only in tunics, carrying in their great monastery at Athribis, to combine the cenobitical life of Tabennisi with the austerities of Nitria.

In the Pachomian monasteries it was left very much to the individual taste of each monk to fix the order of life for himself. Thus the hours for meals and prayers were subject to the convenience of each monk, and each was free to do as he pleased as long as he held his position in the monastery. Thus he might eat with the others in common or have bread and salt provided in his own cell every day or every second day. The conception of the cenobitical life was modified considerably by St. Basil. In his monasteries a true community life was followed. It was no longer possible for each one to choose his own dinner hour. On the contrary, meals were in common, work was in common, prayer was in common, seven times a day. In the matter of asceticism too all the monks were under the control of the superior whose sanction was required for all the austerities they might undertake. It was from these sources that western monachism took its rise; further information on the monasteries of the great Saints: GREAT, SAINT; BASIL, RULE OF SAINT; BENEDICT OF NUBIA, SAINT; PACHOMIUS, SAINT; FALLADIUS, SAINT.

(4) Monastic Occupations.—It has already been pointed out that the monk can adopt any kind of work so long as it is compatible with a life of prayer and renunciation. In the way of occupations therefore prayer must always take the first place.

(a) Monastic Prayer.—From the very outset it has been regarded as the monk's first duty to keep up the official prayer of the Church. To what extent the Divine office was stereotyped in St. Anthony's day need not be discussed here, but Palladius and Cassian both make it clear that the monks were in no way behind the rest of the world as regards their liturgical customs. The practice of celebrating the office apart, or in twos and threes, has been referred to above as common in the Antonian system, while the Pachomian monks performed many of the services in their separate houses, the whole community only assembling in the church for the more solemn offices, while the Antonian monks met together on Sundays and Saturdays. Among the monks of Syria the night office was much longer than in Egypt (Cassian, "Instit.", II, ii; III, i, iv, viii) and new offices at different hours of the day were instituted. In prayer as in other matters St. Basil's legislation became the norm among Eastern monks, while in the west no changes of importance have taken place. St. Benedict's rule gradually eliminated all local customs. For the development of the Divine office into its present form see the articles, Breviary, Hours, Canonical, and also the various "hours", e.g. Matins, Lauds, etc.; Liturgy, etc. In the east this solemn liturgical prayer remains to-day almost the sole active work of the monks, and though in the west many other forms of activity have flourished, the Opus Dei or Divine Office has always been and still is regarded as the pre-eminent duty and occupation of the monk to which all other works, no matter how excellent in themselves, must give way, according to St. Benedict's principle (Reg. Ben., xiii), "Nil operi Dei preponatur" (let nothing take away from the work of God). Alongside the official liturgy, private prayer, especially mental prayer, has always held an important place; see Prayer; Contemplative Life.

(b) Monastic Labours.—The first monks did comparatively little in the way of external labour. We hear of them weaving, mending, making baskets and doing other work of a simple character which, while serving for their support, would not distract them from the continual contemplation of God. Under St. Pachomius manual labour was organized as an essential part of the monastic life; and, since it is a principle of the monks as distinguished from the mendicants, that the body shall be self-supporting, external work of one sort or another has been an inevitable part of the life ever since.

(i) Agriculture, of course, naturally ranked first among the various forms of external labour. The sites chosen by the monks for their retreats were usually in wild and inaccessible places, which were left to them precisely because they were uncultivated, and the monks were enjoined to do the work of clearing them. The rugged valley of Subiasco, or the fens and marshes of Glastonbury may be cited as examples, but nearly all the most ancient monasteries are to be found in places then considered uninhabitable by all except the monks. Gradually forests were cleared and marshes drained, rivers were bridged and roads made; until, almost imperceptibly, the desert place became a farm or a garden. In the later Middle Ages, when the Black Monks were giving less time to agriculture, the Cistercians re-established the old order of things; and even to-day such monasteries as La Trappe de Stauveli in N. Africa, or New Nursia in W. Australia do identically the same work as was done by St. Pachomius and the Antonian monks at the times of St. Basil. The great cultural restoration of a great part of Europe to the monks" (Hallam, "Middle Ages", III, 436); "The Benedictine monks were the agriculturists of Europe" (Guizot, "Histoire de la Civilisation", II, 75); such testimony, which could be multiplied from writers of every creed, is enough for the purpose here (see Cisternarians).

(ii) Copying of MSS.—Even more important than their services to agriculture has been the work of the monastic orders in the preservation of ancient literature. In this respect too the results achieved went far beyond what was actually aimed at. The monks copied the Scriptures for their own use in the Church services and, when their schools developed into schools, as the march of events made it inevitable they should, they copied also such monuments of classical literature as were preserved. At first no doubt such work was solely utilitarian, even in St. Benedict's rule the instructions as to reading and study make it clear that these filled a very subordinate place in the divines of the monastic orders and that they were devotedly set to make the transcription of MSS. and creation of books an organized and important monastic labour, but his insistence influenced western monachism of fact his chief claim to recognition.
monks. It is not too much to say that we to-day are
indebted to the labours of the monastic copists for the
preservation, not only of the Sacred Writings, but of
practically all that survives to us of the secular lit-
ernature of antiquity (see Manuscript; Cloister;
Scriptorium).
(iii) Education.—At first no one became a monk be-
fore he was an adult, but very soon the custom began of
receiving the young. Even infants in arms were
dedicated to the monastic state by their parents (see
Reg. Ben., lix) and in providing for the education of
these child-monks the cloister inevitably developed
into a schoolroom (see Oblate). Nor was it long be-
fore the schools thus established began to include chil-
ren not intended for the monastic state. Some writ-
ers have maintained that this step was not taken until
the time of Charlemagne, but there is sufficient indi-
cation that such pupils existed at an earlier date,
though the proportion of external scholars certainly
increased largely at this time. The system of educa-
tion followed was that known as the “Trivium” and
“Quadrivium” (see Arts, The Seven Liberal),
which was merely a development of that used during
classical times.

The greater number of the larger monasteries in
western Europe had a claustal school and not a few,
Cloister; Education; Schools).
(iv) Architecture, painting, sculpture and metal
work.—Of the first hermits many lived in caves,
tombs, and deserted ruins, but from the outset the
monk has been forced to be a builder. We have seen
that the Pachomian system required buildings of eleb-
ator plan and large accommodation, and the organ-
ized development of monastic life did not tend to sim-
plify the buildings which enshrined it. Consequently
skill in architecture was called for and so monastic
architects were produced to meet the need in the same
almost unconscious manner as were the monastic
schoolmasters. During the medieval period the arts
of architecture, painting, sculpture, and goldsmiths' work were practised in the monasteries all over Europe and the output must have been simply enor-

We have in the museums, churches, and elsewhere
such countless examples of monastic skill in these arts
that it is really difficult to realize that all this wealth of
beautiful things forms only a small fraction of the total
of artistic creation turned out century after century
by these skilful and untiring craftsmen. Yet it is cer-
tainly true that what has perished by destruction,
loss and decay would outweigh many times over the
entire mass of medieval art work now in existence, and
of this the larger portion was produced in the work-
shop of the cloister (see Architecture; Ecclesi-
tical Art; Painting; Illumination; Religious
Shrine; Sculpture).

(v) Historical and patriotic work.—As years
by the great monastic corporations accumulated
archives of the highest value for the history of
countries wherein they were situated. In
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tory. In more
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similar works on a less extensive scale have been un-
dertaken in every country of western Europe by
monks of all orders and congregations, and at the
present time (1910) this output of solid scholarly work
shows no signs whatever of diminution either in qual-
ity or quantity.

(vi) Missionary work.—Perhaps the mission field
would seem a sphere little suited for monastic ener-
gies, but no idea could be more false. Mankind is
proverbially imaginative and so, to establish a Christ-
ianity where paganism once reigned, it is necessary to
present not simply a code of morals, not the mere laws
and regulations, nor even the theology of the Church,
but an actual pattern of Christian society. Such a
“working model” is found pre-eminently in the
monastery, and so it is the monastic order which has
proved itself the apostle of the nations in western
Europe.

To mention a few instances of this—Saints
jumna in Scotland, Augustine in England, Bon.
Germany, Ansgar in Scandinavia, Switlzerland,
libor in the Netherlands, Rupert and Limmerich,
what is now Austria, Adalbert in Bohemia,
Columban in Switzerland, were monks whose
example of a Christian society which the
companions displayed, led the natives,
they lived from paganism to Christianity.
Nor did the monastic apostolate end
point but, by remaining as a community,
their converts in the arts of
society based on Gospel principles in the
stability of the Christian faith, and
individual missionary, even the mon-
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show that the thing was done. A full practice of the last Evangelical counsel (obedience) could only be realized after the monkastic ideal had taken root and passed beyond the purely eremitical stage. The ante-Nicene ascetic would be a man who led a single life, practised long and frequent fasts, abstained from flesh and wine, and supported himself, if he were able, by some small handicraft, keeping of what he earned only as much as was absolutely necessary to support his own sustenance, and giving the rest to the poor. If he were an educated man, he might be employed by the Church in some such capacity as that of catechist. Very often he would don the kind of dress which marked its wearer off as a philosopher of an austere school.

At the time when St. Anthony first embraced the ascetic life, there were numbers of ascetics living in huts in the neighbourhood of the towns and villages. When St. Anthony died (356 or 357), two types of monasticism flourished in Egypt. There were villages or colonies of hermits—the eremitical type; and monasteries in which a community life was led—the cenobitic type. A brief survey of the opening chapters of Palladius's "Lauriac History" will serve as a description of the former type.

Palladius was a monk from Palestine who, in 388, went to Egypt to drink in the spirit of monasticism at the fountainhead. On landing at Alexandria he put himself in the hands of a certain Abbot, who in early life had been a hermit at Nitria and now apparently presided over a hospice at Alexandria without in any way abating the austerity of his life. By the advice of Isidore, Palladius placed himself under the direction of a hermit named Dorotheus who lived six miles outside Alexandria, with whom he was to spend the next three years, and then to return to Isidore to receive higher spiritual knowledge. This Dorotheus spent the whole day collecting stones to build cells for other hermits, and the whole night weaving ropes out of palm leaves. He never lay down to sleep, though slumber sometimes overtook him while working or eating. Palladius, who seems to have lived in his cell, ascertained from other solitaries that this had been his custom from his youth upwards. Palladius's health broke down before he completed his time with Dorotheus, but he spent three years in Alexandria and its neighbourhood visiting the hermitages and becoming acquainted with about 2000 monks. From Alexandria he went to Syria, where there were about 10000 monks, and thence to Egypt, where there were about 5000 solitaries. There was no kind of monastic rule. Some of the solitaries lived alone, sometimes two or more lived together. They assembled at the church on Saturdays and Sundays. The church was served by eight priests of whom the oldest always celebrated, preached, and judged, the others only assisting. All work was considered work, hence there were bakeries where bread was made, not only for the village itself, but for the solitaries who lived in the desert beyond. There were doctors. Wine also was sold.

Strangers were entertained in a guest-house. If able to read, they were lent a book. They might stay as long as they pleased, but after a week they were set to some kind of work. If at the ninth hour a man stood and listened to the sound of psalmody issuing from the different cells, he would imagine, says Palladius, that he was caught up into paradise. But, though there was no monastic rule at Nitria, there was municipal law, the outward symbol of which was the whip whips of which were enjoined on all the monks who might be guilty of some fault, one for thieves who might be caught prowling about, and the third for strangers who misbehaved. Further into the desert was a place called Cellos, or Cellia, whither the more perfect withdrew. This is described by the
author of the "Historia monachorum in Egyptio". Here the solitary lived in cells so far apart that they were out of sight and out of hearing of one another. Like those in Nitria, they met only on Saturdays and Sundays at church, whether some of them had to travel a distance of three or four miles. Often their death was only discovered by their absence from church.

In strong contrast with the individualism of the ascetic life was the rigid discipline which prevailed in the cenobitic monasteries founded by St. Pachomius. When, in 313, Constantine was at war with Maxentius, Pachomius, still a heathen, was forcibly enlisted together with a number of other young men, and placed on board a ship to be carried down the Nile to Alexandria. At some town at which the ship touched, the recruits were overwhelmed with the kindness of the Christians. Pachomius at once resolved to be a Christian and carry out his resolution as soon as he was dismissed from military service. He began as an ascetic in a small village, taking up his abode in a deserted temple of Serapis and cultivating a garden on the produce of which he lived and gave alms. The fact that Pachomius made an old temple of Serapis his abbey was enough for an ingenious theory that he originated as a pagan monk. This view is now quite exploded.

Pachomius next embraced the eremitical life and prevailed upon an old hermit named Palemon to take him as his disciple and share his cell with him. It may be noted that this kind of discipleship, which, as we have already seen, was attempted by Palladius, was a reaction against the Egyptian system. Afterwards he left Palemon and founded his first monastery at Tabennisi near Denderah. Before he died, in 346, he had under him eight or nine large monasteries of men, and two of women. From a secular point of view, a Pachomian monastery was an industrial community in which almost every kind of trade was represented. There was buying and selling, so the monks had ships of their own on the Nile, which conveyed their agricultural produce and manufactured goods to the market and brought back what the monasteries required. From the spiritual point of view, the Pachomian monk was a religious man under a rule more severe, even when a rule, than the Trappists had made for the Trappists.

A Pachomian monastery was a collection of buildings surrounded by a wall. The monks were distributed in houses, each house containing about forty monks. Three or four houses constituted a tribe. There would be from thirty to forty houses in a monastery. There was an abbot over each monastery, and provosts with subordinate officials over each house. The monks were divided into houses according to the work they were employed in: thus there would be a house for carpenters, a house for agriculturists, and so forth. But other principles of division seem to have been employed, e.g., we hear of a house for the Greeks.

On Sundays and other holy days the monks assembled in the church for Mass; on other days the Office and other spiritual exercises were celebrated in the houses.

"The fundamental idea of St. Pachomius's Rule," writes Abbot Butler, "was to establish a moderate level of observance (moderate in comparison with the life led by the hermits) which might be maintained on all; and then to leave it open to each—and to indeed encourage each—to go beyond the fixed minimum, according as he was prompted by his strength, his courage, and his zeal" ("Lausiac History", I, p. 238). This is strikingly illustrated in the rules concerning the priests. According to the priests, in his translation of the "Rule of Pachomius", the tables were laid twice a day except on Wednesdays and Fridays, which, outside of the seasons of Easter and Pentecost, were fast days. Some only took very little at the second meal; some at one or other of the meals confined themselves to a single food; others took just a meal of bread. Some abstained altogether from the community meal; for these bread, water, and salt were placed in their cell.

Pachomius appointed his successor a monk named Petronius, who died within a few months, having likewise named his successor, Horsiesi. In Horsiesi's time the order was threatened with a schism. The abbot of one of the houses, instead of forwarding the produce of his monastery to the head house of the order, where it would be sold and the price distributed to the different houses according to their need, wished to have the disposal of it for the sole benefit of his own monastery. Horsiesi, finding himself unable to cope with the situation, appointed Theodore, a favourite disciple of Pachomius, his coadjutor.

When Theodore died, in the year 388, Horsiesi was able to resume the government of the order. This threatened schism brings prominently before us a feature connected with Pachomius's foundation which is never again met with in the Esat, and in the West only many centuries later. "Like Citeaux in a later age," writes Abbot Butler, "it almost assumed the shape of a fully-organized congregation or order, with a superior general and a system of visitation and general chapters—in short, all the machinery of a centralised government, such as does not appear again in the monastic world until the Cistercian and the Mendicant Orders arose in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries" (op. cit., I, 235).

A word must be said about Schenoudi, or Schnoudi, or Sennuti. Shortly after the middle of the fourth century, two monks, Pgl and Pchaia, changed their eremitical monasteries into cenobitical ones. Of the latter we know scarcely anything. Schenoudi, when he was about forty years old, came under the care of his uncle Pgl. Both Pgl and Schenoudi were reformers—the Pachomian Rule was not strict enough for them.

Schenoudi succeeded his uncle Pgl as head of the White Monastery of Athribia and, till his death (about 453), was not only the greatest monastic reformer, but one of the most influential of the early Church Fathers. He waged war against heretics; he took a prominent part in the rooting out of paganism; he championed the cause of the poor against the rich. He once went in person to Constantinople to complain of the tyranny of government officials. On one occasion 20,000 men, women, and children took refuge in the White Monastery during an invasion of the savages of Blemmyes of Ethiopia, and Schenoudi maintained all the fugitives for three months, providing them with food and medical aid. On another occasion he ransomed a hundred captives and sent them home with food, clothing, and money for their journey (Leipoldt, "Schenute", A.T., 172, 173). Schenoudi's importance for the history of Christianism is small, for his influence, great as it was in his own country, did not make itself felt elsewhere. There were two barriers: Upper Egypt was a difficult and dangerous country for travellers, and such as did penetrate there would not be likely to visit a monastery where hardly anything but Coptic was spoken. According to Abbot Butler, "Schenoudi was named by any Greek or Latin writer" (op. cit., II, 204). He has been rediscovered in our own time in Coptic MSS. A description of the ruins of the White Monastery will be found in Curzon's "Monasteries of the Levant", ch. xi. There are photographs of the outside wall and the inside of the church in Milne's "Hst. of Egypt under Rom. Rule".

In part II of Butler's "Lausiac History" is a map of Monasticon Egypt. A glance at this map and
MONASTICISM

the notes accompanying it brings forcibly before the mind an important fact in monastic history. With the exception of a single monastery at Canopus, near Alexandria, the cenobitic monasteries are in the South, and confined to a relatively small area. The eremitical monasteries, on the contrary, are everywhere, and especially in the North. These latter were thus far more accessible to pilgrims visiting Egypt and so became the patterns or models for the rest of the Christian world. It was the eremitical, not the cenobitical, type of monasticism which went forth from Egypt.

Monasticism at a very early date spread along the route of the Exodus and the desert of the Forty Years' Wandering. The solitaries had a special predilection for Scriptural sites. At every place hallowed by tradition, which they visited (as, for instance, where she found monks. The attraction of Mt. Sinai for the solitaries was irresistible, in spite of the danger of captivity or death at the hands of the Saracens. In 373 a number of solitaries inhabited this mountain, living on dates and other fruit, such bread as they had been reserved for the Sacred Mysteries. All the while they lived apart in the desert, they gathered together in the church on Saturday evening and, after spending the night in prayer, received communion on Sunday morning. Forty of them were massacred in 373, and on the same day another group of solitaries at Rathe (supposed to be Elium) were killed by a second band of barbarians. These events were written by Eusebius (Tillemont, "Histoire eccl.", VII, 573–80). The same kind of life was being led at Mt. Sinai, and a similar experience was undergone some twenty years later when St. Nilus was there.

St. Hilarius, who for a time had been a disciple of St. Anthony, propagated monasticism of the eremitical type in the cities of Gaza and then in Cyprus. His friend St. Epiphanius, after practising the monastic life in Egypt, founded a monastery near Eleutheropolis in Palestine somewhere about 330 or perhaps a little later.

In Jerusalem and its neighbourhood there were numerous monasteries at a very early date. To name only a few, there was the monastery on the Mount of Olives, from which Palladius went forth on his tour of the Egyptian monasteries; there were two monasteries for women in Jerusalem, built by the older and younger Melania respectively. At Bethlehem St. Paula founded three monasteries for women and one for men. Of these which was built, both in Bethlehem the monastery where Cassian some years before began his religious life. The lauras, which were very numerous, formed a conspicuous feature in Palestinian monasticism. The first seems to have been founded before 334 by St. Chariton at Pharan, a few miles from Jerusalem; later on, two more were founded by the same saint at Jericho and at Suca.

St. Euthymius (473) founded another celebrated one in the Valley of Cedron. Near Jericho was the laura ruled over by St. Gerasimus (475). Some details concerning the rule of this laura have fortunately been preserved in a very ancient Life of St. Euthymius. It consisted of a cenobium where the cenobitic life was practised by novices and others less proficient. There were also seventy cells for solitaries. Five days in the week these latter lived and worked alone in their cells. On Saturday they brought their work to the cenobium, where, after receiving Holy Communion on Sundays, they partook of some cooked food. First thing in the morning breakfast was bread, dates, and water. When some of them asked to be allowed to heat some water, that they might cook some food, and to have a lamp to read by, they were told that if they wished to live thus they had better take up their abode in the cenobium (Acta SS., March, I, 386–87).

Antiochian monasticism was a young man, was full of ascetics and the neighbouring mountains were peopled with hermits. So great was the impulse driving men to the solitary life that at one time there was an outcry, amounting almost to a persecution, among Christians as well as pagans against those who embraced it. This was the occasion of the beginning of the offensive of monasticism: in the first book he dwelt upon the guilt incurred by them; the second and third were addressed respectively to a pagan and a Christian father who were opposing the wish of their sons to embrace the monastic state. The pathetic scene between the saint and his mother, which he describes in the beginning of these last two treatises, is typical of what took place in many Christian homes. He himself so far yielded to his mother's entreaties that he contented himself with the ascetic life at home till her death. Palestine and Antioch must suffice as examples of the rapid spread of monasticism outside of Egypt. There is abundant evidence of the existence of cenobitic monasteries in Syria, in some of the cities of the Mediterranean and Mesopotamia; and Mesopotamia, according to St. Jerome, whose testimony is amply borne out by other writers, rivalled Egypt itself in the number and holiness of its monks (Comm. in Isaiam, V, xix).

St. Anthony now comes to a name second only in importance to St. Anthony's for the history of eastern monasticism. St. Basil the Great before embracing the monastic state made a careful study of monasticism in Egypt, Palestine, Cœle Syria, and Mesopotamia. The result was a decided preference for the cenobitical life. He founded several monasteries in Pontus, over one of which he himself for a time presided, and in another of which he was the first superior. He desired to establish a number of monasteries in the East. His monks assembled together for "palmody" and "genuflexions" seven times a day, in accordance with the Psalmist's "Seventy with one who dined with the Lord's table" (Ps. civi, 164) at midnight ("Media nocte surgemus")—Ibid., 62), at evening, morning, and midday (Ps. iv, 18), at the third hour, the hour of Pentecost, and at the ninth, the sacred hour of the Passion. To complete the tale of seven, the midday prayer was divided into two parts separated by the community meal (Sermo "Asceticus", Benedictine edition, II, 321). St. Basil's monastic ideal is set forth in a collection of his writings known as the "Asceticus", or "Ascetical", the most important of which are the sixty-five answers to questions, fifty-five in number, and the "Regulæ breviores tractatus", in which three hundred and thirteen questions are briefly replied to. It must not be supposed that the "Regulæ" form a rule, though it would be possible to go a good way towards constituting one out of them. They are answers to questions which were naturally raised among persons already in possession of a framework of customs or traditions. Sometimes they treat of practical questions, but as often as not they deal with matters concerning the spiritual life. What is on the whole a good description of them will be found in Smith and Cheetham, "Dict. of Christ. Antiquities", II, 233 sqq.

It would not be easy to exaggerate St. Basil's influence upon eastern monasticism: he furnished the type which ultimately prevailed. But two points of utmost importance, as marking the difference between Eastern and Western monasteries, must be kept in mind. (1) He did not draw up a rule, but gave what is far more an elastic thing, a model or plan. (2) He was not the founder of a religious order. No Eastern, except St. Pachomius, ever was. An order, as we understand the word, is a purely Western product. "It is not enough", says a writer who ce:
MAINLY does not underrate St. Basil's influence, "to affirm that the Basilian Order is a myth. One must go further and give up calling the Byzantine monks Basilians. Those most concerned have never taken to themselves this title, and no Eastern writer that I know of has ever bestowed it upon them" (Pargore in "Dict. d'Archéologie chrétienne", s. v. "Basilei"). In a word, every monastery is an order of its own. With St. Basil Eastern monasticism reached its final stage—communities of monks leading the contemplative life and devoting themselves wholly to prayer and work. The monachial life has been a steady basis for the normal form of the religious calling, and the eremitical one the exceptional form, requiring a long previous training.

We must now speak of the grounds upon which St. Basil based his decision—a decision so momentous for the future history of monasticism—in favour of the cenobitical life. Life with others is more expedient because, in the first place, even for the supply of their bodily needs, men depend upon one another. Further, there is the law of charity. The solitary has only himself to regard; yet "charity seeks not itself"!

Again, the solitary will not equally discover his faults, the being no one to correct him with meekness and mercy. There are precepts of charity which can only be fulfilled in the cenobitical life. The gifts of the Holy Spirit are not all given to all men, but one is given to one man and another to another. We cannot be partners in the gifts not bestowed on ourselves if we live by ourselves. The great danger to the soul is that he may become a孤 pioneer, so that he is unable to learn his faults or his progress. How can he learn humility when there is no one to prefer before himself? Or patience when there is no one to yield to? Whose feet shall he wash? To whom shall he be a servant? (Reg. f. tract., Q. vii.)

This condemnation of the eremitical life is not complete. He hints at the flat and commonplace kinds of failure, against which the common life afforded the best protection. Clearly St. Basil found very little that was tragic during the two years he was investigating monasticism in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and elsewhere.

It might be supposed that so uncompromising a verdict against the eremitical life would stir up a fierce conflict. As a matter of fact, it did nothing of the kind. Palestine, towards the end of the fourth century, began to supersede Egypt as the centre of monasticism, and in Palestine the laura and the cenobium were in perfect harmony. That of St. Gerasimus, with its cenobium already referred to, may have been the original of St. Anthony's authority was given to St. Anthony's among the leaders of Palestinian monasticism; yet they took it as a matter of course that life in the laura was the most perfect, though under ordinary circumstances it should not be entered upon before an apprenticeship had been served in a cenobium. The paradox is not so great as it may at first sight appear. The dweller in the laura was under an archimandrite or abbot and so was exposed to the dangers of the purely eremitical state.

The Council of Chalcedon, monasticism had so recently been a recognized part of the life of the Church that it was especially legislated for. Monasteries were not to be erected without the leave of the bishop; monks were to receive due honour, but were not to mix themselves up with the affairs of Church or State. Monks were to be subject to the bishop and his clergy; and monks were not to serve in war or embrace a secular life (can. vii.). Monasteries were not to be secularized (can. xxiv.).

Solitary spots, according to St. Basil, should be chosen as sites for monasteries. Nevertheless, they soon found their way into cities. According to Monasticism in Antiquity in the East (1887, 330-398), at least fifteen monasteries were founded at Constantinople in the time of Constantine the Great; but Besse (Les Moine d'Orient, 18) affirms that the three most ancient ones only dated back to the time of Theodosius (375-95). In 518 there were at least fifty-four monasteries in Constantinople. Their names and those of their founders are given in a petition addressed by the monks of Constantinople to Pope Hormisdas in 518 (Martin, ibid., 18).

For Egyptian monasticism, not only are the original sources far superior to those for early Christian monasticism elsewhere, but it has been more thoroughly investigated. The most important work that has appeared in recent times is BUTLER, The Lusiac History of Palladius in C.G. (1st part, 1889; second part, 1904). Other important works are LADERE, Etudes sur le monastisme Alexandrin pendant le IV ème siècle, I (Leipzig, 1901); BESSE, Les moines d'Egypte en dehors de la première moitié du IV ème siècle (Leipzig, 1903); Cartwright, Early Christian Near Eastern Monasticism (1911). A study of the documents upon which our knowledge of Pachomius and Schenou is based is Besse, Die Pachomianer (11th edition, 1931). Christian asceticism in the first three centuries and 3 (2) monasticism in the fourth; he omits Schenoudi altogether. A very important point of difference, however, is that while Schenoudi on the one hand, and Butler on the other, is the unfavourable estimate formed by the first two and the favourable one by the last of Palladius's account of the Greek Fathers. His restorations and corrections of the original sources will be found in Butler, op. cit., pt. I., 1, 196 sqq.; pt. II., p. xii. The most valuable, however, is that the text has been preserved by Butler in his History of Palladius (see above).

What used to pass for Palladius was a text very much intermixed with the Historia monachorum (see above). An account of the travels of Palladius to Alexandria and Egypt (11th century) is that of a Spanish who visited Egypt in 394-95, written by one of them. The Greek text was printed for the first time by Franchimont, Palladius et Ruffinus (Giessen, 1887). Till 1897 it was only known in the Latin version of Ruffinus, which was supposed to be the original. As the experiences narrated do not square with the facts of Ruffinus's Life, this suppression reduced it to the level of an historical romance. Butler has proved, or nearly proved, that the account in the Historia Monachorum is the original and the restorations and corrections the way to place as a genuine record. He has done the same for the Lusiac Hist. by recovering the uninterpolated text. The Institutes of the De laubais Monks and the Records of the Historia Historica are important additions to our knowledge (see ar. CASSIAN, JOHN). For Pachomian monasticism the chief authorities are the Greek Life of Pachomius; Pachanian Lectionary, known as the Ammonius on Theodorus (all to be found in Acta SS., May I.); and Schenoudi's translation of it. The School of Alexandria, known as the Arabic MSS concerning Egyptian monasticism have been published of late years chiefly by AMPLEIER, for which we must refer the reader to the bibliography. There is a new translation of the text and its history to LEPOLET, op. cit.

An English translation of Byzantine versions of the Lusiac History, the Lectionary, and the Hist. Monach. (there attributed to St. Jerome) will be found in vol. I of Buxtor, Paradise of the Fathers (London, 1897). For Palladius, references to the corresponding Greek text of Butler will be found on pp. xxxii., xxxiv., etc.

For non-Egyptian Eastern monasticism, the chief sources are the Lives, when authentic, of individual monks and hermits. St. THEOGRAPHER, De vita patrum, 2 vols. (Paris, 1841). JEROME, ST. JOHN CHrysostom, ST. ERPHEM, ST. HILUS, etc., of the original, the Summa deserunt saeculi, etc. Among other books dealing with the subject Tillemont's Mémoires is perhaps the most indispensable. MARIN, Vies des Prés des déserts d' Orient (9 vols., Paris, 1854), gives copious quotations from the original sources. The only important modern work upon Eastern Monasticism as a whole seems to be Besse, Les moines d' Orient antérieurs au concile Chalcédonien (1891).

FRANCIS JOSEPH BACCHUS.

III. Eastern Monasticism.—(1) Origin.—The first home of Christian monasticism is the Egyptian desert. Hither during persecution men fled the world and the danger of apostasy, to serve God in solitude. St. Anthony (270-356) is courted as the father of this monasticism. His fame attracted many others, so that under Diocletian and Constantine there were large colonies of monks in...
Egypt, the first λατρεία. St. Athanasius's (d. 375) friendly relations to the Egyptian monks and the monk he found among them during his second (358-362) and third (362-363) exiles are well known incidents of his life. The monks lived each in his own hut, providing for their simple needs with their own hands, united by a bond of willing submission to the direction of some older and more experienced hermit, coming together on Saturday and Sunday for common prayer; others were not nearly so private in their contemplation and works of penance. Celibacy was from the beginning an essential note of monasticism. A wife and family were part of the "world" they had left.

Poverty and obedience were to some extent relative, though the ideal of both was developing. The major point was that the monk's calling was not necessarily a part of his nature, but formed a different class from the clergy who stayed in the world and assisted the bishops. For a long time this difference between monks and clergy remained; the monk fled all intercourse with other people to save his soul away from temptation. Later some monks were ordained priest in order to administer to their brethren. But even in the East the priest-monk (λατρευτός) is a special person distinct from the usual monk (μοναχός), who is a layman.

St. Anthony's scarcely less famous disciple Pachomius (d. 345) is believed to have begun the organization of the hermits in groups, "folds" (μοναχίαν) with stricter vows (μοναχίαν); but the organization was vague. Monasticism was still a manner of life rather than affiliation to an organized body; any one who left wife and family and the "world" to seek peace away from men was a monk. Two codified "Rules" are attributed to Pachomius; of these the longer is translated into Latin by St. Jerome, a second and shorter one by Palladius. Pachomius' "Rule" preserved not a few, and especially by the ascetic writings of monks, letters, sermons, and so on, in which they give advice to their colleagues. Of such monastic writers St. John Damascene (d. c. 755), George Hamartolos (ninth century), and especially St. Theodore of Studion (d. 639) are perhaps the most valuable for this purpose. At the head of each independent monastery (κοινονία is the common name in Greek) was the superior. At first (e.g., by Justinian: "Novii", V; CXXXIII, v and xxiv) he is called indifferently ἱεραρχή, ἱεραρχάρης, πρόεδρος. Later the common name is πρίγκιπας only. The archimandrite has become a person of superior rank and takes precedence over the hegumens. Monasticism meant the superior of a patriarchal monastery, that is, one immediately subject to the patriarch and independent of the jurisdiction of the ordinary. The title then would correspond to that of the Western "Abbas nullius".

Marin (Les Moines de Constantinople, pp. 87-90), adorning this, demonstrates from examples that there was an intermediate period (from about the sixth to the ninth centuries) during which the title archimandrite was given as a purely personal honour to certain hegumenoi without involving any exemption for the monastery. A further precedence belonged to a "great archimandrite". The election and rights of the hegumenos are described by St. Basil in his two Rules, by Justinian (Novel., CXXXIII, xxxiv), and Theodore of Studion (Testamentum, in P. G., XCIX, 1817-1818). He was elected by the monks by a majority of votes; in cases of dispute the patriarch or ordinary decided; sometimes lots were cast. He was to be chosen for his merit, not according to his wealth. He had already the power of the monastery, and should be sufficiently learned to know the canons. The patriarch or bishop must confirm the election and institute the hegumenos. But the emperor received him in audience and gave him a pastoral staff (the
The ceremony of induction is given in the “Euchologion” (Goar’s edition, Venice, 1730, 395-399). He then remained abbot for life, except in the event of his being deposed, after trial, for some canonical offence.

The hegumenos had absolute authority over all his monks, could receive novices and inflict punishments; but he was bound always by the rule of St. Basil and the canons, and he had to consult a committee of the more experienced monks in all cases of difficulty. This committee was the συνέδριον in which in many ways limited the autocracy of the superior (St. Basil’s Rule, P.G., XXXIV, 1037). The hegumenos in the Byzantine time, after Justinian, was generally, but not quite always, a priest. He received the confessions of his monks (there are instances of those who were not priests usurping this office (Marin, op. cit., 96)) and could ordain them to minor Orders, including the subdiaconate. Under the abbot there was a hierarchy of other officials, more or less numerous according to the size of the monastery. The διακόνοι took their place in case of his absence or sickness, the έπισκόποι had charge of all the property, the κελάριοι looked after the food, the ἱεραρχοῦσιν saw to the regular performance of services in the church, the καινοφύταi guided the singers during the Divine office. These officials, who usually formed the synaxis, acted as a restraint on the authority of the hegumenos. Numerous lesser offices, as those of informarian, guest-master, porter, cook, were also divided among the community. The monks were divided into three orders, novices, those who bear the lesser habit and those who have the great habit. Children (the οέρους of Trullo of 692 admits professional as valid after the age of ten years), married men (if their wives are willing), even slaves who are badly treated by their masters or in danger of losing their faith, could be received as novices. Justinian ordered novices to wear lay clothes (Novel., V, ii), but soon the custom was introduced that after a probation of about six months (while they were postulants) they should have their hair cut (τουράμια) and receive a tonsure (ψιλώσις) and the tall cap called καλωδίων. The service for this first clothing is in the “Euchologion” (Goar, pp. 378-380).

After three years’ novitiate the monk received the lesser habit or μαντύα (το μπους σχίμα, μαντίδια). He is again tonsured in the form of a cross, receives a new tonsure, belt, cap, postulants, and the monastic cloak (μαντίδια). For the rite, see Goar, pp. 382-389. The mantyas is the “angelic habit” that makes him a true monk; it is at this service that he makes his vows. An older form of the “sacrament of monastic perfection” (μαντηράς μανττίζής τελειώσας), that is, of the profession and reception of a monk, is given by Dionysius the Areopagite (p. 500), “de Eccles. Hierarch.” VI, ii (P. G., III, 533). The monk is “ordained” by a priest (λειψί; he always calls bishops λέιψία), presumably the abbot. Standing he recites the “monastic invocation” (τη μοναστική επιλογή), evidently a prayer for the grace he needs. The priest then asks him if he renounces everything, explains to him the duties of his state, signs him with the cross, tonsures him and clothes him in the habit, finally celebrates the holy Liturgy, and gives him Communion. From the time of his profession the monk remains inseparably attached to the monastery. Besides the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience he makes a vow of perseverance in the religious exercises of the particular laura he has chosen. Normally he cannot change to another than go back to the world. He should moreover never go out at all. In theory all monks are “enclosed” (St. Basil, P.G., XXXI, 655-663); but this rule has never been taken very literally. Monks travelled about, with the consent of their superiors and with the excuse that they were engaged in business of the laura or of the Church.

But there still remained a further step. After having proved their perseverance for some years monks were accustomed to ask, as a reward for their advancement in the ascetic life, for the “great habit” (το μπους και διψίλων σχίμα). This was simply a larger and more dignified cloak, suitable for the veterans of the monastery. Gradually its reception became a regular ceremony and the wearers of the great habit began to form a superior class, the aristocracy of the laura. St. Theodore of Studion objected strongly, to the practice of the “As there is only one baptism,” he says, “so is there only one habit” (P.G., XCIX, 1819). It is true that there is no real place for the rank in the monastic system. At the reception of the first habit the monk makes his solemn vows for life and becomes a full monk in every sense. However, in spite of opposition, the custom grew. The imposition of the great habit repeats very much the ceremony of the lessor habit and forms a kind of renewal of vows (Goar, p. 403-414); it is from the older monks who have gone through this rite and are honourably distinguished by their long cloaks that the dignitaries of the laura are chosen. Another gradual development was the formation of a class of priest-monks. At first no monks received any ordination; then one or two were made priests to administer sacraments to the others, then later it became common to ordain a monk priest. But it has never become the rule that all choir-monks should be ordained, as it became in the West. On entering monasteries people changed their name. The monk was to abstain from flesh-meat always; his food was fruit and vegetables and on feast-days fish, eggs, milk, and cheese. Wine was allowed. The change of meal, the only full meal in the day, was served at the sixth hour (midday); on the frequent fast-days, including every Wednesday and Friday and the four fasting-times, it was put off till the ninth hour. Later in the evening, after the ἀνακλίνοντα (compline), the remains of the meal were again spread in the refectory and any who wished, chiefly the younger monks, might take partake of a light supper (cf. Marin, op. cit., p. 121).

The monk’s main occupation was the daily chanting of the long Byzantine office in church. This took up a great part of the day and the night. There were moreover the διοικητικά offices, which on the even of great feasts lasted all night. The rest of the time was spent in manual work, digging, carpentry, weaving,
and so on, portioned out to each by the abbot, of which the profit belonged to the monastery (St. Basil, P. G., XXXI, 1016, 1017, 1132, etc.; Marin, op. cit., 132–135). Men who already know an innocent and profitable era of its many continue to exercise it as a St. Basil in M. P., XXXI, 1305–1314). A monk who had proved his constancy for many years in the community could receive permission from the hegumenos to practise the severer life of a hermit. He then went to occupy a solitary cell near the laura (St. Basil’s Rule, P. G., XXXI, 1133). But he was still counted a member of the monastery. Theodore, St. Basil’s mother no longer found solitude too hard. At the court of the Patriarch of Constantinople was an official, the Exarch of the monks, whose duty it was to supervise the monasteries. Most other bishops had a similar assistant among their clergy.

Celibacy became an ideal for the hermits in the East gradually after the 4th century. In the fourth century we still find St. Gregory Nazianzian’s father, who was Bishop of Nazianzos, living with his wife, without scandal. But very soon after that the present Eastern rule obtained. It is less strict than in the West. No one may marry after he has been ordained priest (Paphnutius at the first Council of Nicaea maintains this). But Gregory Nazianzian was married in Constantinople, in the church of the Blessed Martyrs, on 25, 166, 2nd year of the Synod of Nicaea in 314 or 324, ib., p. 327, and Can. Apost., xxvi. The Synod of Elvira about 300 had decreed absolute celibacy for all clerics in the West, Can. xxiii., ib., pp. 238–239; priests already married may keep their wives (the same law applied to widows on the part of the clergy). But this law was modified in Trullo, 692; see "Echoes of Orient", 1900–1901, pp. 65–71, but bishops must be celibate. As nearly as all secular priests were married this meant that, as a general rule, bishops were chosen from the monasteries, and so these became, as they still are, the road through which advancement may be attained. Besides the communities in monasteries there were many extraordinary developments of monasticism. There were always hermits who practised various extreme forms of asceticism, such as binding tight ropes round their bodies, very severe fasting, and so on. A singular form of asceticism was that of the Stygites (στυγίται), who lived on columns. St. Symeon Styliotes (q. v.) began about 420.

From the time of Constantine the building and endowment of monasteries became a form of good work adopted by very many rich people. Constantine and Helen set the example and almost every emperor afterwards (except Julian) followed it (Marin, "Les moines de Constantinople", chap. 1). So monasteries grew up all over the empire. Constantinople especially was covered with them (see the list, ib., 23–25). One of the chief of these was Studion (Στουδιών) in the south-western angle of the city, founded by a Roman, Studius, in 402 or 403. It was occupied by so-called "sleepless" (σπυρόκοιμοι) monks, who divided into companies, kept an unceasing round of prayer and psalm-singing day and night in the church. But there was not a separate order; there was no distinction between various religious orders. St. Theodore, the great defender of images in the second Iconoclasm persecution, became Hegumenos of Studion in 799 (till his death in 826). His letters, sermons and constitutions for the Studite monks gave renewed ideals and influenced all Byzantine monasticism. Dion (this period of a great number of synods, ordinances of patriarchs, emperors, and abbots, further defined and expanded the rule of St. Basil. Many Eastern synods draw up among their canons laws for monks, often merely enforcing the old rule (e. g. the Synod of Capadocia in the middle of the fourth century, Can., xix., etc.). St. John Chrysostom (cf. Montalembert, "Histoire des Moines d’Occident", Paris, 1880, I, 124), the Patriarch John the Faster (d. 555: Pitra, "Spicilegium Solesmensis", Paris, 1852, IV, 416–444), the Patriarch Nicephoros (d. 829: ib., 381, 415), and so on, down to Photios (Hergenrother, "Photius", Ratisbon, 1867, II, 222–223), added to these rules, which, collected and commented in the various constitutions and typika of the monasteries, remain the guide of a Byzantine monk. Most of all, St. Theodore’s "Constitution of Studion" (P. G., XCIX, 1703–1720) and his list of punishments for monks (ib., 1734–1758) represent a classical and much copied example of such a collection of rules and principles from approved sources. But the latter had a modern view that the husbands of women at Annesos near the settlement of the men. From that time convents of nuns spread throughout the Byzantine Church, organized according to the same rule and following the same life as that of the monks with whatever modifications were necessary for their sex. The convicts were subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop; the church was provided for by a priest, generally a priest-monk, who was their "ghostly father" (πνευματικός ναότης). The abbess was called γυναικειόν.

Lastly, during this period the monks played a very important part in theological controversies. The Patriarch of Alexandria, for instance, in his disputes with the bishops of Constantinople in 402–403 over the monasticism of his clergy, shows that he was aware of the fanatical loyalty of the great crowd of monks who swarmed up from the desert in his defence. Often we hear of monks fighting, leading tumults, boldly attacking the soldiers. In all the Monophysite troubles the monks of Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the capital were able to throw the great weight of their united influence. They were the leaders of the Arian and the Anacoretic schism (482–519), while the whole Byzantine Church broke communion with Rome, only the "sleepless" monks of Studion remained Catholic. On the whole, the monks were generally on the Catholic side. During the Iconoclast persecution they were so determined against the overthrow of the holy pictures that the Iconoclast emperors made the abolition of monasticism part of their programme and persecuted people for being monks just as much as for worshiping images (see ICONOCLASM). Especially the great Studion monastery at Constantinople had a tradition of unswerving orthodoxy and loyalty to Rome. They alone kept communion with the Holy See in the Aca- ritarchism, they were the leaders of the Iconoclasts, and their great abbot St. Theodore (d. 826) was one of the last defenders of union and the pope's rights before the great schism.

(3) From the schism to modern times.—The schism made little difference to the inner life of the Byzantine monasteries. Like the lower clergy and the people they quietly followed their bishops, who followed the patriarchs, who followed the Ecumenical patriarch into schism. After that their life went on as before, except that, having lost the advantage of intercourse with the West, they gradually drifted into the same stagnation as the rest of the Orthodox Church. They lost their tradition of scholarship, they had no teaching church, they had no work to do, but in the late Middle Ages they gradually arrived at the ideal that the "angelic life" meant, besides their immensely long prayers, contemplation
and fasting, doing nothing at all. In the eighteenth
century, when an attempt was made to found monas-
tic schools, they fiercely resented such a desecration
of their ideal. During the early Middle Ages the
Orthodox Church lent support, on the holy mountains. 
Catholic monks, who were converting western Europe
and making their monasteries the homes of scholarship.
The chief event of this period is the foundation of
the Athos monasteries, destined to become the centre
of Orthodox monasticism. When St. Athanasius of
Athos founded the great Laura there, there were al-
ready cells of hermits on the holy mountain. Never-
theless he is rightly looked upon as the founder of the
communities that made Athos so great a centre of
Orthodox monasticism (see Athos, Mount; also Kytiakos, Ekklesi-

In the tenth and eleventh centuries the famous monas-
teries called the Meteoras (Μετέωρα) in Thessaly were
built on their inaccessible peaks to escape the ravages
of the Slavs. The Turkish conquest made little dif-
terence to the monks. Moslems respect religious.
Their Prophet had spoken well of monks (Koran, Sura
V, 85) and had given a charter of protection to the
monks of Sinai; but they shared fully the degradation
of all church institutions to which they were subject.
The Turkish conquest sealed their isolation from the rest
of Christendom; the monasteries became the refuge of
peasants too lazy to work, and the monk earned the
scorn with which he is regarded by educated people in
the East. Eugenios Bulgari (d. 1800), one of the chief
restorers of classical scholarship among the Greeks,
made the Meteoras his home, and founded a school at
Athos. The monks drove him out with contumely as an
atheist and a blasphemer, and pulled his school down. Its
ruins still stand as a warning that study forms no part
of the “angelic” life.

(4) Monasticism in the present Orthodox Church.—
The sixteen independent Churches that make up the
Orthodox world (the Oecumenical or Greek) but which
are fewer convents. One great monastery, that of
Mount Sinai, follows what professes to be the old rule
of St. Anthony. All the others have St. Basil’s rule
with the additions, expansions, and modifications
made by later emperors, patriarchs, and synods.
There is no distinction of religious orders as in the
West, but a considerable degree of monasticism is
found. All monks are “Basilians” if one must give them
a special name. A monk is μοναχος, a priest-monk
ιερουργος. A monastery is μονή or λαος.
The novice (δρακος) wears a tunic called βασιν with a
belt and the kalimallion of all the clergy, he is often
called μαθηματικος. After two years (the period is some-
times shortened) he makes his (solemn) vows and re-
ceives the small habit (μαθηματικ). Technically he is
now a μαθηματικος, though the word is not often used.
After an undefined time of perseverance he receives the
great habit (κουσωλιος) and becomes μεγαλομαθηματικος.
The popular Greek name for monk is “good old man”
(ελληνικα). The election, the rights and duties of the
hierarchy, and many rules are retained from the time
before the schism. The title “archimandrite” ap-
pears to be given now to abbots of the more important
monasteries and also sometimes as a personal title of
distinction to others. It involves only precedence of
rank.

Most monasteries depend on the local metropolitan.
In the Orthodox states (Russia, Greece, etc.) the Holy
Church has a good deal to say in their management,
confirms the election of the abbot, controls, and
ubernaturally confiscates their property. But certain
great monasteries are exempt from local jurisdiction
and immediately subject to the patriarch or Holy
Synod. These are called στουρφησια. One Ortho-
odox monastery (Mount Sinai) which is in this class
also “Archbishop of Sinai”, is an autopoitephalous
Church, obeying only Christ and the Seven Councils.

The Γαννσιοι καπναρσιοι of the Oecumenical patriarchate
contain a chapter about monasteries (pp. 67 sqq.).
They are divided into three classes, those with more
than twenty, more than ten or more than five monks.
Only those of the first class (more than twenty
are bound to sing all the Divine office and celebrate
the holy Liturgy every day. Monasteries with less
than five monks are to be suppressed or incorporated
in larger ones. Monastic property accumulated in the
East as in the West. Many quarrels between the
Church and State have arisen from usurped control or
confiscation of this property by the various Orthodox governments. The first Greek Parl-
ament in 1833 (at Nauplion) suppressed all monas-
teries in the new kingdom that had less than six
monks. In 1864 Russia confiscated all monastic
property in Rumania, of which much belonged to the
monasteries of Mount Sinai, Jerusalem, and Athos.
In 1875 Russia confiscated three-fifths of the property
in Bessarabia belonging to the monastery of the Holy
Sepulchre. Of the rest it paid itself one-fifth for its
trouble and applied two-fifths to what it described
euphemistically as pious purposes in Russia. Many
monasteries have farms called μετασχα in distant lands.
Generally a few monks are sent to administer the me-
teria, but most of which all the rest live in the
monastery. The most famous monasteries in the southern
part of the Orthodox Church are Mount Sinai, the
Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, the Meteoras in Thes-
saly, Sveti Naum on the Lake of Ohrida and, most of
all, Athos. The national quarrels in the Orthodox
Church have full development at Athos. Till lately
the Greeks succeeded in found a school at Athos. They
drove the Georgians from Ivron, the Bulgars
from Philotheos, Xenophon, and St. Paul’s. Now
they are rapidly losing ground and influence; the
Slavs are building large Sketai, and Russia here as
everywhere is the great danger to the Greek element.
The Russians have only one laura (Panteleimon or
theotokos), but have thirty-five other monasteries
more than all the Greek lauras together. All the
Athos monasteries are stauropogia; only the Patriarch
of Constantinople has any jurisdiction. For ordina-
tions the hegumen invites the neighbouring Metro-
politan of Heraclea. The monasteries have also the
dignity of “Imperial” lauras, as having been under
the protection of emperors of former days.

(5) Monasticism in Russia.—The writer is indebted
to Mr. C. Faminovsky of the Russian Embassy
Church at London for the following account and the Russian
bibliography. There have been monks in Russia
since Christianity was first preached there in the tenth
century. Their great period was the fourteenth cen-
tury; their decline began in the sixteenth. Peter the
Great (1661–1725) at one time meant to suppress the
monasteries altogether. In 1723 he forbade new
monasteries to be received. Under Catherine II (1761–
1796) a more prosperous era began; since Alexander
I (1801–1825) monasteries flourish again all over the
empire. The latest census (1896) counts 495 monas-
teries and 249 monastic villages as the result of this
into 4 lauras (in Russia the name means a certain
precedence and special privileges); 7 stauropogia
(subject directly to the Holy Synod and exempt from
the ordinary’s jurisdiction), 64 monasteries attached
to bishop’s palaces. The rest are divided into three
classes. There are 73 of the first class (which have at
least 33 monks or, if convents, 52 nuns). 100 of the
second (17 monks or nuns) and 191 of the third (12
monks or 17 nuns). There are further 350 monas-
teries not classified. Catherine II introduced
the practice of drawing up official lists of the monas-
teries. She found 1072 monasteries in her empire of
which she abolished 496 and classified the rest. In
Russia, monasteries of Athos, monasteries (monastery
jitel’nye) or idiorhythmic (neobeshejitel’nye); but
these latter are not in favour with the Holy Synod
which restores the ecumenic rule wherever possible. Some monasteries are supported by government (khaltynie), others have to support themselves. The three classes mentioned above concern the amounts received by the supported monasteries. The main monasteries are: Solovetsky, at Archangel, Simonoff, Donskoy, Novoospassky, and Saikonoospassky at Moscow, Voekresensky, or New Jerusalem, Spaso-Yakovlewy. The censuses 1896 counted 22,940 monks and 7464 nuns in the empire. The most famous Russian monasteries are Kief (Kievsky Laura) founded in 1052 by St. Anthony, the last of all; the Troitsky, or Trinity, Laura near Moscow, founded by St. Sergius in 1335 and now the home of the first "Ecclesiastical Academy" (Serninary) in the empire; the Metropolitan of Moscow is its hegumenos. The Pochaievský Laura, founded in the thirteenth century and famous for its miraculous eikon of the Blessed Virgin; Solovetsky, founded in 1293; Surie (in the government of Novgorod) founded in 1302; Tikhviny (in Novgorod); Volokolamsky (in the Moscow government) founded by St. Joseph of Volokolamsk in 1749, which has an important library and has often been used as a state prison, and Kyrllya-Bilesersky (in Novgorod) founded by St. Cyril in 1387. *The Monasteries of the lesser Eastern Churches.*—Little need be said of these Churches. All had fully developed monasticism according to St. Basil's idea before they went into schism, and all have monks and nuns under much the same conditions as the Orthodox, though, naturally, in each case there has been some special development of their own. The Nestorians in Persia, the Chinese, the Chaldeans, the Assyrians, the Armenians, and the Melchites have all formed their own monasteries. The Copts have many monasteries arranged almost entirely like those of the Orthodox (Silbernagl, *Verfassung u. gegenwartiger Bestand samt. Kirchen des Orients*, Ratisbon, 1804, 291-293). The Assyrian monasteries are very flourishing in Persia and China. The Church of the Syrian Jacobites once had a great number of monasteries. Down to the sixteenth century there were still Stylites among them. They now have only nine monasteries in the present reduced state of their Church, most of them also residences of bishops. The Jacobite monk fasts very strictly. To eat meat is a crime punished as equal to adultery (Silbernagl, op. cit., 319-319). The Armens, Nestorians, and Chinese, as well as the flourishing of these lesser Eastern Churches, has the largest number of monks and the most flourishing monastic state. Armenian monks follow St. Basil's rule, but are much stricter in the matter of fasting. The novitiate lasts eight years. It is a curious contrast to this strictness that the abbot is often not a monk at all, but a married secular priest who hands on his office to his son by hereditary right. Most Armenian bishops live in monasteries. Etchmiadzin, the residence of the Catholicos, is theoretically the centre of the Armenian Church. The Armenians have the huge monastery of St. James, the centre of their quarter of Jerusalem, where their Patriarch of Jerusalem lives, and the court of Dervish uni on Mount Moriah with hundreds of nuns. Armenian monks do not at a rule become bishops; the bishops are taken from the unmarried Vartabeds, that is, the higher class of secular priests (doctors). In all the other Eastern Churches bishops are monks. All use their monasteries as places of punishment for refractory clergy. *The Uniates in Rome.*—The connection of Rome makes to Eastern monks is that there is in the Uniate Churches a certain tendency to emulate the Latin religious orders. As this generally means a disposition to do something more than recite the Divine office, it may be counted an unmixed advantage. Uniate monks, like all the uniate clergy, are admitted into the Roman clergy, while the schismatics, if some of them at least attend Western schools or seminaries of Latin religion in the East. It is a Latinizing tendency that makes them often use special names for their order and even evolve into something like separate religious orders. Thus most Uniate Byzantine monks call themselves "Basilians", as the Latins use "Benedictines" or "Franciscans". Among the Melchites the two great congregations of Salvatorians and Shuwertes (see Melchites) are practically different orders. The Uniate Armenians have the famous Mechitarist Congregation, really a special religious order founded by Mechitar (1676-1749). The Mechitarists have the monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore at Venice, and the Mechitarists in other countries, as in 1774, have a house at Vienna. By their schools, missions, and literary activity they have always done great things in educating and converting their countrymen. The Catholic Chaldæes have three monasteries, Rabban Hormuzd, Alkoeh, and Mar Yurgis in Mesopotamia. The Maronite Church from its beginning has been largely monastic. It was first formed by the schism of the monks of St. John Maro, in the Lebanon, from the Patriarch of Antioch. Since their union with Rome they have formed separate orders. Till 1757 there were two such orders, those of St. Isais and of St. Antony. The St. Antony monks then split again into two congregations, the Aleppoans (monks of Aleppo) and the Baladites (baladie, country monks). Clement XIV sanctioned this separation in 1770. All follow the rule of St. Antony. For the rest the Uniate monks of each Church have the same rule and customs as the corresponding schismatic orders. Certain details have been revised and abuses eliminated by the Roman Congregations. The following list is wide; there are Uniate Christians. Uniate bishops are by no means always monks as there are many of unmarried secular priests. One may note especially that the Uniate Byzantine monks in southern Italy and in the great monastery of Grottaferrata outside Rome. 

IV. WESTERN MONASTICISM.—(1) Pre-Benedictine Period.—The introduction of monasticism into the West may be dated from about A.D. 340 when St.
Athanasius visited Rome accompanied by the two Egyptian monks Ammon and Isidore, disciples of St. Anthony. The publication of the "Vita Antonii" some years later and its translation into Latin spread the knowledge of Egyptian monastic life in Italy. As however the records of early Italian monasticism are very scanty, it will be more convenient to give first a short account of early monastic life in Gaul, our knowledge of which is much more complete.

(a) Gaul.—The first exponent of monasticism in Gaul seems to have been St. Martin, who founded a monastery at Ligugé near Poitiers, c. 300 (see Ligugé; Martin of Tours, St.). Soon after he was consecrated Bishop of Tours; he then formed a monastery outside that city, which he made his customary residence. Although only some two miles from the city the spot was so retired that Martin found there the solitude of a hermit. His cell was a hut of wood, and round it his disciples, who soon numbered about 120, built a monastery. The type of life was simply the Antonian monachism of Egypt (see above, Eastern Monasticism) and so rapidly did it spread, that at St. Martin's funeral two thousand monks were present. Even more famous was the monastery of Lérins (q. v.) which gave to the Church of Gaul some of its most famous theologians. Daniel the Wool Gatherer (q. v.) settled there for living for seven years among the monks of Egypt, and from it he founded the great Abbey of St. Victor at Marseilles. Cassian was undoubtedly the most celebrated teacher that the monks of Gaul ever had, and his influence was all on the side of the primitive Egyptian ideas. Conspicuous among his teaching were the exhortations as being the summit or goal of monastic ambition and the means of perfection recommended were, as in Egypt, extreme personal austerities with prolonged fasts and vigils, and the whole atmosphere of ascetical endeavour so dear to the heart of the Antonian monk (see Cassian; John; France; Cassarius of Arles, St.).

(b) Celtic Monasticism (Ireland, Wales, Scotland).—Authorities are still divided as to the origin of Celtic monasticism, but the view most commonly accepted is that of Mr. Willis Bund which holds it to have been a purely indigenous growth and rejects the idea of any direct connexion with Gallic or Egyptian monasticism. It seems clear that the first Celtic monasteries were merely settlements where the Christians lived together—priests and laity, men, women, and children alike—as a kind of religious clan. At a later period actual monasteries both of monks and nuns were formed, and later still the religious life came into vogue. It seems highly probable that the ideas and ascetical requirements of the eastern monasteries influenced these later developments, even if the Celtic monasticism were purely independent in origin, for the external manifestations are identical in all three forms. Indeed the desire for austerities of an extreme character has always remained a special feature of Irish asceticism down to our own time. Want of space forbids any detailed account of Celtic monasticism in this place but the following articles may be referred to: (for Ireland) Armagh, Bangor, Clonard, Clonfert, Clonmacnois, Lismore, Bohro, Luxeuil, Saints Patrick, Carthage, Columbanus, Comgall; (for Wales) Llançarvon, Bangor, Saints Asaph, David, Dubric, Gildas, Kingtonern; (for Scotland) Aberdeen, of the Seven Bishops, Saint Ninian, Columba, Aidan. Undoubtedly, however, the chief glory of Celtic monasticism is its missionary work, the results of which are to be found over all northwestern Europe. The observance, at first so distinctive, gradually lost its special character and fell into line with that of other countries; but, by that time Celtic monasticism had passed its zenith and its influence had declined.

(c) Italy.—Like the other countries of western Europe, Italy long retained a purely Eastern character in its monastic observance. The climate and other causes however combined to render its practice far harder than in the lands of its origin. In consequence the standard of observance remained, and it is clear from the Prologue to St. Benedict's Rule that by his day the lives of many monks left much to be desired. Moreover there was as yet no fixed code of laws to regulate the life either of the monastery or of the individual monk. Each house had its own customs and practices, its own collection of rules dependent largely on the choice of the abbot of the moment. There were certainly in the West translations of various Eastern codes, e. g. the Rules of Pachomius and Basil and another attributed to Macarius. There were also St. Augustine's famous letter (Ep., cccxi) on the management of convents of nuns, and also the writings of Cassian, but the only actual Rules of Western monasticism were delineated by those of the women's convents nuns respectively, and that by St. Columbanus, none of which could be called a working code for the management of a monastery. In a word monachism was still waiting for the man who should adapt it to Western needs and circumstances and give to it a special form distinct from that of the East. This man was found in the person of St. Benedict, in about 480.

(2) The Spread of St. Benedict's Rule.—Full details of St. Benedict's legislation, which had such immense effect on the monasticism of Western Europe, will be found in the articles Benedict of Nursia, St., and Benedict, Rule of St. It is sufficient here to point out that St. Benedict legislated for the details of the monastic life in ways which had been adapted to either in East or West. It is clear that he had acquainted himself thoroughly with the lives of the Egyptian fathers of the desert, with the writings of St. Basil, Cassian, and Rufinus; and in the main lines he has no intention of departing from the precedents set by these great authorities. Still the standard of monasticism aimed at by the Benedictines, especially in the West, is less severe than that of Egypt or Syria. Thus he gives his monks good and ample food. He permits them to drink wine. He secures a sufficient period of unbroken sleep. His idea was evidently to set up a standard that could and should be attained by all the monks of a monastery, leaving it to individual inspiration to essay greater austerities if the need of them were felt by any one. On the other hand, probably as a safeguard against the relaxations mentioned above, he requires a greater degree of seclusion than St. Basil had done. So far as possible all connexion with the world outside the monastery is to be avoided. If any monk be compelled by duty to go beyond the monastery he must not dwell outside the town. The book which he has seen or heard. So too no monk may receive gifts or letters from his friends or relatives without permission of the abbot. It is true that guests from without are to be received and entertained, but only certain monks specially chosen for the purpose may hold intercourse with them. Perhaps, however, the chief point in which St. Benedict modified the pre-existing practice is his insistence upon the stabilitas loci. By this special Vow of Stability he unites the monk for life to the particular monastery in which his vows are made. This was really a new development and one of the highest importance. In the first place by this the last vestige of monastic freedom, of going away from the monk, Secondly it secured in each monastery that continuity of theory and practice which is so essential for the
family which St. Benedict desired above everything. The abbott was to be a father and the monk a child. Nor was he to be more capable of choosing a new father or a new home than any other child was. After all St. Benedict was a Roman, and the son of a Roman wife, and he alone brought to the monastic life that absolute dependence of all the members of a family upon the father which is so typical of Roman law and usage. Only at the selection of a new abbot can the monks choose for themselves. Once elected the abbot's power becomes absolute; there is nothing to control him except the Rule and his own conscience which is responsible for the salvation of every soul entrusted to his charge.

The Rule of St. Benedict was written at Monte Cassino in the ten or fifteen years preceding the saint's death in 543, but very little is known of the way in which it began to spread to other monasteries. St. Gregory (Dial., II., xxii.) speaks of a foundation made from Monte Cassino at Terracina, but nothing is known of this house. Again, the traditions of Benedictine foundations in Gaul and Sicily by St. Maurus and St. Placid are now generally discredited. Still the Rule must have become known very soon, for by the death of Simplicius, the third Abbot of Monte Cassino, in line from St. Benedict, it is referred to as being the foundation of Monte Cassino. An early (Annal. Benedict., VII. ii.) in the year 580 Monte Cassino was destroyed by the Lombards and the monks fled to Rome, taking with them the autograph copy of the Rule. They were installed by Pelagius II. in a monastery near the Lateran Basilica. It is almost certain that St. Gregory the Great who succeeded Pelagius II. introduced the Benedictine Rule and observance into the monastery of St. Andrew which he founded on the Caelian Hill at Rome, and also into the six monasteries he founded in Sicily. Thanks to St. Gregory the Rule was carried to England by St. Augustine and his fellow monks; and also to the Frankish and Lombard monasteries which the pope's influence did much to raise by binding them to the observance of his "Dialogues" to the story of St. Benedict's life and work, Gregory gave a strong impetus to the spread of the Rule. Thus the first stage in the advance of St. Benedict's code across Western Europe is closely bound up with the name of the first monk-pope.

In the seventh century the process continued steadily. Sometimes the Benedictine code existed side by side with an older observance. This was the case at Bobbio where the monks lived either under the rule of St. Benedict or of St. Columbanus, who had founded the monastery in 609. In Gaul at the same period a union of two or more rules was often to be found, as at Luxeuil, Solignac, and elsewhere. In this there was nothing surprising, indeed the last chapter of St. Benedict's rule seems almost to contemplate such an arrangement. In England, thanks to St. Wilfrid of York, St. Benedict Bishop and others, the Benedictine mode of life began to be regarded as the only true type of monachism. Its influence however was still slight in Ireland where the Celtic monasticism was developing slowly. In the eighth century the advance of Benedictinism went on with even greater rapidity owing principally to the efforts of St. Boniface. That saint is known as the Apostle of Germany although the Irish missionaries had preceded him there. His energies however were divided between the two tasks of converting the heathen tribes and bringing the Christianity of the Irish to the Continental Roman use and obedience. In both these undertakings he achieved great success and his triumph meant the destruction of the earlier Columban form of monachism. Fulda, the great monastery of St. Boniface' institution, was modelled directly on Monte Cassino in which Sturm the abbot had resided for some time so that he might become perfectly acquainted with the workings of the Rule at the fountain head, and in its turn Fulda became the model for all German monasteries. Thus by the reign of Charlemagne the Benedictine form of monachism had become the normal type throughout the West with the remarkable exception of some few Irish monasteries. So completely was this the case that even the memories of earlier things had passed away and it could be gravely doubted whether monks of any kind at all had existed before St. Benedict and whether there could be any other monks but Benedictines.

At the time of Charlemagne's death in 814 the most famous monk in western Europe was Benedict of Aniane, the friend and counsellor of Louis the new emperor. For him Louis built a monastery near his imperial palace at Aix, and there Benedict gathered thirty monks, chosen from among his own personal friends and in full sympathy with his ideas. This monastery was intended to be a model for all the religious houses of the empire, and the famous Assembly of 817 passed a series of resolutions which touched upon the whole range of the monastic life. The object of these resolutions was to secure, even in the minutest details, an absolute uniformity in all the monasteries of the empire, so that it might seem as if "all had been taught by one single master in one single school". And might have been expected the scheme failed to do this for even at this early stage of its development, the decision of his "Dialogues" to the story of St. Benedict's life and work, Gregory gave a strong impetus to the spread of the Rule. Thus the first stage in the advance of St. Benedict's code across Western Europe is closely bound up with the name of the first monk-pope.

In the seventh century the process continued steadily. Sometimes the Benedictine code existed side by side with an older observance. This was the case at Bobbio where the monks lived either under the rule of St. Benedict or of St. Columbanus, who had founded the monastery in 609. In Gaul at the same period a union of two or more rules was often to be found, as at Luxeuil, Solignac, and elsewhere. In this there was nothing surprising, indeed the last chapter of St. Benedict's rule seems almost to contemplate such an arrangement. In England, thanks to St. Wilfrid of York, St. Benedict Bishop and others, the Benedictine mode of life began to be regarded as the only true type of monachism. Its influence however was still slight in Ireland where the Celtic monasticism was developing slowly. In the eighth century the advance of Benedictinism went on with even greater rapidity owing principally to the efforts of St. Boniface. That saint is known as the Apostle of Germany although the Irish missionaries had preceded him there. His energies however were divided between the two tasks of converting the heathen tribes and bringing the Christianity of the Irish to the Continental Roman use and obedience. In both these undertakings he achieved great success and his triumph meant the destruction of the earlier Columban form of monachism. Fulda, the great monastery of St. Boniface' institution, was modelled directly on Monte Cassino in which Sturm the abbot had resided for some time so that he might become perfectly ac-
tain. Nothing is more remarkable in the history of Benedictine monasticism than its power of revival by the springtide of new life which flowed within. This power, and again and again, when reform had been needed, the impetus has been found to come from within the body instead of from outside it. But in the case of Cluny such a thing had been rendered practically impossible, and the only recovery no recovery took place.

(4) Reaction against Cluny.—The reaction against Cluny and the ultra-regular monasticism took various forms. Early in the eleventh century (1012) came the foundation of the Camaldolese by St. Romuald. This was a hard back to the ancient Egyptian ideal of a number of hermits living in a "laura" or collection of detached cells which were situated some considerable distance apart (see Camaldolese). A few years later (1015) came the foundation of the order of Vallombrosa, which is chiefly important for the institution of "lay brothers," as distinct from the choir monks, a novelty which assumed high importance in later monastic history (see Lay-brother; Vallombrosa). In 1074 came the Order of Grammont which however did not move to the place from which its name is derived until 1227 (see Grammond, Stephen; Munster, Sr.). Far more important than these was the establishment in 1084 of the Carthusians by St. Bruno, at the Grand Chartreuse near Grenoble, which boasts that it alone of the great orders has never required to be reformed (see Carthusians; Chartreuse, Le Grand; Bruno, St.). In a sense this was the beginning of the monasticism of the 12th century, e.g. the general chapters, to the use of the Black monks, a movement which made a great step in the path which later proved so successful. At the time however they were practically ignored by the monasteries on the Continent, and only in England was any serious effort made to put them into practice. The consequence was that the English monasteries of Black monks soon formed themselves into one national congregation throughout the country became largely uniform, and a far higher standard of life obtained than was common in continental monasteries at the same period. The system of periodical general chapters ordered by the Lateran Council was maintained. So too was the subjection of all monasteries to the diocesan bishop. The normal state of affairs was one in which all England were exempt from episcopal jurisdiction. There were of course individual failures here and there, but it is clear that, from the date of the Council of Lateran up to the time of their destruction, the English Benedictine houses maintained on the whole a good standard of discipline and preserved the affectionate respect of the great majority of the laity in every rank of life.

(5) Period of Monastic Decline.—On the Continent the period succeeding the Fourth Lateran Council was one of steady decline. The history of the time tells of civil disturbance, intellectual upheaval, and a continual increase of luxury among ecclesiastics as well as laity. The decay of the monasteries, "monastic order" it is used to exclude all monastic observance not exactly on the lines of the "new monastery," i.e., Citeaux, and subject to it. The monasteries of the Cistercians spread over Europe with surprising rapidity and from the style the habit they adopted was called the "White Monks," the older Benedictines and Cluniacs being known as the "Black Monks" (see Cistercians; Citeaux; Robert of Molesme, St.; Bernard of Clairvaux, St.).

The impetus given by these new foundations helped to revitalise the Benedictine monasteries of the older type. The system of monasteries under the rule of the Prior of Monte Fano, who ruled the whole congregation as general assisted by a chapter consisting of representatives from each house (see Sylvesterines).
The Celestines, founded about forty years later by St. Peter Morone (Celestine V), were organized on much the same plan but the superiors were not perpetual and the head of the whole body was an Abbot elected by the General Chapter for three years and ineligible for re-election for twelve years. The order was divided into six provinces and each province into a number of provinces (see Ceistercian Orders: Celestine V, St.). The Olivetans, founded about 1313 by Bernardo Tolomei of Siena, mark the last stage of development. In their case the monks were not professed for any particular monastery, but, like friars, for the congregation in general. The officials of the various houses were chosen by a small committee appointed for this purpose by the general chapter. The abbots-general were visitor of all monasteries and “superior of superiors”, but his power was held for a very short period only. This system had the very great advantage that it rendered the existence of commendatory superiors practically impossible, but it secured this at the cost of sacrificing all family life in the individual monastery which was the central idea of St. Benedict’s legislation. Further, by taking the right of election away from the monastic communities, it concentrated all real power in the hands of a small committee, a course obviously open to many possible dangers (see Olivetans).

Monastic Renewal.—In the great wave of reform and revival which characterized the later fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the older institutions of Benedictines once more gave proof of their vitality and a spontaneous renewal of vigour was shown throughout Europe. This revival followed two main lines. In the Latin countries the movement pursued the path marked out by the Olivetans. Thus in Italy and the monasteries of Black monks were gradually united together under the name of the Congregation of St. Justina of Padua, afterwards called the Cassinese Congregation (see under Benedictines). Similar methods were adopted in the formation of the Congregations of St. Maur and St. Vannes in France, in the two Congregations of Spanish Benedictines, and in the revival of the English Congregation. In Germany the revival took a different path; and, while keeping closer to the traditions of the past, united the existing monasteries very much in the manner ordered by the Fourth Council of Lateran in 1215. The Union of Bursfeld is perhaps the best example of this method. An example of uniform in the seventeenth century was the work of Abbé de Rancon in instituting the Cistercian reform at La Trappe. In this his object was to get as close as possible to the primitive form of Benedictine life. No one can question his sincerity or the singleness of his intentions, but de Rancon was not an antiquary and had not been trained as a monk but as a courtier. The result was that he interpreted St. Benedict’s rule with the most absolute literalness, and thus succeeded in producing a cast-iron mode of life far more rigid and exacting than there is any reason to believe St. Benedict himself either desired or did beget. The upheaval of the French Revolution and the wars which followed it seemed to give a death blow to Western monasticism and in fact it did destroy many monasteries in the hundred. But nothing perhaps is more noteworthy, in all the wonderful revival of Catholicism which the last hundred years have seen, than the resuscitation of monastic life in all its forms, not only in Europe, but also in America, Africa, Australia, and other distant lands whose very existence was unknown to the founders of this cloistered, fourth-century, this will be found in the articles on the various orders and congregations referred to above.

No mention has been made in this article of the question of women under Monasticism. Broadly speaking the history of contemplative nuns, as distinct from nuns of the more recent active orders, has been identical with that of the monks. In almost every instance the modifications, reforms, etc., made by the various monastic legislators have been adopted by convents of women as well as by the monks. In cases where any special treatment has been thought necessary, e.g., the Carthusian Nuns, a separate section of the article on the order or congregation in question has been dedicated to the subject. These sections should be referred to in all cases for detailed information. (For practical details of the monastic life and the actual working of a monastery see the articles Monasticism; Monastery; Abbey; Abbot; Abbes; Obedientiaries; Benedict, Rule of St.; Benedict of Nursia, St.; Nun.)

G. Roger Hulseston.

Moncada, Francisco de, Count of Osona, Spanish historian, son of the Governor of Sardinia and Catalonia, b. at Valencia, 29 December, 1586; d. near Goch, Germany, 1635. He entered the army at an early age, and in 1624, was appointed by King Philip IV ambassador to the imperial court at Vienna, where he soon succeeded in acquiring the esteem of Ferdinand II and his ministers. In 1629 he was recalled from Vienna and sent to Brussels in place of Cardinal de la Cueva, ambassador to the Infanta Isabella. His chief duty therewith consisted of teaching the Infanta in regard to the conditions in the Netherlands, in supervising the royal officials, and in watching over the disbursements of Spanish funds. He soon discovered the chief fault of the preceding administration and endeavoured to conciliate the Belgians a much larger share in the administration of their country’s affairs, for he realized that Portuguese confidence could they be kept loyal to the empire. He also proposed, though without success, to transfer the general management of Belgian affairs from Madrid to Brussels. In 1630 he was appointed commander-in-chief of the navy, in 1632 of the entire army, and in 1641, after the death of his brother Charles, 1st Duke of Burgundy, until relieved by the arrival of Prince Cardinal Ferdinand. His crowning and final achievement as military commander was the liberation of Breda, the citizens of which ordered memorial coins struck in his honour. The following year he accompanied the cardinal on an expedition into the Duchy of Cleves, where he died after a short illness at the siege of Goch. He had an amiable character, knew how to guide men according to his own desires, and combined great shrewdness and firmness with wise moderation. He wrote a valuable history of the expedition of the Catalonians and Aragonians against the Turks and Greeks (Barcelona, 1623; Madrid, 1777, 1805, 1883; Paris, 1841, in "Tesoro de los Leones de España.") We furthermore possess from his pen the "Vida de Anicio Manlio Torquato Severino Boecio", which was printed (Frankfort, 1642) seven years after his death.


Patriicus Schlegler.

Mondino (a diminutive for Raimondino; Mundinus) dei Lucci, anatomist, b. probably at Bologna, about 1275; d. there, about 1327. Mondino performed a series of pubic dissections at the University of Bologna in the early part of the fourteenth century. He is sometimes said to have performed only two or three dissections, but his own writings refute this. He is often proclaimed the first to have performed dissections in modern times, but Hauser says that many anatomists dissected before his time, and that we have even a manual of dissection written before this, by one Riccardus. For this Riccardus he wrote a manual called "Anathomia", which was used in nearly all medical schools for three centuries after his time. Its popularity can be judged from the editions issued after the invention of printing. There is one at Pavia (1478), Bologna (1482), and Padua (1484); there are Venice editions of 1494, 1498, 1500, and 1507; Leipzig (1505), Strassburg (1509), and Marburg and
Lyons shortly afterwards. His book was considered such an authority that an old teacher declared that medical students for centuries worshipped him as a god. Although onions were not described in Mondeno's "Anathemia," constantly open before them while dissecting, it was considered an anomaly. The work of course has been superseded by progress in the science of anatomy, but it is easy to understand from it how much practical anatomy for surgical purposes the medieval physicians were taught.

Many of the bishops of Mondeno were noted for their sanctity and learning. First among these is St. Rosendus, who, in consideration of his eminent virtues, was created a bishop when he was very young, and governed the diocese from 923 to 923. He founded the monastery of Celanova, to which he afterwards retired to live the life of a monk. Of another abbot of Celanova, Gonzalo, a legend has been preserved which attributes to his prayers the repulse of the Northmen who were devastating the coasts of Galicia.

The See of Mondeno, the cathedral of which is Villamayor de Brea, where the cathedral church of Santa Maria Vallabriensis was built. The Blessed Virgin, under her title of the Assumption, was the patroness of this church. Alfonso VII gave a charter to the monastery of Mondeno, which continued in the possession of the Bishops of Mondeno until Ferdinand II of Leon transferred the episcopal residence to Ribadeo. In 1233 Don Martin, successor to Don Pelayo, transferred it to its present location, Mondeno, now a town of 10,500 inhabitants. To appease the discontent occasioned in Ribadeo by this change, Bishop Nuno III restored the cathedral church in Ribadeo with a canon and four prebendaries (raciomeri).

The cathedral church of Mondeno, which was formerly the cathedral of the diocese, is the see of the bishop of Mondeno. The church was founded by St. Martin of Mondeno, and the see was established in 851. The church was sacked and destroyed by the Saracens, the bishop and priests took refuge in Asturias. In 899, during the reign of Alfonso III, Theodesimus, Bishop of Britonia assisted with other prelates at the consecration of the church of Santiago. It may also be noted that, in the partition of the parishes, the church of San Pedro de Nova was assigned as the residence of the bishops of Britonia and Orense, when they should come to assist at the councils of Oviedo. By that time, however, the See of Britonia had been translated to the town of Mondumat and the church of St. Martin of Dumio, or Mondeno. The diocese has been most generally known by this name, although formerly it was Britonia; it has fine old churches.

The church of St. Martin of Mondono, one of the best of the ancient churches of this region, has been the cathedral church since 866. The present parochial house is a part of the old episcopal palace, connected with the church by a gallery from what seems to have been one of the episcopal chambers. In 1112 this house became a monastery, transferred residence to Brea, a valley about seven and a half miles from St. Martin of Mondeno, in the midst of which is Villamayor de Brea, where the cathedral church of Santa Maria Vallabriensis was built. The Blessed Virgin, under her title of the Assumption, was the patroness of this church. Alfonso VII gave a charter to the monastery of Mondeno, which continued until Ferdinand II of Leon transferred the episcopal residence to Ribadeo. In 1233 Don Martin, successor to Don Pelayo, transferred it to its present location, Mondeno, now a town of 10,500 inhabitants. To appease the discontent occasioned in Ribadeo by this change, Bishop Nuno III restored the cathedral church in Ribadeo with a canon and four prebendaries (raciomeri).
In any other part of Spain, has been erected over his grave. His memory is venerated, and the faithful visit his tomb. The convent of the Alcantarines (Franciscans of the reform of St. Peter of Alcantara), founded in 1731, is now used as barracks. The court-house (1584) and the seminary are among the principal buildings of Mondóvar.

The present seminary building, in the Huertas del Torrillón, was built by Bishop José Francisco de Losada In 1770-75. Mondóvar, which until 1836, was the capital of the province, numbers among her distinguished sons the teacher Pascual Febrero, author of “Galera de Escritores” José Cayetano Suáez, Bishop of Palencia; Lucas Miranda, author of the “Teatro de Prelados de la Iglesia de Mondóvar”, and the sculptor Castro, designer of the inspiring figure of Saint Francis in the cathedral. Bishop Manuel Navarrete wrote a long history of Mondóvar and its bishops. The present (1910) Bishop of Mondóvar, Don Juan José Solé y Fernández, b. at Oviedo, 1848, was consecrated on 26 May, 1907.

Flórez, España Sagrada, XVIII (2nd ed., Madrid, 1780): VI-LAMIT, Crónica de la Provincia de Lugo (Madrid, 1867); Murocita, España, sus monumentos y arte: Galicia (Barcelona, 1888); DE LA FUENTE, Historia eclesiástica de España (Barcelona, 1885).

RAMÓN RUIZ AMADO.

Mondoñedo, Diocese of (Montesregalan), in Piamont, province of Cuneo, northern Italy. The city is built upon three hills, at a height of about 1600 feet above sea-level, and dates from the year 1000; but the suburb of Brec, the name of which recalls the Bredolens, a city mentioned in a Roman inscription found in that neighbourhood, had a castle in the time of Charlemagne. The town, called Monsvici, also Monteregale, was under the bishops of Asti until 1198, when it established itself as a commune, but was compelled to struggle against the bishops of Asti, the marquesses of Saluzzo and of Monferrato, and the counts of Savoy, a struggle in which the jealously of the suzerainty of one or another of those lords. The commune maintained a war against the marquesses of Civa (1240-50), and finally, Bressadro di Vico, a powerful lord in Mondoñedo, attempted to make himself master of the city, which submitted to Charles of Anjou (1260), and from that time, with some interruptions, was subject to the crown of Naples, until 1396. In 1396, having again changed lords several times, it came under the dominion of the Savoyard lords of Achaia, and in 1418, under that of the dukes of Savoy, in whose possession it remained. In 1476 and in 1533, the inhabitants of Mondoñedo attempted to give their allegiance either to the Marques of Villahermosa or to the king of France, but the French contested for its possession with the imperialists (1530-43), and with the house of Savoy (1543-59). The city was at war with the Duke of Savoy for the salt monopoly (1678-99). Napoleon defeated the Piedmontese near Mondoñedo (1796), thereby assuring his way through the valley of the Po, and in 1799 it was occupied by the French.

It was the birthplace of the pious Cardinal Bona, of the celebrated physicist Becarca, and of Marquess Ormea, a statesman of the eighteenth century. Its cathedral contains paintings by Giulio Romano, Cambiaso, and others. The residence of the bishop is one of the noblest episcopal palaces in Italy. In the church of la Missione there are frescoes by the Jesuit Pergolesi. The city is the site of the Madonnina del Filone, dating from the fourteenth century, but finished later (1730-49). The palace of the counts of San Quintino contained the first printing-office in Piedmont, and was the seat of a university (1581-91) founded by Duke Emmanuel Filibert, the first institution of its kind in Piedmont. The city, at first part of the Diocese of Asti, had a bishop, suffragan of the Archbishop of Milan, but, since 1515, Turin has been its metropolitan. In 1817, the territory of Cuneo was detached from the See of Mondoñedo, and made a diocese. The first bishop of Mondoñedo was Damiano Zavaglia, a zealous and pious prelate: and before him was a small barracks in Palma (1429), Amadeo Romagnano (1497), who reconstructed the cathedral (1550); Michele Ghislieri, O.P. (1550), later Pope Pius V; Cardinal Vincenzo Lauro (1666), founder of the seminary, during whose incumbency the cathedral and other churches were torn down to make room for the citadel; Giovanni Battista Lamardi (1697), who restored the episcopal palace and the church of St. Dalmazio; Carlo Felice Sanmartino (1741), founder of the new seminary, and Giovanni Tommaso Ghilardi, O.P. (1842), a very pious and charitable man. The city contains 145parishes, with 170,000 faithful, 6 religious houses of women, 10 educational establishments for boys and 15 girls; it has the three Catholic newspapers.

Cappelletti, L'Chiesa d'Italia (Venice, 1887); XIV, GAZETTE, Memorie storiche della chiesa vescovile di Montereale (Turin, 1816); DEI DONNA, Storia dell'antica città di Montereale ossia Mondoñedo (2 vols., Turin, 1894-99).

U. BENIGNI.

Mone, Franz, historian and archaeologist, b. at Mingolheim near Bruchsal, Baden, 12 March, 1785; d. at Karlsruhe, 12 March, 1871. He attended the gymnasium at Bruchsal and in 1814 entered Heidelberg, where in 1817 he was appointed tutor (Privatdozent) in history, in 1818 secretary of the university library, in 1819 extraordinary, and in 1822 ordinary, professor, and in 1825 head of the university library. From 1825 to 1844 he was in Paris, where, in 1839, he returned. He then returned to Baden for a time, and in 1851, when he had been appointed professor of History, went to Kiel. While in Kiel he published (1850) his famous “Das deutsche Sprache”, (1851); “Celtische Forschungen”, (1857) suffered from his tendency to trace everything possible to a Celtic origin. More important are his works on literary history, which include: “Einleitung in das Nibelungenlied” (1818); “Geschichte des Heidentums im nördlichen Europa” (2 vols., 1822-3); “Onn” (1831); “Quellen und Forschungen für Geschichte der deutschen Literatur und Sprache” (1830); “Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Heldensage” (1836); “Uebersicht der niederländischen Volksliteratur älterer Zeit” (1838). In the “Anzeiger für Kunde des deutschen Mittelalters” (1835-9), he calls attention to a great mass of unknown materials. Of great value is his history of his native language: “Das Badische Archiv” (2 vols., 1826-7); “Quellen- und Sammlung der badischen Landesgeschichte” (4 vols., 1848-67); “Das deutsche Mone, historian and archaeologist, b. at Mingolheim near Bruchsal, Baden, 12 March, 1785; d. at Karlsruhe, 12 March, 1871. He attended the gymnasium at Bruchsal and in 1814 entered Heidelberg, where in 1817 he was appointed tutor (Privatdozent) in history, in 1818 secretary of the university library, in 1819 extraordinary, and in 1822 ordinary, professor, and in 1825 head of the university library. From 1825 to 1844 he was in Paris, where, in 1839, he returned. He then returned to Baden for a time, and in 1851, when he had been appointed professor of History, went to Kiel. While in Kiel he published (1850) his famous “Das deutsche Sprache”, (1851); “Celtische Forschungen”, (1857) suffered from his tendency to trace everything possible to a Celtic origin. More important are his works on literary history, which include: “Einleitung in das Nibelungenlied” (1818); “Geschichte des Heidentums im nördlichen Europa” (2 vols., 1822-3); “Onn” (1831); “Quellen und Forschungen für Geschichte der deutschen Literatur und Sprache” (1830); “Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Heldensage” (1836); “Uebersicht der niederländischen Volksliteratur älterer Zeit” (1838). In the “Anzeiger für Kunde des deutschen Mittelalters” (1835-9), he calls attention to a great mass of unknown materials. Of great value is his history of his native language: “Das badische Archiv” (2 vols., 1826-7); “Quellen- und Sammlung der badischen Landesgeschichte” (4 vols., 1848-67); “Das deutsche Sprache”. (2 vols., 1826-7); “Quellen- und Sammlung der badischen Landesgeschichte” (4 vols., 1848-67); “Das deutsche Archiv”. (2 vols., 1826-7); “Quellen- und Sammlung der badischen Landesgeschichte”. (4 vols., 1848-67).
MONGOLIA

The Mongols.—Organization.—With regard to the word Mongol, Mr. E. H. Parker (Asiatic Quart. Rev., July, 1910) writes: "It is usually believed that Jenghiz Khan gave the name Mung-Ku (the present Chinese name for 'Mongol') to his people, and the word is said to mean 'silver', just as the Liao (Lee) and Tang (T'ang) dynasties in China were mentioned under the Manchus (Niuchen) dynasty to mean 'gold'. . . . In the same way, I suspect the various forms, Mungu or Mungut, which have an unbroken descent from A.D. 600 to A.D. 1200 (before Jenghiz rose to power), must refer to some ancient stream or typographical peculiarity in the Onon region, near where Jenghiz arose." In the Yuan dynasty the Mongol tribes are styled Ta-ta (Tatars) and also Meng-gu. The Mongol tribes are divided into Nui Mung-ku (Inner Mongols) and Wai Mung-ku (Outer Mongoals). The Nui Mung-ku, including forty-nine banners (ho shun), arose out of the organization formed by the descendants of Jenghis Khan, which has continued to the present time. Under the Yuan dynasty they were organized in six divisions (Dzirughan Tuman, or "Six Ten Thousands"), forming two wings, the right occupying the western portion of the Mongolian territory, the left the eastern portion. The Inner Mongols are now divided into six menyt (Chinese), or chogolts (Mongol), including twenty-four pu (Chinese), and the Outer Mongol (Udumak), known as the Mongol League, comprising the following pu, or tribes: (1) Khorich, 6 banners; (2) Daljai, 1 banner; (3) Turtub, 1 banner; (4) Ghorlo, 2 banners. II. Cho-

phlets, "Die katholischen Zustände in Baden" (1841–
3).

VON WECHS, Bodenliige Biographien, 11 (Heidelberg, 1870), 88–
9; in der All. deutscher Biogr., XXXII (Leipzig, 1885), 165–9. Portions of Moneta's correspondence were edited by von Wechs in Zeitkräfte, für die Geschichte, des Obersteir., LV (1901), 422 sqq., 450
sqq.; LVII (1903), 488 sqq.

KLEMMENS LÖFFLER.

Moneta (MoNeta), theologian, b. at Cremona, Italy, date unknown; d. at Bologna, 1240. He was one of the first disciples of St. Dominic. Previous to his entrance into the order in 1220, he was professor of philosophy in the university of Bologna, where his rare erudition and depth of thought as well as his clearness of exposition won for him a wide reputation. The eloquence of Bl. Reginald, the superior of the local community, attracted to the order so many renowned doctors and students that Moneta began to fear for his own prestige, to insure which, he carefully avoided the preacher and exhorted his pupils, by word and example, to do likewise. But yielding to his pupils' wishes one day he accompanied them to a sermon and was so deeply moved by it that he resolved to become a religious. He was later noted for his sanctity no less than for his eloquent and learned

counterparts with the heretics. His intense devotion to study caused him to lose his sight in the latter days of his life, but there is no doubt of his "Summa contra Catha-

ricos et Waldenses", a widely read work during his time. It was first edited in 1743 by a religious of his order, Thomas Aug. Ricchini, who supplied the work with copious notes. In a biographical sketch of the author with which he prefaced the work, we are informed that Moneta wrote also a commentary on Aristotle's logic and a "Summa contra Franciscanorum".


JOSEPH SCHRODER.

Mongola.—The name used to designate an im-

mensely uneven plateau, part of the Chinese Empire, ex-

tending, roughly speaking, from the Tarbagatai to the

great K'ingan chains.

Geography.—Mongolia is bounded on the north by the

Siberian provinces of Tomsk, Irkutsk, Yeniseisk, and Transbaikalia, as defined by the Russo-Chinese treaty of 1860; on the east by Manchuria, and the frontier crossing the Nonni River; on the south, the frontier, after following the Shara Muran, which separates it from the Chinese provinces of Chi-li, Shan- 

si, Shen-si, and, crossing the bend of the Huang-ho (Ordo Country), Kan-su, includes Ala-shan, following part of the Great Wall; on the southwest and west it is bounded by the New Dominion (Sin Kiang) and the

Siberian province of Semipalatinsk to Mount Kaldar (Altai). The population of Mongolia is estimated variously at 2,600,000 (Statesmen's Year Book, 1910), 2,580,000, or nearly 2 to the square mile, and 5,000,000.

Its area of 1,367,953 square miles may be di-

vided into three regions: the central region, known as the Ordo Country, covered in the east by the Great Shas-mo, or Desert of Gobi; the north-western region, a plateau connected with the Great Altai, including Kobdo and Uurga, and bounded on the S. E. by the Ektagh Altai (or Mongolian, or Southern Altai); the southwestern region of the great K'ingan, a long

chain of mountains, stretching from the Shara Muren to the Argun River; separating the plateau of Gobi from the Manchurian plains.

The climate is extremely dry, and the temperature varies abruptly with the season of the year and even the hour of the day. An idea of the severity of a Mongolian winter may be gathered from the following description of conditions in the month of October: "The cold blows from the tent to the tent was frozen through and through; potatoes were like lumps of iron; meat had to be broken rather than cut; and some eggs which we had brought with us were frozen so hard that, in spite of a preliminary thawing, the yolks were still solid lumps of ice when the whites were perfectly fried. Tea left in the bottom of the kettle was frozen solid in a very few minutes. The ink froze on one's pen as one wrote, and one had to blow on it after writing every two or three words, while each page had to be thawed over the lamp before it could be blotted. In the morning we woke with our moustaches fringed with lumps of ice and a coating of ice along the edge of the bed-clothes where the breath had taken" (Kiddston, "China", no. 3, 1904, 21).

The Kerulen, or Khérelon, River, though "an in-

considerable river, is the longest of the vast arid East

Mongol upland, and the permanence of the pastures along its banks has always attracted a large share of the nomad population; many of the Tsetseen princes keep their headquarters or close in a very few miles" (Campbell, 24). This river rises on the southern slopes of the Kentaial Mounts, near Mount Burkhan Kal-
duna and enters the Dalai Nor, five or six miles southwest of the Altan Emüli (Golden Saddle), a pair of

brown hills, famous in Mongol legend, between which the river flows. The Dalai, or Kulun Nor, is a lake in the Himalaya Manchurian region, between the Kolu-

nor and the Xunnor, about 25 miles south-east, and about 10 miles from east to west, near the Transbaikalian frontier of Russia; it was visited in 1889 by Father Gerbillon. This lake receives on the north the waters of the Dalai Gol, which, united to the Khalhar River, form the Argun River, and this in turn joins the Shilka. The Argun and Shilka being united take the name of Amur, which, flowing into the sea which runs into the Okhotek Sea. The Ursun Gol carries the overflow of the Buyr, or Bur, Nor to the Kulun Nor; the Khalha Gol, which rises in Lake Galba, on the western slope of the great K'ingan range, flows into the Buyr Nor; near it, on its south bank, stands the Ikte Boshun Sume (Monastery of the Great Buddha), famous for a start on Lake Baikal, rises in the Ulán Taša and Khan Taša Mountains; its main tributaries are on the left, the Eke Gol flowing from the Kossol Gol in the middle of which is the Buddhist sacred island of Dalai Kui; on the right the Orkholon, which springs from the Khan-
gai chain, receiving on the left the waters of the Tamir and on the right that of the Tulun. The People.—Organization.—With regard to the word Mongol, Mr. E. H. Parker (Asiatic Quart. Rev., July, 1910) writes: "It is usually believed that Jenghiz Khan gave the name Mung-Ku (the present Chinese name for 'Mongol') to his people, and the word is said to mean 'silver', just as the Liao (Lee) and Tang (T'ang) dynasties in China were mentioned under the Manchus (Niuchen) dynasty to mean 'gold'. . . . In the same way, I suspect the various forms, Mungu or Mungut, which have an unbroken descent from A.D. 600 to A.D. 1200 (before Jenghiz rose to power), must refer to some ancient stream or typographical peculiarity in the Onon region, near where Jenghiz arose." In the Yuan dynasty the Mongol tribes are styled Ta-ta (Tatars) and also Meng-gu. The Mongol tribes are divided into Nui Mung-ku (Inner Mongols) and Wai Mung-ku (Outer Mongols). The Nui Mung-ku, including forty-nine banners (ho shun), arose out of the organization formed by the descendents of Jenghis Khan, which has continued to the present time. Under the Yuan dynasty they were organized in six divisions (Dzirughan Tuman, or "Six Ten Thousands"), forming two wings, the right occupying the western portion of the Mongolian territory, the left the eastern portion. The Inner Mongols are now divided into six menyt (Chinese), or chogolts (Mongol), including twenty-four pu (Chinese), and the Outer Mongol (Udumak), known as the Mongol League, comprising the following pu, or tribes: (1) Khorich, 6 banners; (2) Daljai, 1 banner; (3) Turtub, 1 banner; (4) Ghorlo, 2 banners. II. Cho-

 phenomen Mysteries, "Die katholischen Zustände in Baden" (1841–
3).
sot'u League: (5) Kharsach'in, 3 banners; (6) T'unmed, 2 banners. III. Chao Uda League: (7) Ao Khan, 1 banner; (8) Naiman, 1 banner; (9) Barin, 2 banners; (10) Djar, 16 banners; (11) Auriak, 1 banner; (12) Ongniid, 1 banner; (13) Kenkhhteng, 1 banner; (14) Khalka of the Left, 1 banner. IV. Silinghol League: (15) Uchumch'in, 2 banners; (16) Khaochiid, 2 banners; (17) Sunid, 2 banners; (18) Abagha, 2 banners; (19) Abaganur, 2 banners. V. Ulan Ch'ap League: (20) Sae Tse Pu Lo, or Durban Keuked, 1 banner; (21) Mou Mingan, 1 banner; (22) Urad, 3 banners; (23) Khalka of the Right, 1 banner; VI. Ikh Chao League: (24) Oodo, 7 banners. W. F. Maysers who give these particulars (Chinese Government) adds that with the tribes of the Oodo there are amalgamated certain fragments of the T'unmed tribe, occupying the region adjacent to Kwei Hwa Ch'eng, to the north-east of the Great Bend of the Yellow River.

Inner Mongolia is broadly speaking "what is to the south of the Great Desert"; it extends over the plateau beyond the Kingan Mountains into the upper valleys of the Manchurian rivers, the Liao and the Sungari; it includes part of Outer Chi-li. With the exception of the Khalkha and the T'unmed, which are under the government of Manchu generals, each Mongolian banner is ruled by an hereditary chieftain or noble (Dassak or Jassak). These nobles are classed in six ranks, from ta'in wang, "prince of the first order", to taichi, or dadi, "noble". They are controlled by the Li fan Yuan. Campbell writes (op. cit. supra): "It is thought by many that this word means of preserving the integrity of Mongolian territory; it was resolved that two divisions of modern troops should be sent to this country, that education should be established according to Chinese methods, and that a railway should be built across Mongolia with its terminus at Peking. The religion of the Mongols is Buddhism under the Lamaist form, introduced from Tibet at the end of the Ming Dynasty. The lamas like the chepstundampa hui'uhk'uu at Urga, have their head clean shaven. Large monasteries exist at Je-hol and Dol-nor (Lama-miao), and at Wu T'ai shan, in the Shan-si Province. The Lamaist organization in and near Peking is headed by the Dalai Lama, the metropolitan Ch'ang-chia Hu't'uhk'uu of the Dalai Lama or, rather at Yung Ho Kung—and controls the Mongols of Ch'ahar. Lamaism has certainly altered the character of the warlike followers of Jenghis, who are now a peaceful population of herdmen. "The Lamas," writes Kidston (op. cit., p. 19), "exercise enormous influence; every village is divided into high and low; the sacred cairn, the repetitions of the sacred word, and the chanting of prayers are universal and incessant, and almost every collection of "yurts" has its prayer flags, fluttering conveniently easy petitions with every breeze that blows. Belief in the transmigration of the soul and in the utter unimportance of the mere body is so strong that the bodies of laymen are not buried at all, but simply thrown to the ants and dogs that make short work of them. The taking of life is regarded with horror, though sheer necessity makes an exception and provides quibbling excuses for the slaughter of sheep. On the whole journey we usually saw one fire-arm, and that was evidently intended for show rather than for use. It was carried by one of the escort provided by the Provinces. On all occasions of inquiry, I believe that it represented the entire armed force of the Principality."
Customs, Language, etc.—The typical Mongol is short and stumpy; the head is shaven, with the exception of a smooth bald head for the Mongol prince. Family ties are very loose; marriage being a civil contract the binding force of which is the mere will of the parties. Stock-breeding is the occupation of practically all Mongols. They are remarkable herdsmen, and their ponies which are excellent, are branded. They have herds of camels, and yaks to be found in the mountainous parts of modern Mongolia. Mr. George J. Kidston (China, No. 3, 1904) observes: “Both in features and in character they are less foreign to the European than the Chinese. They have often almost ruddy complexion; they laugh more heartily, have none of the endless formalities and (to us) crooked ways of thought that distinguish the Chinese, and they have certain customs that strike us as being distinctly Western. The Mongol, for instance, when they meet, embrace one another and kiss on both cheeks, while the men shake both hands. . . . Perhaps the first thing that strikes a stranger about the Mongols, after their exceeding filthiness, is their love of talking. . . . Hospitality is a universal virtue, and one may enter as ‘yurt’ upon the door, and in a setting of a kind of a place, uninvited, and be made welcome, but courage is not their strong point, and disputes die out in lengthy warfare of words.” They are also lazy and voracious. They live on mutton, milk, and brick tea; they have neither flour, vegetables, nor eggs. They have one very excellent preparation which the Chinese call ‘mil-ko-sti,’ it is made by boiling milk until the cream separates in a thick skin at the top, and it much resembles Devonshire cream. The only native strong drink is made from fermented mare’s milk. We were told that it is intoxicating if partaken of in large quantities. The Mongols, however, have a decided weakness for Chinese wine and spirits, and the Chinese also are said to speak of a drunken rapt” (op. cit., p. 181). The Mongol tent (ghurum) is made of a trellis of wooden staves fastened neatly together with strings of hide, the whole being covered with felt, the best of which comes from Russian Turkestan.

The Mongol language belongs to the Ural-Altaic family, the Kalmuk dialect, though containing a number of Turkish words, being the purest. The Ulghur is the name of the Turks, and Mongolian characters: it is of Syriac origin, introduced into Eastern Turkestan by the early Nestorian missionaries. There is a dialect poem in Ulghur, the “Kudatuku bikk,” dating from A. D. 1069, which was published in 1870 by Arminius Vamberty, and in 1891 by W. Radloff. The old Chinese alphabet was introduced into Ulghur in 1227, his dominions were divided among his four sons. Juji, the eldest son, died before his father, and was replaced by his own son Batu, who had for his share the plains of Kipchak, the lower course of the Syr-Daria, the Aral and Caspian Seas, the valleys of the Don and the Volga, and northward beyond the Ural River; Chagatai had the Kingdom of Merv; North or Tu-li, and also what is now Chinese Turkestan, Ferghana, Badakhshan, etc., and his capital was Almalik; Okkodai, the third son, had the Mongol country with the capital, Karakorum; lastly, Tu-li had the territory between the Karakorum mountains and the sources of the Onon River. Karakorum (kara, black; kuren, a camp), was called by the Chinese (Tsou), and his capital by Jenghiz Khan in 1266. Its full name, Ha-la Ho-lin, was taken from a river to the west. In the spring of 1235, Okkodai had a wall built round Ho-lin. After the death of Kublai, Ho-lin was altered to Ho-Ning, and in 1320 the name of the province was changed into Lingpe (“mountains of the North”), i.e., the Yang-shan chain, scenically beautiful place, Chien Chao (Progoz).

The researches have fully confirmed the belief that the Erdeni Tso, or Erdeni Chao, monastery, founded in 1866, occupies the site of Karakorum, near the bank of the Orkbow, between this river and the Kokchin (old) Orkbow. In 1266, Mangkou Khan decided to transfer the seat of government to Kaita-tu, or Shansi, near the present Dolon nor, north of Peking. In 1269, Kublai transferred his capital to Ta-tu (Peking), and it was called Khan-baligh. The second Supreme Khan was Okkodai (1229-41), replaced by his son Kuyuk (third Great Khan) (1246-48), Turakinha being regent (1241-46); Ogulgamish was regent (1245-51). The title was then transferred to the Tu-li branch of Jenghis family, and the fourth great Khan was Mangku, who was killed at the siege of Ho-chou in Sze-ch’u-an (1251-57).

Kublai, brother of Mangku, who succeeded him, was the fifth great Khan and the first real Emperor of China, the Yuan Dynasty (1260). His ancestor have the following descriptive titles: his father was the Son of Jenghis Khan, his grandfather the Son of Jenghis, his great-grandfather the Son of Tong Tem (Jengis), Tem Tsung (Okkodai), Tsung Sun (Mangku). Kublai himself has the miao hao of She Tsu and the two reign-titles (niem hao) of Chung Tung (1260) and Che Yuan (1264). The list of his successors according to their miao hao, with niem hao in parentheses, is as follows: Tung Tung, 1260 (Che Yuan); Tung Shin, 1264 (Che Chao, 1264); Shin Tung, 1264 (Che Chao, 1264); Shin Tung, 1267 (Che Ho, 1268); Sung Tung, 1269 (Che Chao, 1269); Sung Tung, 1271 (Ti Li, 1270); Teh, 1277; Wu Teh, 1280 (Chen Teh, 1280); Jun Teh, 1285 (Hwang K’ing, 1312; Chen Teh, 1285); Ying Teh, 1291 (Che Che, 1291); Ying Teh, 1291 (Che Che, 1291); Tai Ting Ti, 1294; Tai Ting, 1294 (Che Ho, 1294); Ming Tsung, 1295 (Tien Li, 1295); Men Ti, 1300 (Ti’en Li, 1300); Che Shun, 1300); Shun Ti, 1333 (Yuan Tung, 1333; Che Yuan, 1335; Che Chao, 1335). The misfortune of the Chinese in the person of the emperor, Liu-chia-chou, is now a popular expression in the history of China; the Yuan-chieh, to raise the standard of rebellion and expel the Mongols, in 1368. This priest ascended the throne under the title of Hung Wu, and established his dynasty, the Ming, at Nan-king. Of the Court of Kublai Khan the Venetian traveller Marco Polo has left us a glorious account. China was described by him as “a country more populous than Chinese territory, as far as the Yellow River, and to the Arap (1335-36); Musa (1336); Mohammed (1336-38); Totiga Timur (1338-39); Isiz ed Djinhan-Timur (1339); Satibeig (1339); Suleiman (1339-44); Adil Anushirwan (1344-45). After the death of Abusad all these princes were but nominal sovereigns, overruled by five small dynasties: (1) Ikhanian-Jeladat, in Bagdad (1336-1432); (2) Beni Kurt, in Khorsakan and Herat (1248-1383); (3) Modhafferin, in Irak, Fars, and Kerman (1335-92); (4) Serberdian, in Khorsakan (1335-81); (5) Jubanian, in Azerbaijan (1337-55). They were all destroyed by Timur or his successors. Among the first Ilkans, Arghun and Oljaitu had relations with the kings of France: two letters are presented in the French Archives, one from Arghun Khan (1289), brought by Bucarel, and the other from his son Oljaitu (May, 1305) to Philip the Fair. These letters are both in the Mongol language, and, according to Abel Rémuat and other authorities, in the Ulghur character, the parent of the present Mongol writing; Sir Thomas Roe, Prince Roland Bonaparte’s “Recueil des documents de l’époque mongole.” Under this dynasty, in 1318, Pope John XXII had created an archbishopric at Sulthaneyh, of which Franco of Perugia, William X.—31
Adam (1 June, 1323), John of Corna (1329), and others were the incumbents, down to Thomas de Abarane (19 Dec., 1425).

Chagatai died in 1241, and was replaced by his grandson Kara Hulaku. About 1321, under Kabak, the realm of Chagatai was divided into two parts; Maxwell-nur-Nair, or Transoxiana, and Moghulistan, or Jatah. About fifteen khans ruled Transoxiana, who intermarried and intermarried intermarried, until the great Timur conquered the land and restored order in 1370 (a.h. 771). The first ruler of Moghulistan (1321) was Isan Bugha Khán; after the death of Sultan Ahmed Khan (1504) a state of anarchy prevailed in the country until Sultan Mansur, the eldest son of Ahmed, established his authority at Aksu, Turfan, etc., and created the khanate of Uigure. Nestorian Kirghis in the steppes, having evicted khans, formed the Confederation of Kazak~Uzbek, and Sultan Said Khan, third son of Ahmed, established a khanate in Kashgar and the western provinces (see TURKESTAN).

From Juji, the eldest son of Jenghis Khan, descended the following dynasties of khans: (1) Ripchak, 1224-1502; (2) Astrakhan, 1466-1554; (3) Great Bulgaria, 1224-1438; (4) Kazan, 1438-1552; (5) Casimoff, 1450-1681; (6) Crimea, 1420-1783; (7) Nogais, 1242-1301; (8) Kazak~Uzbek, 1427-1830; (9) Turan and Tiumen, 1225-1659; (10) Tiumen and Sibir, 1301-1588; (11) Khazresa, 1515-1805; (12) Maxwell-nur-Nair, 1500-1798.

Peter Bormann. In 1838, the Vicarate Apostolic of Liao-tung was detached from the Diocese of Peking. It included both Manchuria and Mongolia. Emmanuel-Jean-François-Verrolles, of the Paris Missions Etrangères, was the first vicar Apostolic. Five years later (28 August, 1840) the new vicariate was divided into three vicariates Apostolic: (1) Liao-tung was united with Korea, (2) Mongolia had been a dependency of the Diocese of Peking from 1690 to 1838, and after 1783 had been administered by the Lazarists; the Paris Missions Etrangères kept it only two years, and when it was made a separate vicariate Apostolic (28 August, 1840) at the head of it was placed Joseph Martial Moully, titular Bishop of Pusols, who, on his transfer to Peking (1857), was replaced by Florient Dagui, titular Bishop of Trosa, who died 9 May, 1859. François Tagliabue was then appointed pro-vicar and superior of the mission. On 7 Sept., 1864, the Lazarists surrendered Mongolia to the Belgian missionaries, and Theophilus Verbiest (b. at Antwerp in 1828) was the first superior and Prior. He died 28 Aug., 1886, and was succeeded as pro-vicar by Edward Smorembourg. Jacques Bax (b. 1824) was appointed vicar Apostolic 22 Oct., 1874, was consecrated titular Bishop of Adrian, 6 Jan., 1875, and died 4 Jan., 1895, at Si-wan-tse. On 21 Dec., 1883, Leo XIII divided Mongolia into three vicariates Apostolic, Eastern, Central, and Western and Southern Mongolia, all in the hands of the Belgian missionaries (Congr. Imm. Cordis B.M. V. de Scheutveld). The first Vicar Apostolic of Eastern Mongolia was Conrad Abels, b. at West, Limburg, Holland, 31 Jan., 1856, consecrated titular Bishop of Lagania, 31 Oct., 1897; residence at Sung shu tsuei tse (Notre Dame des Fins). He was succeeded by Theodore Hermann Rutjes, titular Bishop of Eolutrepolis, who died 4 Aug., 1896. There are in Eastern Mongolia 39 European and 12 native priests; 19,864 Christians; 18 churches. (2) Central Mongolia, after the partition, in 1883, remained under Mgr Bax, who was succeeded as vicar Apostolic by Jerome Van Aertslers (b. 1 Nov., 1845), consecrated titular Bishop of Karakorum, 24 June, 1888, at Siwan-tse. There are 46 European and 23 native priests; 25,775 Christians; 37 churches. (3) Western Southern Mongolia.—To the vicariate created in 1883 were added by decree of 12 Oct., 1886, the Prefecture of Ning hia from the Kan-su vicariate and the Sub-prefecture K'iu-huan. The residence is at Eul ahe on K'ung ti. Vicar Apostolic Alphonse Bertram (b. 2 Aug., 1853) was consecrated 15 April, 1901, titular Bishop of Stratonicus. He replaced Alphonse de Vos, titular Bishop of Abdira, 21 July, 1888, and Ferdinand Hamer, who was transferred from Kan-su, 30 August, 1888, and martyred August, 1900. There are 45 European and 1 native priest; 13,896 Christians; 30 churches (see TALAC).

Henri Cordier. Monica, Sailor, widow: born of Christian parents at Tagaste, N. Africa, in 333; died at Ostia, near Rome, in 387. We are told but little of her childhood. She was married early in life to Patricius who held an official position in Tagaste. He was a pagan, though like so many at that period, his religion was no more than a name; his temper was violent and he appears to have been of dissolute habits. Consequently Monica's married life was far from being a happy one, especially as Patricius's mother seems to have been of a like disposition with herself. There was of course a gulf between husband and wife; her almsdeeds and her habits of prayer annoyed him, but it is said that he always held her in a sort of reverence. Monica was not the only matron of Tagaste whose married life was unhappy, for the story of her suffering is but a part of the larger story that we should tell. She was able to exercise a veritable apostolate amongst the wives and mothers of her native town; they knew that she suffered as they did, and her words and example had a proportionate effect.

Three children were born of this marriage, Augustine the eldest, Navigius the second, and a daughter, Perpetus. Monica was at first unable to secure baptism for her children, and her grief was great when Augustine fell ill; in her distress she besought Patricius to allow him to be baptized; he agreed, but on the boy's recovery withdrew his consent. All Moni ca's anxiety now centred in Augustine; he was wayward and, as he himself tells us, lazy. He was sent to school to be instructed in the faith, but he ran away and wrestled with God for the soul of her son. A great consolation was vouchsafed her—in compensation perhaps for all she was to experience through Augustine—Patricius became a Christian. Meanwhile, Augustine had been sent to Carthage, to prosecute his studies, and here he fell into grievous sin. Patricius died very shortly after, and the young people, into the Church and Monica resolved not to marry again. At Carthage Augustine had become a Manichean and when on his return home he ventilated certain heretical propositions she drove him away from her table, but a strange vision which she had urged him to recall him. It was at this time that she went to see a certain holy bishop, whose name is not given, but who consoled her with the now famous words, "the child of those tears shall never perish." There is no more pathetic story in the annals of the Saints than that of Monica pursuing her wayward son to Rome, whither he had gone by stealth; when she arrived he had already gone to Milan, but she followed him. Here she found St. Ambrose, and with renewed assurance pursued the way of seeing Augustine yield, after seventeen years of resistance. Mother and son spent six months of true peace at Cessaciun, after which time Augustine was baptized in the church of St. John the Baptist at Milan. Africa claimed them however, and they set
Monism (from the Greek mónos, "one", "alone", "unique") is a philosophical term which, in its various meanings, is opposed to Dualism or Pluralism. Wherever pluralistic philosophy distinguishes a multiplicity of things, Monism denies that the manifoldness is real, and holds that the apparently many are phases, or phenomena, of a one. Wherever dualistic philosophy distinguishes between body and soul, matter and spirit, object and subject, matter and force, the system which denies such a distinction, reduces one term of the antithesis to the other, or merges both in a higher unity, is called Monism.

I

In Metaphysics.—The ancient Hindu philosophers stated as a fundamental truth that the world of appearances is an illusion, an exchange, plurality, and causation are not real, that there is but one reality, God. This is metaphysical Monism of the idealistic-spiritual type, tending towards mysticism. Among the early Greek philosophers, the Eleatics, starting, like the Hindus, with the conviction that sense-knowledge is untrustworthy, and that only being is real, proclaimed the idealism of exchange; change, plurality, and origination do not really exist, that Being is one, immutable, and eternal. They did not explicitly identify the one reality with God, and were not, so far as we know, inclined to mysticism. Their Monism, therefore, may be said to be of the purely idealistic type. These two forms of metaphysical Monism recur frequently in the history of philosophy; for instance, the idealistic-spiritual type in neo-Platonism and in Spinoza's metaphysics, and the purely idealistic type in the national absolutism of Hegel. Besides idealistic Monism there is Monism of the materialistic type, which proclaims that there is but one reality, namely, matter, whether matter be an agglomerate of atoms or the material nebula of the IONIAN SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY, or the so-called cosmic nebula out of which the world evolved. There is another form of metaphysical Monism, represented in these days by Haeckel and his followers, which, though materialistic in its scope and tendency, professes to transcend the point of view of materialistic Monism and unite both matter and mind in a higher something. The weak point of all metaphysical Monism is its inability to explain how, if there is but one reality, and everything else is only apparent, there can be any real changes in the world, or real relations among things. This difficulty is met in dualistic systems of philosophy by the doctrine of matter and form, or primary and secondary qualities, which are the ultimate realities in the metaphysical order. Pluralism rejects the solution offered by scholastic dualism and strives, with but little success, to oppose to Monism its own theory of synecchism or panpsychism (see Pragmatism). The chief objection to materialistic Monism is that it stops short of the point where the real proper or metaphysical reality, which is the ultimate reality in the metaphysical order, even does not seem to have found a place in the Roman Brevislavia before the sixteenth century. In 1850 there was established at Notre Dame de Sion at Paris an Association of Christian mothers under the patronage of St. Monica; its object was mutual prayer for son and husband, and the care of the family. This Ass. was established in 1856 to the French, it may, of course, be continued. A new Confraternity and spread rapidly over all the Catholic world, branches being established in Dublin, London, Liverpool, Sidney, and Buenos Ayres. Eugenius IV had established a similar Confraternity long before.

II

In Theology.—The term Monism is not much used in theology because of the confusion to which its use would lead. Polytheism, the doctrine that there are many Gods, has for its opposite Monotheism, the doctrine that there is but one God. If the term Monism is employed in place of Monotheism, it must be understood that it is a monotheistic doctrine, or it may mean Pantheism, which is opposed to theism. In this sense of the term, as a synonym for Pantheism, Monism maintains that there is no real distinction between God and the universe. Either God is indwelling in the universe as a part of it, not distinct from it (pantheism), or He is the universe as such, but all as a reality (Acosmism), only as a manifestation or phenomenon of God. These views are vigorously combated by Theism, not only on considerations of logic and philosophy, but also on considerations of human life and conduct. For the ethical implications of pantheism are as detrimental to it as its shortcomings from the viewpoint of metaphysics and reasonableness. Theism does not deny that God is indwelling in the universe; but it does deny that He is comprised in the universe. Theism does not deny that the universe is a manifestation of God; but it does deny that the universe has no reality of its own. Theism is, therefore, dualistic: it holds that God is a reality distinct from the universe and independent of it, and that the universe is a reality distinct from God, though not independent of Him. From another point of view, theism is monistic; it maintains that there is but one Supreme Reality and that all other reality is derived from Him. Monism is not then an adequate equivalent of the term Theism.

In Psychology the central problem of rational psychology is the question of the relation between soul and body. Scholastic dualism, following Aristotle, maintains that man is one substance, composed of body and soul, which are respectively matter and form. The soul is the principle of life, energy, and perfection; the body is the principle of decay, change, plurality, and origination. The body is then complete substances; their union is not accidental as Plato thought, but substantial. They are, of course, really distinct, and even separable; yet they act on each other and react. The soul, even in its highest functions, needs the co-operation, at least extrinsic, of the body, and the body in all its vital functions is energized by the soul as the practical principle of those functions. They are not so much two in one as two forming one compound. In popular imagination this dualism may be exaggerated; in the mind of the extreme ascetic it sometimes is exaggerated to the point of placing a too sharp contrast between "the flesh" and "the spirit", "the beast" and "the angel".

Psychological Monism tends to obliterate all distinction between body and soul. This it does in one of three ways. (A) Monism of the materialistic type reduces the soul to matter or material conditions, and thus, in
effect, denies that there is any distinction between soul and body. The Stoics described the soul as a parallel with the material world and the nervous system; the Epicureans held that it is a compound of material atoms; modern Materialism knows no substantial soul except the nervous system; Cabanis, for instance, proclaims his materialism in the well-known crude formula: "The brain digests impressions, and organically secretes thought." Psychological materialism, as metaphysical materialism, closes its eyes to those phenomena of the soul which it cannot explain, or even denies that such phenomena exist. (B) Monism of the idealistic type takes an entirely opposite course. It reduces the body to mind or mental conditions. Some of the neo-Platonists held that all matter is non-existent, that our body is, therefore, an error on the part of our soul, and our soul is nothing but, or identical with, the soul of God. John Scottus Eriugena, influenced by the neo-Platonists, held the body to be a resultant from incorporeal qualities which the soul, by thinking them and synthesizing them, creates into a body for itself. In modern times, Berkeley included the human body in his general denial of the reality of matter, and maintained "nothing exists except soul and God." The grounds for this belief are epistemological. Psychological Monism runs counter to common sense and experience. Historically, it is a reaction against materialism. To refute materialism it is not necessary to deny that the body is a reality. The unreflecting dualism of common sense and the scientific dualism are immoral except so far as they are supported by our experience and by the desires of the Materialist, who sees nothing but body, and the cold paradox of the Idealist, who recognizes no reality except mind.

(C) A third kind of psychological Monism goes by the name of psychophysical parallelism. It maintains that body and mind are the other affirmative. First, it denies categorically that there is, or can be, any direct causal influence of the soul on the body or of the body on the soul: our thoughts cannot produce the movements of our muscles, neither can the action of light on the retina produce in us the "thought" of a color. Secondly, it affirms in some shape or form that both the body and the soul are phases of something else, that this something evolves its activities along two parallel lines, the physical and the psychical, so that the thought, for instance, of moving my hand is synchronous with the motion of my hand, without one in any way influencing the other. This is the doctrine of parallelism. Its chief exponent is Malebranche, who holds that the union of soul and body "consists in a mutual and natural correspondence of the thoughts of the soul with the processes of the brain, and of the emotions of the soul with the movements of the animal spirits." (Rech. de la Vérité, II, v). It is the doctrine of Spinoza, whose metaphysical Monism concerning the identity of body and soul are merely aspects of the one substance, God, under the attributes extension and thought, but that they unfold their modes of activity in a manner preordained to correspondence (Eth., II, ii, schol.). Leibniz meets the difficulty in his own characteristic way by teaching that all monads are partly material and partly immaterial, and that among all monads and their activities there exists a pre-established harmony (see LEIBNIZ; MONAD). In the so-called Identitätsphilosophie of some German Transcendentalists, such as Schelling, reality is mind in so far as it is active, and matter in so far as it is passive; mind and matter are, therefore, two harmonious, but independent, series of physical and psychical reality. Fechner's view has it that the reality pertaining to the whole universe is at once physical and psychical, that the physical is the "exterior" and the psychical the "interior", or "inner", side of reality, and that the body and soul in man are but one instance of a parallelism which prevails everywhere in nature. ("Introduct. to Phil.", tr. Thilly, 87, 88) and he also affirms that "two propositions are contained in the theory of parallelism: (1) Physical processes are never effects of psychical processes; (2) Psychical processes are never effects of physical processes." He adopts Fechner's panpsychism, maintaining that "everything corporeal points to something else, an inner, intelligible element, a being for whose sake the soul manifests within its own experience within ourselves." Both the corporeal and the "inner" are parts of the universal system, which is the body of God, and, though they do not interact, they act in such a way that harmony results.

Herbert Spencer uses the word parallelism in a slightly different sense: the separate impressions of the senses and the stream of our mental action must be adjusted by the activity of the mind, if the two series are to be of any use to the developing or evolving animal or man; that is, there must be a parallelism between a certain physical evolution and the psychical evolution (Principles of Psych., n. 179), "while both mind and matter are "forms" sets, and the system of the universe, and forever unknown to us" (op. cit., n. 63). This idea finds favor among the evolutionists generally, and has one distinct advantage: it obviates the necessity of explaining many phenomena of mind which could not be accounted for by the principles of materialistic evolution. Thus, under the name "double-skeletalism" theory, as advanced by Charles H. Huxley, and Huxley. Among empirical psychologists parallelism has been found satisfactory as a "working hypothesis". Experience, it is maintained, tells us nothing of a substantial soul that acts on the body and is acted upon. It does tell us, however, that psychical states are apparently conditioned by bodily states, and that there is an interaction of body and mind. But for the purposes of science, conclude the empiricists, it is enough to maintain as an empirical formula that the two streams of activity are, so to speak, parallel, though never confluent. There is no need to ground the formula on any universal metaphysical theory, such as the pan-psychism of Fechner and Pauli. It is enough that, as Wundt points out, the facts of experience establish a correspondence between physical and psychical, while the dissimilarity of the physical and the psychical precludes the possibility of one being the cause of the other. To all these parallelistic explanations of the relations between soul and body the Scholastic dualists take exception. First, the scholastics hold that both body and soul are mortal and perish at death. But to a certain point, the facts of experience are capable of a parallelistic, as well as of a dualistic, explanation. But when we come to consider the unity of consciousness, which is a fact of experience, we find that the theory of parallelism breaks down, and the only explanation that holds is that of dualists, who maintain that soul and body are perfectly distinct entities. If the parallelistic theory be true, what, asks the Scholastic dualists, becomes of the freedom of the will and moral responsibility? If our mental and bodily states are not to be referred to an immediate personal subject, but are considered phases or aspects of a universal substance, a cosmic soul, mind-stuff, or unknown "form of Power", it is not easy to say in what sense the will can be free, and man be held responsible for his mental or bodily acts.

In a minor sense the word monism is sometimes used in psychology to designate the doctrine that there is no real distinction between the soul and its faculties. Psychological dualism holds that soul and body are distinct, though they can act simultaneously. But how about the soul itself? Plato's doctrine that it has three parts has had very little following in philosophy. Aristotle distinguished between the substance of the soul and its powers (dunamies), or faculties,
and bequeathed to the Schoolmen the problem whether these faculties are really, or only notionally, distinct from one another. It is evident that the real distinction are sometimes called pluralists in psychology, and their opponents, who say that the distinction is nominal or, at most, notional, are sometimes called psychological Monists. The question is decided by inferences from the facts of consciousness. Those who hold real distinction of function argue that this is sufficient ground for a real distinction of faculties.

IV. In Epistemology, as in psychology, Monism is used in various senses to signify, in a general way, the antithesis of dualism. The Dualist in epistemology agrees with the ordinary observer, who distinguishes both in theory and in practice between "things" and "thoughts". Common sense, or unreflecting consciousness, takes things generally to be what they seem. It acts on the conviction that the internal world of our thoughts corresponds with the external world of reality. The philosophical dualist questions the extent and accuracy of that correspondence; he learns from psychology that many instances of so-called immediate perception have in them a large share of the semblance of thought, and that the activity of the mind. Nevertheless, he sees no reason to quarrel with the general verdict of common sense that there is a world of reality outside us, as well as a world of representation within us, and that the latter corresponds in a measure to the former. He distinguishes, therefore, between subject and object, but not between self and external world. The Monist in one way or another eliminates the objective from the field of reality, obliterates the distinction between self and not-self, and denies that the external world exists. The Monist in one way or another eliminates the objective from the field of reality, obliterates the distinction between self and not-self, and denies that the external world exists.

Sometimes he takes the ground of idealism, maintaining that thoughts are things, that the only reality is perceptible reality, and that everything else is a mere sense that it is perceived. He also fulfills the view of naïve realism, refers with contempt to the copy-theory (the view that our thoughts represent things) and is rather proud of the fact that he is in conflict with common sense. Sometimes he is a solipsist, holding that self alone exists, that the external world of consciousness is the only thing known, and that the existence of other minds than our own is a vulgar error. Sometimes, finally, he is an ascetic: he denies that the external world exists except in so far as it is thought to exist: or he affirms that we create our own external world out of our own thoughts.

However, the classical form of epistemological Monism is that of the Hegelian—metaphysical monism of the purely idealistic type. It holds that both subject and object are merely phases of an abstract, unlimited, impersonal consciousness called the Absolute; that neither things nor thoughts have any reality apart from the Absolute. It teaches that the universe is a process of becoming, a process of self-derivation. It is a process of self-derivation. It is the absolutely intellectual "ground" and multiform "appearance" of that ground, one appearance being what the Realist calls "things", and another what the Realist calls "thoughts". This is the doctrine of the Hegelians, from Hegel himself down to his latest representatives, Bradley and McTaggart. All these forms of epistemological Monism—namely, idealism, solipsism, acosmism, and absolutism—have, of course, metaphysical bearings, and sometimes rest on metaphysical foundations. Nevertheless, historically speaking, they are traceable to a psychological assumption which is, and always will be, the dividing line between Dualism and Monism in epistemology. The Dualists, in fact, are only vaguely aware of the fact that in every process of perception the object is immediately given. It seems like emphasizing the obvious to say so, yet it is precisely on this point that the whole question turns. What I perceive is not a sensation of whiteness but a white object. What I taste is not a sweet substance but a sweet taste. No matter how much the activity of the mind may elaborate, synthesize, or reconstruct the data of sense-perception, the objective reference cannot be the result of any such subjective activity; for it is given originally in consciousness. On the contrary, the Monist starts with the idealistic assumption that what we perceive is the sensation. Whatever objective reference the sensation has in our consciousness is conferred on it by the activity of the mind. The objective is, therefore, reducible to the subjective; things are thoughts; we make our world. In the dualist's analysis there is immediate, presentative contact in consciousness between the subject and the object. In the Monist's account of the matter there is a change between subject and object which must be bridged over somehow. The problem of Dualism or Monism in epistemology depends, therefore, for solution on the question whether perception is representative or presentative; and the dualist, who holds the presentative theory, seems to have on his side the verdict of introspective psychology as well as the arguments of the activity of the mind. In recent Pragmatist contributions to epistemology there is presented a different view of epistemological Monism from that given in the preceding paragraphs, and a solution is offered which differs entirely from that of traditional dualism. In William James's work, for instance, Monism is described as such that "the 'sense of the all' or collective-unit form is the only form that is rational", while opposed to it is Pluralism, that is, the doctrine that "the 'each-form' is an eternal form of reality no less than it is the form of temporal appearance" (A Pluralistic Universe, 324 sqq.). The multitude of "each-forms" constitute, not a chaos, but a cosmos because they are "organized together" into a system. The unity, however, which exists among the "each-forms" of reality is not an integral unity nor an articulate or organic, much less a logical, unity. It is a unity of the "strung-along type, the type of continuity, contiguity, or concatenation" (op. cit., 320). Into this unfinished universe, into this stream of subjective, subjective, subjective, subjective experience, steps at a certain moment. By a process which belongs, not to logic, but to life, which exceeds logic, he connects up these experiences into a concatenated series. In other words, he strings the single beads on a string, not of thought, but of the practical needs and purposes of life. Thus the subject makes his own world, and, beyond that, makes the object; if we accepted the verdict of the intellectualist Idealist. We have merely put the practical reason in place of the theoretical: so far as the value of knowledge is concerned the antithesis between Monism and Pluralism is more apparent than real, and the latter is as far from the sameness of realist Dualism as the former. It is a principle of self-derivation. In a sense, the existence of the external world; but so also does the Absolutist. The trouble is that neither admits it in a sense which would save the distinction between subject and object. For the Pluralist as well as the Monist is entangled in the web of subjective Idealism as soon as he favours the doctrine that perception is representative, not presentative.

V. In Cosmology, the central question is the origin of the universe. The early Ionian philosophers assigned, as the cause or principle (4ρη is the Aristotelian word) of the universe, a substance which is at once the material out of which the universe is made and the force by which it was made. As Aristotle says, of himself and his predecessors, 'the material cause and the efficient cause. They were, therefore, dynamists and hylomorphic. That is, they held matter to be of its nature active, and en-
dowed with life. Without the aid of any extrinsic force, they said, the original substance, by a process of thickening and thinning, or by quenching and kindling, or in some other immanent way, gave rise to the universe as we now see it. This primitive cosmoehtic Monism gradually gave way to a dualistic conception of the origin of the world. Tentatively at first, and then more decisively, the later Ionians introduced the notion of a primitive force, distinct from matter, which fashioned the universe out of the primordial substance. Anaxagoras it was, who, by clearly defining this force and describing it as mind (nous), earned the encomium of being the "first of the ancient philosophers who spoke sense". Dualism, thus introduced, withstood the onslaughts of many anomie in the modern and materialistic Stoicism and emanationistic neo-Platonism. It was developed by Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, who brought to their description of the world-forming process a higher notion of cosmoehtic mind than the pre-Socratic philosophers possessed. It was left for the Christian philosophers of Alexandria and their successors, the Scholastics of medieval times, to elaborate the doctrine of creation ex nihilo, and thus bring out more clearly the role played by the Divine Power and Will in the formation of the universe. The order, harmony, and purposefulness evident everywhere in nature are cited by the creationists as evidence to show that mind must have presided at the beginning. A high degree of dynamism or mechanism hinges on the problem of the nature of matter. This phase of the question has been developed especially in post-Cartesian philosophy, some maintaining that matter is essentially inert and must, therefore, have acquired force and activity from without, while others as stoutly maintain that matter is essentially active as evil and has developed its own force from within. Evolution of the thoroughgoing type takes the latter view. It holds that in the primitive cosmic matter was contained "the power and potency" of all life and movement, in such a way that no external agent was required in order to bring it to actual existence. Here, as in the question of Theism, Christian philosophy is frankly dualistic, although it acknowledges that, since actuality antedates potency by nature and, as a matter of fact, the world originated in time, while God is eternal, there was, before creation, but One Reality.

VI. In Ernics, the word Monism is very little used. In some German works it is employed to designate nothingness, the non-omnes. Christian ethics is essentially heteronomic: it teaches that all law, even natural law, emanates from God. Kantian ethics and Evolutionistic ethics hold that the moral law is either self-imposed or emanates from the moral sense which is a product of the struggle for existence. In both the Kantian and the Evolutionistic systems there is source of the power of moral discrimination and approval. For this reason the word Monism is here used in its generic sense. In English philosophical literature, however, the word has no such signification. In accounting for the origin of evil, a problem which, though it belongs to metaphysics, has important bearings on ethical questions, some philosophers have adopted a Dualistic doctrine and explained that good and evil originate from two distinct principles, the one supremely good, the other completely and absolutely evil. This was the doctrine of the ancient Persians, from whom it was borrowed by Manes, the founder of the Manichean sect. Opposed to this is the Monistic view that God is the only absolutely real in the universe, and that evil is not to be assigned to any supreme cause distinct from God. Whatever explanation be given of the existence of evil in the world, it is maintained that a supreme principle of evil is utterly impossible and even inconceivable.

VII. CONTEMPORARY MONISTIC MOVEMENTS AND SCHOOLS.—In current philosophical literature, whenever no special qualification is added, Monism generally means the modified materialistic monism of Haeckel. Modern materialistic Monism in Germany begins with Feuerbach, a disciple of Hegel. Feuerbach was followed by Vogt and Molechott. To these succeeded Haeckel, who combines Darwinian evolution with a materialistic interpretation of Spirit. *Bruno*. Haeckel's works, both in the original and in English translations, have had a wide circulation, their popularity being due rather to the superficial manner in which Haeckel disposes of the most serious questions of metaphysics than to any intrinsic excellence of content or method. Haeckel is honorary president of the monistic movement and also founded at Jena in 1906, for the purpose of propagating the doctrines of Monism. The society is openly anti-Christian, and makes active warfare against the Catholic Church. Its publications, "Der Monist" (a continuation of the "Freie Glocken"—first number, 1890), "Blätter des deutschen Monistenbunds" (first number, July, 1906), and various pamphlets (Flugblätter des Monistenbunds), are intended to be a campaign against Christian education and the union of Church and State.

The group of writers in America who, under the editorship of Dr. Paul Carus, have been identified with the "Monist" (Chicago, monthly, first number, April, 1891) are the most coherent, acceptable, and unanimous against Christianity. Nevertheless, they hold Haeckel's fundamental tenet that Monism as a system of philosophy transcends Christianity as a form of belief, and is the only rational synthesis of science and religion. "Religious progress no less than scientific progress", writes Carus, "is a process of the organism. Religion is the basis of ethics... The ideal of religion is the same as that of science, it is a liberation of the mythological elements and its aim is to rest upon a concise but exhaustive statement of facts" (Monism, Its Scope and Import, 8, 9). This "concise but exhaustive statement of facts" is positive Monism, the doctrine, namely, that the whole of reality constitutes one inseparable and indivisible entirety. Monism is not the doctrine that one substance alone, whether it be mind or matter, exists: such a theory, says Dr. Carus, is best designated as Henism. True Monism "bears in mind that our words are abstracts representing parts or features of one and the same substance..." (Monism, Its Scope and Import, 7). This Monism is Positivistic, because its aim is "the systematisation of knowledge, that is, of a description of facts" (ibid.). "Radical free thought" is the motto of this school of Monism; at the same time, it disclaims all sympathy with destructive Atheism, Agnosticism, Materialism, and Negativism in general. Nevertheless, the group of the most trained students of philosophy will be likely to be more profoundly influenced by the Monistic criticism of Christianity than by the constructive effort to put something in place of the errors referred to.

All Monism may be described as resulting from the tendency of the human mind to discover unitary concepts under which to subsume the manifold of experience. So long as we are content to take and preserve the world of our experience as we find it, with all its manifoldness, variety, and fragmentation, we are in the condition of primitive man, and little better than brute animals. As soon as we begin to reflect on the data of the senses, we are led by instinct to the notion of a universal unity, that of a cause or reasons behind the events of the universe, or the unity of a causal concept. This we first do in the scientific plane. Afterwards, carrying the process to a higher plane, we try to unify these under philosophical categories, such as substance and accident, matter and force, body and mind, subject and object
The history of philosophy, however, shows with unmistakable clearness that there is a limit to this unifying process in philosophy. If Hegel were right, and the formula, ‘The rational alone is real’, were true, then man has no realm of his own, and reality is in all things. But Christian philosophy holds, the real extends beyond the domain of the (finite) rational. Reality eludes our attempt to compress it within the categories which we frame for it. Consequently, Dualism is often the final answer in philosophy; and Monism is the one philosophical instrument which Dupuis, but aims at an ideal completeness, often results in failure. Dualism leaves room for faith, and hands over to faith many of the problems which philosophy cannot solve. Monism leaves no room for faith. The only mysticism that is compatible with it is rationalistic, and very different from that ‘vision’ in which, for the Christian mystic, all the limitations, imperfections, and other shortcomings of our feeble efforts are removed by the light of faith.

See works referred to under metaphysics: also, Vercruysse, Dualism and Monism (London, 1859); Ward, Naturalism and Apropos of a Book by H. Rolin, The World (London, 1890); Rolin’s, The World, Individual (New York, 1901); Békele, Pluralism and Monism in Philos. Rev. VII (1898), 335 sqq.; Bezzenberg, Dualism, Monism, and the Idea of God (Berlin, 1870); Gernsheim, Monism in Mind, VI (1881), 153 sqq.; Articles in Monist, Monismus, Le Monde, Beobachtungen, Die Welt in Bildern, Die Welt (Berlin, 1886); Gutenbrun, Der Mechanische Monismus (Paderborn, 1893); Engel, Der naturphilosophische Monismus Haeckel’s (Berlin, 1898); Articles by K. E. Meyer, Jahrbuch für Phil. wiss. Theol. (1895, 1900); Maistre, Monisme et nationalisme (2 vols., Vittoria, 1887); Arato, Il monismo moderno (Catania, 1893); Haeckel, Der Monismus in der Verbindung Religionen und Wissenschaft, tr. Gernsheim (London, 1894); Idem, Die Weltreligionen, tr. McCabe (London, 1900). On Canu, Schoch of Monism, besides The Monist (1891)—and the Open Court (pub. fortnightly, first number, Feb. 17, 1887), cf. Canu, Primer of Philosophy (Chicago, 1896); Idem, Fundamentals of Problems (Chicago, 1894); Idem, Monism, Its Scope and Importance (Chicago, 1891).

WILLIAM TURNER.

Monita Secreta, a code of instructions alleged to be addressed by Acquaviva, the fifth general of the Society, to its various superiors, and laying down the methods to be adopted for the increase of its power and influence. According to them, every means is to be employed of acquiring wealth for the order, by enticing promising young men with their estates; and for that purpose, rich widows are to be coajusted and dissuaded from remarriage; every means is to be used for the advancement of Jesuits to bishoprics or other ecclesiastical dignities, and to discredit the members of other orders, while the world is to be persuaded that the Society is animated by the purest and least interested motives: the reputation of those who quit it is to be assailed and traduced in every way.

That the “Monita” are in reality what they pretend, cannot possibly be maintained. They are known to be the work of one Jerome Zahorowski, a Pole, who, having been a member of the Society, had been discharged in 1811. They first appeared in the Cracow in 1812 in MS., purporting to be a translation from the Spanish, and were printed in the same city in 1814. Various stories were told, however, as to the mode in which these secret instructions were originally discovered; the credit being most commonly assigned to Duke Christian of Brunswick who, having been born in 1690, was a mere boy when they first saw the light. The place where they were found was variously set down as Paderborn, Prague, Liège, Antwerp, Glatz, and on board a captured East Indianman. Attempts were likewise made at various times, as late even as 1783, to excite interest in the work as the result of a new discovery; to say nothing of an undated edition, in 1800. A more recent attempt, made the light tradition from the Propaganda Press, and to be authenticated by the testimonies of various Jesuit authorities. These, however, are manifestly nothing but impudent and malignant fabrications, the general, “Felix Acquaviva,” being utterly unknown in the Annals of the Society, and the censor who approves the publication bearing the ominous name of “Pascinelli,” while the titles which, it is alleged, show the expansion of partial men in general for the Society, include all the crimes and abominations of every kind—immoralities, conspiracies, murders, and regicides—which their bitterest enemies have ever attributed to the Society.

In looking for more authentic evidence as to the true character of the “Monita”, it is unnecessary to cite any to whose authenticity I am disposed of might attach—from Bishop Lipaki of Cracow (1616), through the long list of Jesuit writers who have from the first denounced the fabrication, and who are quoted by Father Bernard Duhre in his “Jesuiten Fabeln”. Witnesses beyond any such exception are few. For example, the famous Fra Paolo Sorber, the historian of the Council of Trent, the Jesuit Henri de Saint-Ignace, as well as Arnauld and the “Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques”, to whom may be added Pascal himself, whose negative testimony is sufficient to show what he thought on the subject.

To these witnesses may be added such pronounces and Jesuits as von der Lan, Dodgeair, Friedrich (the author of Janus) Huber, and Rese, as well as the Protestant historian Gieseler. In the British House of Commons, during the debates on Catholic Emancipation, the fraudulent character of the “Monita” was fully acknowledged by more than one speaker, while the authorities of the British Museum, and likewise the French bishops, the German, agree in describing the work as “apocryphal”.

The only defence seriously attempted on the other side is that offered by the late Dr. Litteldein in his notorious article “Jesuits”, in the “Encyclopedia Britannica”. He acknowledges, indeed, that the work is in reality “both caricature and libel”, but pleads nevertheless, that it is a shrewd and keen observer, having noticed how Jesuits actually worked, deduced from his observations the rules by which they were guided. As to this remarkable example of “jesuitical” argumentation, it is sufficient to inquire upon what solid foundation Dr. Litteldein’s basal assumption rests. There is, for instance, the evidence that the principles of the “Monita” animate Jesuit practice? The official rules and constitutions of the order plainly contradict in every respect these supposed instructions, for they expressly prohibit the acceptance of ecclesiastical dignities by its subjects, unless compelled by papal authority, and from the days of the founder, St. Ignatius himself, it is known that every charge levied against the Society in the way of such promotion. Moreover, in many cases, genuine private instructions from the general to subordinate superiors have fallen into hostile hands, but while in many cases they are found to give instructions directly contrary to those we have heard, it is not even alleged that in any instance they are.

DEUB, Die Monita Secreta oder die geheimen Verordnungen der Gesellschaft Jesu; Saint-Heliers, Les Monita Secreta des Jesuites, l'histoire de l'histoire; Burne, The Jesuits in the Fox's Book of Ethenics, etc.; De Diez der Verbotener Bücher, p. 281; Parkinson in The Month (July-August, 1873; March, 1902); Gerard, The Sacred Instructions of the Jesuits (Catholic Truth Society Pamphlet).

JOHN GERARD.

Monk.—A monk may be conveniently defined as a member of a community of men, leading a more or less contemplative life apart from the world, under the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, according to a rule characteristic of the particular order to which he belongs. The word monk is not itself a term commonly used in the official language of the Church. It is a popular rather than a scientific designation. But it is at the same time very ancient, so much so that its origin cannot be precisely determined. So far as regards the English form of the word, that undoubtedly
comes from the Anglo-Saxon monuca, which has in turn arisen from the Latin monachus, a mere transliteration of the Greek μοναχός. This Greek form is commonly believed to be connected with μόνος, lonely or single, and is suggestive of a life of solitude; but we cannot altogether dismiss the fact that the different root, seems to have been freely used, e.g. by Palladius, as well as μοναχικός, in the sense of a religious house (see Butler, "Palladius’s Lausiac History", passim). Be this as it may, the Fathers of the fourth century are by no means agreed as to the etymological significance of monachus. St. Jerome writes to Heliodorus (P. L., XXXII, 350), “I interpret the name monk, it is thine own; what business hast thou in a crowd, thou who art solitary?” St. Augustine on the other hand fastens on the idea of unity (uni) and in his exposition of Ps. cxxxi, extols the appropriateness of the words “Ecce quam bonum et quae jucundum habitare fratres in unum when chanted in a monastery, because those who are monks should have but one heart and one soul (P. L. XXXVII, 1733). Cassian (P. L., XLIX, 1097), and Pseudo-Dionysius (De Eccl. Hier., vi) seem to have thought monks were so called because they were celibate.

In any case the fact remains that the word monastic in the fourth century was freely used of those consecrated to God, whether they lived as hermits or in communities. So again St. Benedict a little later (c. 535) states at the beginning of his rule that there are four kinds of monks (monachi)—(1) cenobites who live together under a rule or an abbot, (2) anchorites or hermits, who after long training in the discipline of a community, go forth to lead a life of solitude (and all of both these classes he approves); but also (3) "sara-bites" and (4) "girovaggi" (wandering monks), whom he strongly condemns as men whose religious life is but a pretence, and who do their own will without the restraint of obedience. It is probably due to the fact that the Rule of St. Benedict so constantly describes the brethren as monachi and their residence as monasterium, that a tradition has arisen according to which these terms in Latin and English (though not so uniformly in the case of the corresponding German and French words) are commonly applied only to those religious bodies which in some measure reproduce the conditions of life contemplated in the old Benedictine Rule. Of course, the Franciscans, Carmelites, etc., though they live in community and chant the Divine Office in choir, are not correctly described as monks. Their work of preaching, mixing with their fellow men in the world, soliciting alms, and moving from place to place, is inconsistent with the monastic ideal. The same is to be said of the "clerks regular," like the Jesuits, in whose rule the work of the apostolate is regarded as so important that it is considered incompatible with the obligation of sitting office in choir. Again members of the religious congregations of men, which take simple but not solemn vows, are not usually designated as monks. On the other hand it should be noted that in former times monks, even though he sang office in choir, was not necessarily a-priest, the custom in this respect having changed a good deal since medieval times. Besides the Benedictines with their various modifications and offshoots, e. e. the Cluniaces, Cistercians, Trappists etc., the best known orders of monks are the Carthusians, the Premonstratensians, and the Cistercian. The honorific title of Domus, and an abbreviation of Dominus is given to Benedictines and Carthusians.

**Monogram of Christ.**—By the Monogram of Christ is ordinarily understood the abbreviation of Christ's name formed by combining the first two letters of the Greek form ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ, thus Χ; this monogram was also known as the Chriamon. There are, however, besides this type of monogram, three others of Christ—one of His name, Jesus, the other of both His names together. The most common form (that first alluded to), was adopted by Constantine the Great on his military standards. The monogram of the famous labarum (q. v.), as described by Eusebius (Vita Const., I, xxxi), is that given above. Lactantius (De mort., xlvii) describes it as "transversa X littera summo capite circumflexo," a somewhat obscure expression interpreted by Hauck ("Rea. kir. für prob. Theol.", s, vv. Monogram Christi) as a X with one of its strokes perpendicular and the upper arm of this stroke rounded to form a P. Many variants of these two forms exist in the monuments of the fourth and fifth centuries. The Greek letters P combined in a monogram occur on pre-Christian coins (e. g. the Attic tetradrachma and some coins of the Ptolemies), and in some Greek manuscripts of the Christian period they are employed as an abbreviation of such words as ΧΡΟΝΟΣ, ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ, ΧΡΙΣΤΟΤΟΜΟΣ. Lowrie remarks, however, that when used as an abbreviation the X stands usually upon the monogram of Christ it lies on its side thus, appearing more symmetrical. The form P is of Christian origin; it came into use in the X course of the fourth century, and represents a stage in the development of the monogram into the cross.

The opinion of Hauck that the monogram, in the form in which it occurs upon the coins of Constantine, was, was well known in Christian society before Constantine would seem, from the circumstances of the case, to be well founded; for otherwise how would the emperor have recognized it as a Christian symbol? Yet, at the same time it must be said that it appears only rarely on pre-Constantinian manuscripts, and then generally as an abbreviation (compendium scripturae) rather than as an emblem; as, for instance, in a third century inscription in the Catacomb of St. Prisca: ΖΩΙ ΑΘΩZ ΕΝ P. The adoption of the monogram by Constantine for his use on the imperial military standards and on the shields of the soldiers, as a symbol of Christianity, was the beginning of its popularity in the empire. During the fourth century, as we find it on the vast majority of all manuscripts: on public edifices, churches, sarcophagi, lamps, vestments, clothing, household utensils, etc. It appears frequently in association with inscriptions on tombs, sometimes in relation with the apocalyptic letters Α and Ω, or with the symbolic fish, dove, palm branches, and the like. It rarely appears on Roman monuments, however, after the fatal year 410, when the Eternal City fell into the hands of Alaric, but in the East it long continued to enjoy its popularity. In the course of the fifth century, in the West, the P form became the more common, but in the East X the earlier form continued in favour.

**Monograms of Jesus.**—A monogram formed of the initial letters of both Christ's names appears in a Roman monument of the year 268 or 279 as part of the inscription on a tomb: BENE MERTI (in) X Domi No. Two Gallic monuments with this monogram, bearing the dates 491 and 597, are noted by Le Blant, and once it occurs on an ancient lamp, in association with the apocalyptic letters Α and Ω. In a somewhat different form it occurs in several monuments of the cemetery of St. Callistus: in these the I crosses the X horizontally instead of perpendicularly Χ. The IX monogram (for IHΣΟΤΟ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ), also appears on some sarcophagi of Provence enclosed in a circle, thus forming a star: the star that guided the Wise Men to Bethlehem. These monograms occur in manuscripts of the Scriptures (the Codex Alexandrinus and the Codex Claromontanus) as early as
the fifth and sixth centuries. Peculiar to the Latin Church is the monogram ΙΗΣ ΧΡ, which occurs in the sixth century Greek-Latin Codex Claromantunus, as an abbreviation of both Our Lord's Greek names. The Greeks also employed the letters ΗΙ as an abbreviation for the name of Jesus with a peculiarly exomorphic meaning. According to the Epistle of pseudo-Barnabas the circumcision by Abraham of 318 men of his household had a mystic signification. The Greek letters ΙΕΤ, used as numerals, amount to 318, and at the same time the first two of these letters are abbreviations of the Name of Jesus, while the third represents the greatest (Pseudo-Barnabas, c. 16). The same thing was borrowed by the Latin Church, and from them it was borrowed by the Latins. The familiar monogram IHS was first popularized by St. Bernardine of Siena in the early fifteenth century and later, with the addition of a cross over the central letter, by the Society of Jesus (see I.H.S.).


MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Monomotapa.—Whatever be the etymological meaning of the word Monomotapa, the origin of which is much disputed, it is certain, at any rate, that the Portuguese of the sixteenth century employed it to denote the paramount chief of the Makaranga, a powerful South African tribe dwelling between the Zambesi and Limpopo rivers and extending westward from the Indian Ocean probably as far as the twenty-fifth parallel of latitude. Thus, "is attached to this word Monomotapa, inasmuch as it was placed on maps of the day as if it were the name of a territory, not the title of a ruler, and soon it was applied to the entire region from the Zambesi to the mouth of the Fish River. Geographers, who knew nothing of the country, wrote the word upon their charts, and people in general, until the belief became general that a people far advanced in civilization, and governed by a mighty emperor, occupied the whole of southeastern Africa. . . . Such an empire never existed. The foundation upon which imagination constructed it is nothing more than a Bantu tribe. The empire of the Monomotapa was called Makaranga. In the year 1505 when the Portuguese first wrote of it, but, when the Portuguese arrived in 1505, it was in a state of dispersion. According to the reigning Monomotapa, Kamomba by name, had delegated his authority over the more distant parts of his dominions to members of his family who soon asserted their independence. The Makaranga still live scattered in different parts of Rhodesia over a territory which was once their own. In the matter of civilization they never had much to lose, but their warlike qualities have disappeared, so that the word Makaranga is used by their neighbours as a term of reproach and a synonym for coward. The word Monomotapa is no longer known among them. They are, at any rate, more intelligent and docile than their predecessors, which is a point in favor of their customs point to an infusion of Semitic blood. The theory has lately obtained in some quarters, that they built the Great Zimbabwe and other ruins scattered over their country. It is far more probable, however, that, as well as the numerous rock-mines found in the gold areas of Shona and Portuguese Africa, were the work of some Semitic people who occupied the country as gold seekers long before the arrival of the Bantu. The Makaranga were evangelized in 1561 by the Ven. Father Gonçalo da Silveira, S.J., who baptized the Monomotapa and many of their people. But within three months of his arrival the converted chief, together with the townspeople and other refugees from Mozambique, turned against the missionary and had him strangled on 16 March, 1561.

João dos Santos, Ethnologia Oriental (Evora, 1609), tr. Theol. in Records of South-Eastern Africa, VII, printed for the Government of Cape Colony at Cape Town, 1901; Travels of South Africa before 1715 (London, 1867); BENT, The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland (London, 1896); HALL, Prehistoric Rhodesia (London, 1900); WILKIE, Monomotapa (British Empire, 1905). JAMES KENDALL.

Monophysites and Monophysitism.—The history of this sect and of its ramifications has been summarized under EUTYCHIANISM (the nickname somewhat unfairly given by Catholic controversialists). The theology of Monophysitism has also been described under the same heading. Two points are discussed in the following article: first, the literary activity of the Monophysites both in Greek and Syriac; secondly, the question whether they can be exculpated from material heresy in their Christology.

LITERARY HISTORY.—From many points of view the Monophysites are the most important of early heretics, and no heresy or related group of heresies until the sixteenth century has produced so vast and important a literature. A large portion of it is lost; some remains in manuscript, and of late years important publications have brought much of this material to the light of day. Nearly all the Greek literature has perished in its original form, but much of it survives in early Syriac translations, and the Syriac literature itself is considerable in extent. The scientific, philosophical, and grammatical writings of Monophysites must for the most part be passed over here. Ecclesiastical history and biography, as well as dogmatic and polemical writings will be described for the fifth and sixth centuries, together with a few of the chief works of the centuries immediately following.

Dioscorus (q. v.) has left us but a few fragments. The most important is in the "Hist. Misc." III, 1, from a letter written in exile at Gangra, in which the banished patriarch declares the reality and completeness of our Lord's Human Body, intending evidently to deny that he had approved the refusal of Eutyches to admit Christ's consubstantiality with us.

Timothy, or, of Constantinople (d. 477) who had been ordained priest by St. Cyril himself, and preserved a profound attachment to that saint, published an edition of some of his works. He accompanied Dioscorus to the Robber Council of Ephesus in 449, as he says himself "together with my brother the blessed priest Basil, a friend and confidant of Cyril" (the second "asidus"). But, when Dioscorus arrived in 1505, it was in a state of dispersion. As the reigning Monomotapa, Kamomba by name, had delegated his authority over the more distant parts of his dominions to members of his family who soon asserted their independence. The Makaranga still live scattered in different parts of Rhodesia over a territory which was once their own. In the matter of civilization they never had much to lose, but their warlike qualities have disappeared, so that the word Makaranga is used by their neighbours as a term of reproach and a synonym for coward. The word Monomotapa is no longer known among them. They are, at any rate, more intelligent and docile than their predecessors, which is a point in favor of their customs point to an infusion of Semitic blood. The theory has lately obtained in some quarters, that they built the Great Zimbabwe and other ruins scattered over their country. It is far more probable, however, that, as well as the numerous rock-mines found in the gold areas of Shona and Portuguese Africa, were the work of some Semitic people who occupied the country as gold seekers long before the arrival of the Bantu. The Makaranga were evangelized in 1561 by the Ven. Father Gonçalo da Silveira, S.J., who baptized the Monomotapa and many of their people. But within three months of his arrival the converted chief, together with the townspeople and other refugees from Mozambique, turned against the missionary and had him strangled on 16 March, 1561.

Dioscorus (q. v.) has left us but a few fragments. The most important is in the "Hist. Misc." III, 1, from a letter written in exile at Gangra, in which the banished patriarch declares the reality and completeness of our Lord's Human Body, intending evidently to deny that he had approved the refusal of Eutyches to admit Christ's consubstantiality with us.

Timothy, or, of Constantinople (d. 477) who had been ordained priest by St. Cyril himself, and preserved a profound attachment to that saint, published an edition of some of his works. He accompanied Dioscorus to the Robber Council of Ephesus in 449, as he says himself 'together with my brother the blessed priest Basil, a friend and confidant of Cyril' (the second "asidus"). But, when Dioscorus arrived in 1505, it was in a state of dispersion. As the reigning Monomotapa, Kamomba by name, had delegated his authority over the more distant parts of his dominions to members of his family who soon asserted their independence. The Makaranga still live scattered in different parts of Rhodesia over a territory which was once their own. In the matter of civilization they never had much to lose, but their warlike qualities have disappeared, so that the word Makaranga is used by their neighbours as a term of reproach and a synonym for coward. The word Monomotapa is no longer known among them. They are, at any rate, more intelligent and docile than their predecessors, which is a point in favor of their customs point to an infusion of Semitic blood. The theory has lately obtained in some quarters, that they built the Great Zimbabwe and other ruins scattered over their country. It is far more probable, however, that, as well as the numerous rock-mines found in the gold areas of Shona and Portuguese Africa, were the work of some Semitic people who occupied the country as gold seekers long before the arrival of the Bantu. The Makaranga were evangelized in 1561 by the Ven. Father Gonçalo da Silveira, S.J., who baptized the Monomotapa and many of their people. But within three months of his arrival the converted chief, together with the townspeople and other refugees from Mozambique, turned against the missionary and had him strangled on 16 March, 1561.
Under Eutychianism something has been said of his theology, and more will be found below. Of his works a fragment on the Two Natures, is in Migne (P. G., LXXXVI, 273). The unpublished Syriac collection of his works (in British Mus., MS. Addit. 1528, sixth century) contains (a) a treatise against the "Dyophysites" (Catholica) which contains mainly a collection of extracts from the Fathers against the Two Natures, the last of the citations being from a letter of Dioscorus. This is, however, but a summary of a larger work, which has recently been published entire in an Armenian translation under the title of "Refutation of the Council of Chalcedon." Elsewhere, Dioscorus is mentioned as the author of a work of the same title. (b) Extracts from a letter written to the city of Constantinople against the Eutychians (Isaias of Hermopolis and Theophilus, followed by another florilegium from the "Fathers" (almost entirely from Apollinarian forgeries). This letter is preserved entire by Zacharias (in Hist. Misc. IV, xii, where it is followed by the second letter), and also in the "Chronicle" of Michael the Syrian. (c) A second letter against the same. (d) Extracts from two letters to all Egypt, the Thebaid, and Pentapolis on the treatment of Catholic bishops, priests, and monks who should join the Monophysites. (e) A refutation of the Council of Chalcedon and of the Tome of Leo, written between 454 and 460, and respecting the title, and concluding with extracts from the "Acts" of the Robber Synod and four documents connected with it. (f) A short prayer which Blessed Timothy used to make over those who returned from the communion of the Dyophysites. (g) Exposition of the faith of Timothy, sent to the Emperor Leo by Constantine, and an abridged narration of what subsequently happened to him. A similar supplication of Ælurus to Leo, sent by the silentiary Diomedes, is mentioned by Anastasius Sin. The contents of this MS. are largely cited by Lebon. A translation into Latin of patriarchic testimonies collected by Ælurus was made by Constantine the Macedonian, with the Armenian collection. A Coptic list of Timothy's works mentions one on the Canticle of Canticles. The "Plerophoria" (33, 36) speak of his book of "Narrations," from which Crum (p. 71) deduces an ecclesiastical history by Timothy in twelve books. Lebon does not accept the attribution to Timothy. The Copt fragment (87) has established the existence of such a work, but he finds (p. 110) another reference to a historical work by the patriarch in MS. Addit. 14602 (Chabot, "Documents," 225 sqq.).

*Peter Monogus* (q. v.) of Alexandria was not a writer. His letters in Coptic are not genuine, though a complete Armenian text of them has been published, which is said to be more probably authentic. Peter Fullo (q. v.) of Alexandria similarly left no writings. Letters addressed to him exist, but are certainly spurious. *Timothy IV*, Patriarch of Alexandria (517–533), composed "Antirrhetica" in many books. This polemical work was lost; but a homily of his remains and is in Heraclius, the Theodosian (10–11 February, 535, and again July, 535–537 or 538) has left us a few fragments and two letters. The Severians of Alexandria were called Theodosians after him, to distinguish them from the Gaianites who followed his Inconstantist rival Gaianus. The letter left no writings.

Severus: The most famous and the most fertile of all the Monophysite writers was Severus, who was Patriarch of Antioch (512–518), and died in 538. We have his early life written by his friend Zacharias Scholasticius; a complete biography was composed soon after his death by John, the superior of the monastery where Severus had first embraced the monastic life. He was a native of Ptolemais, his father being a senator of the city, and descended from the Bishop of Sozopolis who had attended the Council of Ephesus in 431. After his father's death he was sent to study rhetoric at Alexandria, being yet a catechumen, as it was the custom in Ptolemais to delay baptism until a beard should appear. Zacharias, who was his fellow-student, testifies to his brilliant talents and the great progress he made in the study of rhetoric. He was an assistant to several orators, and also over Libanious. Zacharias induced him to read the correspondence of Libanious with St. Basil, and the works of the latter and of St. Gregory of Nazianus, and he was conquered by the power of Christian oratory. Severus went to study law at Beirut about the summa of 486, and he was followed therewith by Zacharias. Severus was later accused of having been in youth a worshipper of idols and a dealer in magical arts (so the libellus of the Palestinian monks at the council of 536), and Zacharias is at pains to refute this calumny indirectly, though at great length, by relating interesting stories of the discovery of a board of idols at Menuthus in Egypt and of the routing of necromancers and enchanters at Berytus; in both these exploits the friends of Severus took a leading part, and Zacharias asks triumphantly whether they would have consorted with Severus had he not agreed with them in the hatred of paganism and sorcery. Zacharias continued to influence him, by his own example, and induced him to devote the free time, according to which the students were free on Saturday afternoons and Sundays to the study of the Fathers. Other students joined the pious company of which an ascetic student named Evagrius became leader, and every evening they prayed together in the church of the Resurrection. Severus was persuaded to be baptized. Zacharias refused to be his godfather, for he declared that he did not connected with the bishops of Phenicis, so Evagrius stood sponsor, and Severus was baptized in the church of the martyr, Leontius, at Tripolis.

After his baptism Severus renounced the use of baths and betook himself to fasting and vigils. Two of his compositions deserve to be included in the works of Peter the Iberian. When the news of the death of that famous monk (488) arrived, Zacharias and several others entered his monastery of Beith-Aphthonia, at the native place of Zacharias, the port of Gassa (known also as Maiuma), where Peter had been bishop. Zacharias did not persevere, but returned to the praet. by which he had made his pilgr- 382
tiage in his own country, but he first visited the shrine of St. Leontius of Tripolis, the head of St. John Baptist at Emesa, and then the holy places of Jerusalem, with the result that he joined Evagrius who was already a monk at Maiuma. The great austerities there did not suffice for Severus, and he preferred the life of a solitary in the desert of Eleutheropolis. Severus, reduced himself to great weakness he was obliged to pass some time in the monastery founded by Romanus, after which he returned to the laura of the port of Gassa, in which was the convent of Peter the Iberian. Here he spent what his charities had left of his patrimony in building a monastery for the ascetics who were reduced to Patriarch Theodosian. Severus extended his influence over the whole East and the Empire, and was rudely disturbed by Nephalius, a former leader of the Acheptali, who was said to have once had 30,000 monks ready to march on Alexandria when, at the end of 483, Peter Monogus accepted the Henoticon and became patriarch. Later on Nephalius joined the more moderate Monophysites, and finally the Catholics, accepting the Council of Chalcedon. About 507–8 he came to Maiuma, preached against Severus, and obtained the expulsion of the monks from their convents. Severus betook himself to Constantinople with 200 monks, and remained there three years, influencing the Emperor Anastasius as far as he could in the support of the Henoticon, against the Catholics on the one hand and the Monophysites on the other. He was spoken of as successor to the Patriarch Macc
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r uptibility" an obligatory doctrine, in spite of the fact that Julian had been anathematized by a council at Constantinople in 536, at which date he had probably been dead for some years.

A commentary by Julian on the Book of Job, in a Latin version, is printed in an old Paris edition of Origen (ed. Genebrardus, 1574). A MS. of the original Greek is mentioned by Mai. It is largely quoted in the catena on Job of Nicetas of Heraclea. The great work of Julian against Severus seems to be lost. Ten anathematisms remain. Of his commentaries, one on Matthew is cited by Moses Barkephu (P. G., CXI, 551). It is to be hoped that some of Julian's five books will be recovered in Syriac or Coptic translations. An anti-Dionysian catena in the British Museum (MS. Addit. 12155) makes mention of Julian's writings. We hear of a treatise by him, "Against the Eutychianists and Manichaeans," which shows that Julian, like his great opponent Severus, had to be on his guard against extravagant Monophysites. Part of the treatise which Peter of Calcinus, Patriarch of Antioch (578-591), wrote against the Damisians is extant in Syriac MSS. (see Assemani's and Wright's catalogues).

The writers of the Theissian sect (see TRINITARIANS) next demand our attention. The chief among them, John (or Ierocles) of Cyzicus, and the Cappadocian Trithystes at Alexandria at the beginning of the sixth century, and was the principal writer of his party. He was a grammarian, a philosopher, and an astronomer as well as a theologian. His principal theological work, Περὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς, in ten books, is lost. It dealt with the Chalcedonian and Trinitarian controversies of that time, and forms part of Julian's (De sectis, Oct. 5). In St. John Damascene (De her. sectis, XI, 101-107, ed. Le Quen) and in Niceph. Call., XVIII (see Mansi, XI, 301). A complete Syriac translation is in Brit. Mus. and Vat. MSS.

Another lost theological work, τετρασυμβολή, described the writer's theory of a creation of new bodies at the general resurrection. The author of this treatise is named by the clerical writers, Theophylact Presbyter and Nicephorus. As a philosopher, Philonous was an Aristotelian, and a disciple of the Aristotelian commentator Ammonius, son of Hermias. His own commentaries on Aristotle were printed by Aldus at Venice (on "De generatione et interitu," 1527; "Analytica posteriora," 1534; "Analytica priora," 1535; "De anima," 1535; "Meteorologia," 1551; "Metaphysica," 1583). He also wrote much against the "Gnostics," that is, the Neo-Platonists of Proclus, the last great Neoplatonist: eighteen books on the eternity of the world (Venice, 1635), composed in 529, and τετρασυμβολή (printed by Corderius, Vienna, 1630, and in Gallandi, XI, new ed. by Reichert, 1897), on the hexameron, in which he follows St. Basil and other Fathers, and shows a vast knowledge of all the literature and science accessible in his day. The latter work is dedicated to a certain Sergius, who may perhaps be identified with Sergius the Grammarian, the Eutychianizing correspondent of Severus. The work was possibly written as early as 476 and is practically the earliest extant work of a clerical error. A "Computatio de Pascha," printed after this work, argues that the Last Supper was on the 13th of Nisan, and was not a real passover. A lost theological work entitled ταματά is summarized by Michael the Syrian (Chronicle, II, 69). A book against the Council of Chalcedon is mentioned by Photius (cod. 585). A work "Concerning the Apostles" is preserved in a Syriac MS. Another work "Against the Antimonicarians" exists in MS., and may be the work Philonous is noted in grammar as manuscripts, and his extant writings on the subject are based upon the καθολικὸν τῆς Ηρωδίας of Herodian (τοιαῦτα εικονομικά, ed. Dindorf, 1825; τετρά τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοιούτων, ed. Egenolf, 1890).

This sixth century Monophysite is to be distinguished from an earlier grammarian, also called Philonous, who flourished under Augustus and Tiberius. Of his life little is known. On account of his Tritheistic opinions he was summoned to Constantinople by Justinian, but he excused himself on account of his age and infirmity. He addressed the emperor a letter, "De divisione, differentia, et numero," which seems to be the same as the treatise spoken of as "De differentia que manere creditur in Christo post unionem"; but it is lost. He addressed an essay on Trithism to Athanasius Monachus, and was condemned on this account at Alexandria. At a disputation held by the emperor's order before the Patriarch of Constantinople, John Scholasticus, Canon, and Eugenius represented the Trithystes; John condemned Philonous, and the emperor issued an edict against the sect (Photius, cod. 24). In 688 Philonous was still alive, for he published a pamphlet against John, which Photius describes with great severity (cod. 76). The style of Philonous, he says, is always clear; but without dignity, and his argumentation is puerile. (For the theological views of the sect, see TRINITARIUS.)

Conon, Bishop of Tarsus, though a Trithyst and, with Eugenius, a supporter of John Philonous before the emperor, disagreed with that writer about the equality of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity (see TRINITARIANS). "Pandecheses," a work of Conon of Caesarea, was written about the year 525, and in it Conon on the Theissians (see TRINITARIANS). Conon wrote a book, εἰς Ἰωάννην, against his views on the Resurrection. Eugenius is called a Cilician bishop by John of Ephesus, but Bar Hebraeus makes him Bishop of Seleucia in Isauria (see TRINITARIANS). The Trithystes, surnamed Calonymus, was a deacon of Alexandria, who separated from his patriarch, Timothy IV (516-535), and in 527, in which year a Council of Alexandria met, he wrote against Severus a book called "Apology for the late Theophobius," to which a Severian monk named Theodore replied; the answer of Theophobius was again refuted by Theodore in three books (Photius, cod. 108). Other works of Theophobius are referred to by St. Maximus Confessor, and some fragments are cited by Socrates, X, 36 (ed. by Scholz, 1763).) Conon represents the Trithystes is known only by the elaborate analysis of his book given by Photius (cod. 232); it was a "Sic et non" like that of Abelard, giving authorities for a proposition and then for the contrary opinion. At the end were some remarks on curious views of a number of Fathers. It was evidently, as Photius remarks, a periphrastic method (I, 148). Historiography.—We now turn to the historians. Zacharias of Gaza, brother of Procopius of Gaza, the rhetorician, Zacharias Scholasticus, Zacharias the Rhetorician, Zacharias of Mitylene, are all apparently the same person (so Kugener's latest view, Krüger, and Brooks). Of his early life we have a vivid picture in his memoirs of Severus, with whom he studied at Alexandria and at Berytus. His home was at the port of Gaza, near the monastery of the bishop, Peter the Iberian. In the latter he was greatly devoted, and believed that Peter had prophesied his unfitness for the monastic life. He in fact did not become a monk, when his friends Evagrus, Severus, and others did so, at the behest of Constantinople, and reached a high eminence in his profession. Of his writings Photius speaks: "that the world did not exist from eternity" was probably composed in youth while he lived at Berytus. "His "Ecclesiastical History" is extant only in a Syriac epitome which forms four books (III—VI) of the "Historia Miscellanea." It begins with a short account from a Monophyist point of view of the Council of Chalcedon, and then traces the history of the monophysite church from the council till the death of Zeno (491). From the same history is derived a curious statistical description of Rome in "Hist. Misc.," X, xvi. The very interesting life of Severus carries the author's recollections up to the accession of his hero to the See of Antioch in 512. It was written subsequently to the history, as the cubicularius Euphrasius, to whom that
work was dedicated, was already dead. His recollections of Peter the Iberian and of Theodore, Bishop of Antioch, are lost, but his biography of Isaías, an Egyptian ascetic, is preserved in Syriac. A dispute against the Manicheans, published by Cardinal Pitra in Greek, was probably written after the edict of Justinian against the Manicheans in 527. He seems to have been still a layman. Up to the time he wrote the life of Severus of Sirmium, and the homilias of the Nourm. It was the easy course under Zeno and Anastasius. It would seem that he found it paid to revert to orthodoxy under Justin and Justinian, for he was present as Bishop of Mitylene at the Council of Mennas at Constantinople in 536, where he was one of the three metropolitans who were sent to summon Anthimus to answer the charges of heresy brought against him. The printed list of subscriptions to that patriarch's deposition, but Labbe testifies that it is found in some MSS. (Mausi, VIII, 975); it is absent from the condemnation of Severus in a later session. Zacharias was dead before the ecumenical council of 553.

An important historical work in anecdotal form is the "Plerophoria" of John of Matara, composed about 515; it contains stories of Monophysite worthies up to date, especially of Peter the Iberian, whose life was also written by Zacharias, but is now lost. A later life of Peter has been printed, which contains curious information about the Iberian princes from whom the Monophysite bishop descended. The life was written by Zacharias, and is to be found in some MSS. The interesting "Historia Miscellanea", often referred to as Pseudo-Zacharias, was composed in Syriac in twelve books by an unknown author who seems to have lived at Amida. Though the work was completed in 569, he seems to have used part of the history of John of Ephesus, which was finished only in 571. Chapter IV was written in Psalter, or for the monks of the monastery, and contains 1205 verses; it is not to be confused with the Psalter of the Byzantine church, which is a much earlier work. The book contains a quantity of legendary matter, of which the sources are at first extant; a few words are added on the Syriac doctors Isaac and Dodo. Book II has the story of the Seven Sleepers. History begins in II, ii, with an account of Eutyches, and the letter of Proclus to the Armenians follows. The next four books are epitomes of the lost work of Zacharias Rhetor. The seventh book continues the story from the accession of Anastasius (491), and together with general ecclesiastical history it combines some interesting data, which is of use to those who study the history of the times.

A curious chapter gives the Prologue of Moro, or Mara, Bishop of Amida (a Syriac writer whose works appear to be lost), to his edition of the four Gospels in Greek, which were written as a companion to the Syriac version. Book X is lost, with most of X and XII. Some of X has been restored by Brooks from the "Chronicle" of Michael the Syrian (died 1199). It is necessary to mention the "Chronicle of Edessa", from 495 to 506, which is embodied in the "Chronicle" attributed to Josua the Stylite (who seems to have been a Catholic); this latter is included in the second book of the "Chronicle" attributed to the Patriarch of Antioch, Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, a compilation which has a fourth book (from the end of the sixth century to 775) which is an original work by the compiler, who was in reality a monk of the monastery of Zoro (north of Amida), possibly Joshua the Stylite himself.

Some small chronicles of the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries have been published as "Chronica minora" in the "Corpus Script. Or." Of later histories, those of Bar Hebraeus (died 1266) must be noted. His "Chronicon Syriacum" is abridgment of Michael the Syrian with a continuation; the "Chronicon ecclesiasticum" contains the ecclesiastical history first of Western Syria and then of Eastern Syria, with lives of the patriarchs of Antioch, of the Jacobite missionary bishops (called marphrians) and of the Nestorian patriarchs. The "Chronicle" of Elías of Nisibis to 1008 is important because it mentions its sources, but it is very defective in the early period through the loss of some MSS. The lives of the bishops of Egea are counted as Monophysite writers by Ehrhard (in Krumbacher, p. 53), but Photius clearly makes them out Nestorians (cod. 41, 55, 107), and it is by a slip that he conjectures Basil to be the author of a work against Nestorius.

Syriac Writers.—Of the Syriac Monophysite writings none is more important than Philoxenus, otherwise Xenaias, who was Bishop of Mabug (Hierapolis) from 485. For his life and the version of Scripture which was made by his order, see Philoxenus. His dogmatic writings alone concern us here. His letter to the Emperor Zeno, published by Vauchalde (1902) is of 485, the date of his episcopal consecration and of his acceptance of the Nestorian. His treatises on the Incarnation date perhaps before 500; to the same period belong two short works, "A Confession of Faith" and "Against every Nestorian". He wrote also on the Trinity. A letter to Marco, lector of Anazarbus, is attributed to 515-518. After he had been exiled by Justin to Philippopolis, he wrote three letters to the monks of Teleda, and wrote another letter of which fragments are found in MS. Addit. 14533, in which he argues that it is sometimes wise to admit baptisms and ordinations by heretics for the sake of peace; the question of sacramental validity does not occur to him. Fragments of his commentaries on the Gospel are found in MSS. This work has also been published by Budge. They scarcely touch upon dogma. Of his three liturgies two are given by Renaudot. Out of the great mass of his works in MS. at Rome, Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, London, only a fraction has been published. He was an eager controversialist, a scholar, and an accomplished writer. His Syriac style is much admired. His sect had no more energetic leader until Jacob Baradzethus himself. He was president of the synod which elevated Severus to the See of Antioch, and he had been the chief agent in the excommunication of Flavian. He was an energetic foe of Catholicism, and his works stand next in importance to those of Michael the Syrian, with whom they are in the same party. He was exiled by Justin in 519 to Philippopolis and then to Gangra, where he died of suffocation by smoke in the room in which he was confined.

James of Sarugh, 451-521 (q. v.), became episcopale, or visitor, of Hauran in that district about 505, and bishop of its capital, Batanin, in 519. Nearly all his numerous writings have been lost. We are told that seventy amanuenses were employed to copy his 760 metrical homilies, which are in Wright's opinion more readable than those of Ephraem or Isaac of Antioch. A good many have been published at various times. In the Vatican are 233 in MSS., in London 140, in Paris, 100. They are much cited in the Syriac Liturgy, and a liturgy and a baptismal rite are ascribed to him. Numerous letters of his are extant in Brit. Mus., MSS. Addit. 14587 and 17163. Though his feast is kept by Maronites and even by some Nestorians, there is no doubt that he accepted the Henoticon, and was afterwards in relation with the leading Monophysites, rejecting the Council of Chalcedon to the end of his life. Stephen ben Soudail was an Edessa Monophysite who fell into Pantheism. He was attacked by Philoxenus and James of Sarugh, and retired to Jerusalem. The confession of faith of John of Tella (483-533; bishop, 519-521) is extant, and so is his commentary on the Trisagion, and his canons for the clergy and replies to the questions of
MONOPHYSITES

the priest Sergius—all in MSS. in the British Museum. The great James Baradates, the eponymous hero of the Jacobites, who supplied bishops and clergy for the Monophysites when they were definitively divided from the Eastern Catholics in 453, wrote little: liturgy, a few letters, a sermon, and a confession of faith are extant (see Baradates). Of Syriac translators it is not necessary to speak, nor is there need to treat of the Monophysite scientist Sergius of Reschians, the writer on philosophy, Aboudemmeh, and many others.

John of Ephesus, called also John of Asia, was a Syrian of Amida, where he became a deacon in 529. On account of the persecution of his sect he departed, and was made administrator of the temporal affairs of the Monophysites in Constantinople by Justinian, who sent him in the following year as a missionary bishop to the pagans of Asia Minor. He relates of himself that he converted 60,000, and had 96 churches built. He returned to the capital in 546, to destroy idol worship there also. But on the death of Justinian he suffered a continual persecution, which he describes in his "History," an excuse for its excision and repetitions. What remains of that work is of great value as a contemporary record. The style is strikingly similar to that of the expressions of the lives of blessed Easterns were put together by John about 565-566, and have been published by Land. They include great men like Severus, Baradates, Theodorus, etc. (For an account of these works and for bibliography see John of Ephesus.)

George, bishop of the Arabians (c. about 640; d. 734), is the author of the Assyrian Jacobites. He was a personal follower of James of Edessa, whose poem on the Hexameron he completed after the death of James in 708. In this work he teaches the Apocatastasis, or restoration of all things, including the destruction of hell, so that many Greek Fathers learned from Origen. George was born in the Tigris region, and was made bishop of the wandering Arabs in November, 686; his see was at Akoula. He was a man of considerable learning. His translation, with introduction and commentary, of the "Organa" of Aristotle ("Catagories," "De Interpretatione," and "Prior Analytics") is extant (Brit. Mus., MS. Addit. 14659), as is the translation of the Greek of the "New Testament," of Nazianzus, and an explanation of the three Sacraments (Baptism, Holy Communion, and consecration of chrism,—following Pseudo-Dionysius). His letters of 714 till 718 are extant in the same MS. as this last work (Brit. Mus., MS. Addit. 12154). They deal with many things; astronomical, exegetical, liturgical questions, explanations of Greek orthodoxy; and contains historical matter about Aphraates and Gregory the Illuminator. His poems included one in dodecasyllables on the unpromising subject of the cultivation of movable feasts and the correction of the solar and lunar cycles, another on the monastic life, and two on the consecration of the "Church of Body and Blood." Father, in the vernacular knowledge of Syriac Church and literature. His reading was vast, including the chief Greek Fathers, with whom he classes Severus and Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite; he knows the Pseudo-Clementines and Josephus, and of Syriac writers he knows Bardeanes, Aphraates, and St. Ephraem. His correspondence is addressed to literary monks of his sect. The canons attributed to George in the "Nomocanon" of Bar Hebraeus are apparently extracts from his writings reduced to the form of canons.

James of Edessa (q. v.), about 633-708, was the chief Syriac writer of his time, and the last that need be mentioned here. His works are sufficiently described in a separate article. The Syriac literature of the Monophysites, however, continued throughout the middle ages. Their Coptic, Arabic, and Armenian literature is large, but cannot be treated in an article like the present one.

ORTHODOX.—Were the Monophysites really heretics or were they only schismatics? This question was answered in the affirmative by Assenheimer, recently by the Oriental scholar Nau, and last of all by Lebon, who has devoted an important work, full of evidence from unpublished sources, to the establishment of this thesis. It is urged that the Monophysites taught that there is but one Nature of Christ, μακρινή θρησκεία, because they identify the words φίλος and σύμμαχος, but in just the same way the Nestorians have lately been justified. A simple scheme will make the matter plain:

Nestorians: One person, two hypostases, two natures.
Catholics: One person, one hypostasis, two natures.
Monophysites: One person, one hypostasis, one nature.

It is urged by Bethune-Baker that Nestorius and his friends took the word hypostasis in the sense of nature, and by Lebon that the Monophysites took nature in the sense of hypostasis, so that both parties really intended the Catholic doctrine. There is a prima facie argument against both these pleads. The Nestorians held that the doctrine of ὑποστάσεις might misunderstand one another and fight about words while agreeing as to the underlying doctrine, yet it remains that the words person, hypostasis, nature, (ὑποστάσεις, ὑποστάσεως, φίλος) had received in the second half of the fourth century a perfectly definite meaning, as to which the whole Church was at one. All agreed that in the Holy Trinity there is one Nature (ὑποστάσεις) having three Hypostases or Persons. If in Christology the Nestorians used ὑποστάσεως and the Monophysites φίλος in a new sense, not only does it follow that their use of words was singularly inconsistent and inexcusable, but (what is far more important) that they cannot hold that the Antiochene party had no difficulty in coming to terms with St. Leo; they understood him well enough, and declared that they had always meant what he meant. How far this was a fact must be discussed under Nestorianism. But the Monophysites always withstood the Catholic doctrine, declaring it to be false. The great, one half Nestorian, and that it divided Christ into two.

Lebon urges that Severus himself more than once explains that there is a difference in the use of words in "theology" (doctrines of the Trinity) and in "the economy" (Incarnation): "Admittedly hypostasis and φίλος or φίλος are not the same in theology; however, in the economy they are the same" (P. G., LXXXVI, 1921), and he alleges the example of Gregory of Nazianzus to show that in a new mystery the terms must take new significations. But surely these very passages make it evident that Severus distinguished between φίλος and ὑποστάσεως. Putting aside the Trinity and the Incarnation, every φίλος is a ὑποστάσις, and every ὑποστάσις is a φίλος—in this statement all Catholics and Monophysites agree. But this means that the denotation of the words is the same, not that there is no difference of connotation. Φίλος is an abstraction, and cannot exist except as a concrete, that is to say, as a ὑποστάσεως. But "admittedly" in the Trinity the denotation as well as the connotation of the words is diverse, it is still true that each of the three Hypostases is identified with the Divine Nature (that is, each Person is God); but
if each Hypostasis is therefore still a θειός (the one θειίς) yet the θειίς is not one but three Hypostases. The words retain their old sense (connotation) yet have received a new sense in a new relation. It is obvious that this is the phenomenon to which Severus referred. Catholics would add that in the Incarnation conversely two natures are one hypostasis. Thus the meanings of the terms (αὐτότος and οὐσίατος, φύσις, φύσικα ὄντως or ὑποστάσεις) in the Holy Trinity were a common possession; and all agreed further that in the created universe there cannot exist a nature which does not subsist, there is no such thing as a φύσις αὐτότος (αὐτότος). (α) But Catholics hold the Human Nature of Christ considered in itself to be one, to have no Hypostases, but that the second person of the Holy Trinity is its θεότης. As the infinity of the Divine Nature is capable of a threefold subsistence, so the infinity of the Hypostasis of the Word is able to be the Hypostasis of the Human Nature assumed as well as of the Divine. The union in Christ is not a union of two natures directly with one another, but a union of the two in one hypostasis; thus they are distinct yet inseparable, and each acts in communion with the other. (β) The Nestorians argued thus: There are, according to the Fathers, two natures in Christ; but since every nature is a hypostasis, the Human Nature in Christ is a hypostasis. In order to make one Christ, they tried (in vain) to explain how the union was to be understood (αὐτότος). They did not mean to divide Christ, but their prosopic union leaked at every seam; it was difficult to express it or argue about it without falling into heresy. The Antiochenes were glad to drop such inadequate formulae, for it was certain that "person" in the Holy Trinity was only another name for "his person", and the same for the Human Nature. They did not mean to divide Christ, two Christs, two Sons. (γ) Conversely, starting from the same proposition that every φύσις is a θεότης, the Monophysites argued that as Christ is one Person, one Hypostasis, so is He one Nature, and they preferred "one nature" to the equivalent "has one nature". They alleged high authority for their formula, not only St. Cyril, but behind him St. Athanasius, Pope St. Julius, and St. Gregory the Wonderworker. These authorities, however, were but Apol- linarian forgeries; the favourite formula of St. Cyril, the μαζί φύσις συγκεκριμένη, had been borrowed un- worthily from the doctrine of the Trinity the word θεότης was meant by its original inventor in a heretical sense. Nay, the "one nature" went back to the Arians, and had been used by Eudoxius himself to express the incompleteness of the Human Nature of Christ.

Yet the Monophysites were far from being Apollinarians, still less were they Arians; they were careful from the beginning to distinguish Christ is perfect Man, and that He assumed a complete Human Nature like ours. Diodorus is emphatic on this point in his letter to Secundinus (Hist. Misc., III, i) and with need, since he had acquainted Eutyches who had de- nied our Lord's "consubstantiality with us". Ælurus is just as clear in the letters by which he re- fused and excommunicated Isaias of Hierapolis and Theophilus as "Eutychians" (Hist. Misc., IV, xii), and Severus had an acute controversy with Sergius the Grammarian on this very point. They all declared with one voice that Christ is μαζί φύσις, but ἐν δύο φύσισιν, that His Divine Nature is combined with a complete Human Nature in one hypostasis, and was treated by all as a hypostasis, though Severus was not ranged with the Nestorian who thought of the Divine Nature of that one hypostasis, howbeit without mixture or confusion or diminution. Ælurus insists that after union the properties of each nature remain unchanged; but they spoke of "the divine and human things", divina et humana, not natures; each nature re- mains in its natural state with its own characteristics (ἐν θείᾳ τῇ κατὰ φύσις) yet not as a unity but as a part, a quality (ποιότητι φυσικό), not as a φύσις. All the qualities of the two natures are combined into one θεότης σύνθεσις and form the one nature of that one hypostasis. So far there is no heresy in in- tent, but only a wrong definition.—that one hypostasis can have only one nature.

But however harmless the formula "one nature" might look at first sight, it led in fact immediately to serious and disastrous consequences. The Divine Nature of the Word is not merely specifically but numerically one with the Divine Nature of the Son and the Holy Ghost. This is the meaning of the word Æcthos applied to the Three Persons, and if Haz- hock were right in saying that the Nicene Creed of Constantine in 381 was taken to imply only three Persons of one species, then that Council accepted three Gods, and not three distinct but inseparable Persons in one God. Now if the Divine and Human Natures are united in the Word into one Nature, it is impossible to avoid one of two conclu- sions, either that the whole Divine Nature became man and suffered and died, or else that each of the three Persons had a Divine Nature of His own. In fact the Monophysites split upon this question. Ælurus and Severus seem to have avoided the diffi- culty, but it was not long before those who refused the latter alternative were taunted with the necessity of reverting to the Nestorianism and the Eutychianism of Opesiches, making God to suffer. Vehemently Severus and his school declared that they made the Divinity to suffer not as God, but only as man; but this was insufficient as a reply. Their formula was not The Word made flesh, "the Son of God made man", but "one Nature of the Word made flesh"; the Nature became Man, the Word became a Divine Nature. They did not reply: "We mean hypostasis when we say nature, we do not mean the Divine Nature (which the Word has in common with the Father and the Holy Ghost) but His Divine Person, which in the present case we call His φύσις", for the φύσις τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, before the word cæcæcæ, has been added, is in the sphere of the "theology" not of the "economy", and its significance could not be doubted.

Just as there were many "Eutychians" among the Monophysites who denied that Christ is consubstantial with us, so there were found many to embrace boldly the paradox that the Divine Nature has be- come incarnate. Peter Fullo added to the praise of the Arians of Antioch and the Nestorians which were refused to allow the natural inference to be explained away. Stephen Niobes and the Niobites expressly denied all distinction between the Human and the Divine Natures after the union. The Actistetes de- clared that the Human Nature became "uncreated" by the union. If the greatest theologians of the sect, Severus and Philetus, who handed down these excesses, it was by a refusal to be logically Monophysite.

It was not only the orthodox who were scandalized by these extreme views. An influential and very learned section of the schism rebelled, and chose the second of the two alternatives.—that of making the Divine Nature itself threefold, in order to ensure that the Human Nature in Christ was made one with the Nature of the Son alone and not with the whole Divine Nature. John Philoponus, the Aristotelian commen- tator, therefore taught that there are in the Trinity three partial substances (μερική oibpi) and one com- mon substance (μαζὶ oibpi), thus falling into Polythei- smism, with three, or rather four, gods. This Tritheistic and Monophysite doctrine was accordingly adopted. Though they were excommunicated at Alexandria, the Patriarch Damian held a view not far different. He so distinguished between the Divine oibia and the three Hypostases which partake (μεριξαίσθησι) in it, that he conceded the oibia to be existent of itself (μαζὶ oibτω),
and his followers were nicknamed Tetradiotes. Thus Peter Fullo, the Actistetes, and the Nicobites on the one hand, and the Trithists and Damianites on the other, developed the Monophysite formula in the only two possible directions. It is obvious that formula which involved such alternatives were heretical in fact as well as in origin. Severus tried to be orthodox, but at the expense of consistency. His "corruptibility" view is absurd, and the nature is concerned with the abstract apart from the union (see Eutychianism), but to consider this union as an entity was certainly an admission of the Two Natures. All change and suffering in Christ must be (as the Julianists and Justinian右边 swept) strictly voluntary, in so far as the union gives to the Sacred Humanity a right and claim to so become. It is just this same dedication of Severus was willing to divide the Natures not merely "before" the union (that is, logically previous to it) but even after the union "theoretically," and he went so far in his controversy with the orthodox John the Grammarian as to concede δος φόρος επί θεοσ. This was indeed an immense concession, but considering how much more orthodox were the intentions of Severus than his words, it is scarcely astonishing, for St. Cyril had concealed much more.

But though Severus went so far as this, it is shown elsewhere (see Eutychianism, Maximus Confessor, and especially Monothelitism) that he did not avoid the error of giving one activity to our Lord, one will, and one mind. It is true that he had the intention of admitting any incompleteness in the Humanity of Christ, and that he and all the Monophysites started merely from the proposition that all activity, all will, and intelligence proceed from the person, as ultimate principle, and on this ground alone they asserted the unity of each in Christ. But it was in fact that Monothelites, not Eutychians. It was not supposed by the best Catholic theologists who attacked that doctrine that the Monophysites denied Christ to have exercised human activities, human acts of the will, human acts of cognition; the error was clearly recognized as lying in the failure to distinguish between the human or the mixed (theandric) activity of Christ as a Man, and the purely Divine activity, will, knowledge, which the Son has in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and which are in fact the Divine Nature. In speaking of one activity, one will, one knowledge in Christ, Severus was reducing Monophysitism to pure heresy just as much as did the Nicobites or the Trithists whom he certainly held in mind. His confusion between human and human faculties of Christ—activity, will, intellect—and the Divine nature itself. This is not Apollinarism, but is so like that it the distinction is theoretical rather than real. It is the direct consequence of the use of Apollinarian formula. St. Cyril did not go so far; and in this Monothelite error we may see the essence of the heresy of the Monophysite; for all fell into this snare, except the Trithists, since it was the logical result of their mistaken point of view.

For general literature see Eutychianism. In P.G. there are more fragments than complete writings. Important collections are Ammonius, Bibliotheca historica sive de omnibus et aliis, Corpus Christii Orient., Corpus Syriacorum, Graeae, 1862; de Le Blanc, Histoire de la Monophysite (Lyon, 1857); A. Scholten, Carth. of the Syrian MS. in the Brit. Mus. (1798, 2 vols.); and Cook, Carth. of the Syrian MSS. of the Univ. of Cambridge (Cambridge, 1801); G. Hantsch, Handschriften-Verzeichniss der K. Bibl. zu Berlin, 1801, etc. On the various literature in general see Ammonius, op. cit., II. Dissertationes de Monophysitacce, etc. (Gottingen, 1833—6); Wright, Syriac Literature (Encyclop. Brit., 9th ed., 1857; published separately as A Short History of Syriac Literature, London, 1864); Duval, La litterature Syrienne (3rd ed., Paris, 1897); many excellent articles by Kuehner in Realencyclopaedia.


Le lettera di Filsegno ai Monaci di Tell Adda in Mem dell'Acad. dei Lincei, 1616, p. 497, vol. II. [Ed. of _Monopolii_, op. cit., by J. J. Winckelmann. On JAMES OF SARDO see ABBELOO, De vida et scriptis S. Jacobii (with three ancient Syrian biographies, Louvain, 1857); and also the free and prices here given, see Acts 22: 20 (October, 1859); HERMANN, Die jüdische Juden in Kirchent., in _Nestle in Religions_, and MARTIN, Un équipes postes au IV et VI siècles in _Revue des Sciences eccl._ (Oct., Nov., Dec., 1867); Correia, _Observações sobre as Monopólios de Mar Basutos in Zeitschr. der deutschen Morgendörrd., Gesellschaft, 1870, 217; Liturgy in Latin in Remonzie, Lit. C. of V., 1877; Didier, Les monopoles des h. Jacob monaka (1867); BIBIANI, 70 Homiliae selectar Mor Jacobi S. (Paris and Leip- zig, 1878). See also articles in various publications; and in CURTENS, Ancien Syriac Documents (1864).

PROPHETICUS, Stephen Bar Sudati, the Syrian mystic, and the book of Hierothesus (Leüden, 1886). On JORDAN DE TELLA, Het leven van Johannes van Tella (Leüden, 1882); another life in BROOKS, Life viraorum, loc. cit.; his confession of faith is cited by the same writer. On JORDAN DE ARABIA, see myth in H. W. BEAM, _Die Briefe des Johannes de Arabia zu Zeit des Johannes_ (1883); comparison with the commentaries: Syriac of the letter to Joshua in LAGADER, Anale., part of Greek in Israel. L. P. Salmon, Liber inamnatur dotosts _Spero_ (1753); the whole, with that on the monastic life, ed. by _Ryssel in Atti della R. Accad. dei Lincei_, 9 (1892), 1, which edited the astronomical letters also, _ibid._, _VII_, etc.

On the question of orthodoxy, see ARMENIAN, II., Nau, Dou quelle mesure les Jacobites sont-ils Manichéens? in _Revue de l'orient chrétien_, 1903, no. 2, p. 112; _Berol., 1904_.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Monopoly, Dioecese of (Monopolitana), in the Province of Bari, in Apulia, southern Italy. The city has been the subject of an antiquarian. It was the ancient Egnatis, the ruins of which are not far from the modern town. In the eighth and ninth centuries, Monopoli was often ravaged by the Saracens. After the end of the Normans counts, it became (1042) the seat of Hugues. During the war between France and Spain for the possession of the Kingdom of Naples, Monopoli was captured twice by the Venetians (1495 and 1528), and on the second occasion was sacked. In 1552 Charles V surrounded the town with walls and towers that still exist. The episcopal see was created in 1602, and its first prelate was Deodatus. The cathedral was erected by the second bishop, Roseme, in 1610. It is magnificent. There was a small town situated on a high promontory along the Adriatic, which is united to this diocese. The diocese is immediately subject to the Holy See; it has eight parishes, 65,000 inhabitants, and three educational institutes for girls.

CAFFELETTI, La Chiesa d'Italia, XXI (Venice, 1887).

U. BENIGNI.

Monopoly, Moral Aspects of.—According to its etymology, monopoly (monopolia) signifies exclusive sale, or exclusive privilege of selling. Present usage, however, extends the term to one's exercise of unified control over a commodity sufficient to enable the person or corporation in control to limit supply and fix price. The proportion of the supply of an article that must be controlled in order to attain these ends, depends upon many factors, and differs considerably in different industries. In the majority of cases, the unified control of industry, based on between 70 and 90 per cent, although there are cases in which the unified control of a little more than one half the supply of the commodity seems to suffice. In most of the cases in which the monopoly controls less than three-fourths of a business, the independent dealers seem to have the power to overthrow the monopoly by bidding down the market prices and setting off steadier market conditions established by the dominant concern. They are, consequently, passive factors in the monopolized condition of the trade. No matter how great the degree of control which the monopoly enjoys, its power over supply and prices is not absolute. Many economic and prudential considerations will prevent the exercise of this power to the extent that it might desire—for example, the fear of potential competition, the discovery of a substitute for the monopolized article, or the possibility that people may get on without either the article or a substitute. But in all cases monopoly implies the ability deliberately to regulate supply and prices, and to maintain them at a point other than that which would have been reached by the natural action of the market under normal competition. However inexpedient a monopoly may be, it is not in itself immoral. Its moral character depends entirely upon its actions and its effects. More specifically, its morality is determined by the prices that it establishes, and by the methods that it employs toward actual or potential competitors.

I. Monopoly Prices.—According to the older moral theologians, monopoly prices were unjust when they were higher than the prices that would have prevailed under competition (cf. Lugo, "De Justitia et de Jure," disp. xxvi, n. 72). While this rule was substantially correct for the Middle Ages, when the competitive, or rather the customary, price was generally fair to both producers and consumers, it is far from acceptable to-day, when the competitive price is often too low to provide a just return to the agents of production. For competitive prices, as well as for monopoly prices, the objective rule of justice is that a sufficient return should be so high that it is conveniently high to remunerate fairly all who have contributed to the production of the thing; the subjective rule of justice is the social estimate, the price approved by competent and fair-minded men (cf. Tanqueray, "De Justitia," 776). If the monopoly price does not exceed these limits, it is not unjustly high, even though it is much higher than what was had obtained or would have obtained under the stress of competition. Since the different classes that help to produce a socially useful commodity have a right to a fair return for their services, and since this return can only come from the price at which the commodity is sold, the latter is unjustly low unless it is sufficient for this purpose. Today, it can be said in competition by which an unjust price can be made just. On the other hand, there is no secret virtue in monopoly to justify a selling price that is more than sufficient to render fair returns to the different agents of production. These propositions are accepted by the overwhelming majority of persons, whether experts or not: the practical difficulty is to determine precisely what is a fair return to each of the different agents.

Putting the matter as briefly and as summarily as possible, we may say that a just remuneration to the agents of production comprises: (1) a living wage for all labourers, and something more than this for all those who form part of the union of workers; (2) fair profits for the business man, on account of his activities as director of industry; (3) a fair rate of interest on the actual capital invested in the business. Fair recompense for the work of the worker, fair profit for the business man, and a fair rate of interest on the actual capital invested in the business services in a competitive business. Although competition is not of itself a determinant of fair wages in the case of ordinary labour, inasmuch as it often forces remuneration below the level of decent living, it is generally fair to the director of industry, inasmuch as it enables him not merely to obtain a decent livelihood, but to maintain himself in accordance with that higher standard of living to which he has a reasonable claim. And it yields even more than this to those business men whose ability is exceptional. A fair rate of interest on monopoly capital will be the rate that prevails in the market, as it enables him not merely to maintain a sufficient amount of risk. The capitalist or interest receiver as such, does not work, but is free to earn his livelihood by his labour from other sources. Thus, since
interest is not his sole means of livelihood, the just rate of interest is not determined by, nor does it bear to those from which he must derive his livelihood in the individual case. Consequently, competition may be the proper rule of justice for the interest receiver, as well as for the director of industry, although it is not always a just rule for the ordinary wage-earner.

What are the grounds for the assertion that the investor in a monopoly has no right to more than the competitive or prevailing rate of interest? The answer to this question is bound up with the more fundamental question concerning the basis of the right of any investor to receive any interest at all. But, no matter what answer we give to this latter question, no matter what justification of interest we may advance, we cannot suppose that the investor has any ground upon which to erect the beginnings of a proof, that the capitalist has a right, as capitalist, to more than the prevailing or competitive rate of interest. If we assume that interest is justified as the product of capital, or of the product of capital, we have no reason to assert that the so-called product has a higher value than men attribute to it in the ordinary conditions. If we regard interest as the due reward of the capitalist's sacrifices in saving, we have no ground for maintaining that these are not fully remunerated in the current rate. If we adopt the theory that seems to be most satisfactory and least assailable, namely, that interest is a purely physical and monetary consideration, it is obvious that it probably would not be sufficient capital unless men were encouraged to save by the hope of interest, we must likewise conclude that the current competitive rate is sufficiently high, since it brings forth sufficient saving and sufficient capital for society's needs. The argument based upon this theory may be stated as follows: suppose that the price of capital cannot be shown to be unjust on individual grounds, that is, as a payment from the purchaser of the product of capital to the owner of capital (for it must be remembered that the consumer is the real and final provider of interest on capital), it will be justified on social grounds if it is necessary in order to evoke sufficient social capital; and there is an overwhelming probability that it is necessary for this purpose. Since interest is justified only for this purpose and to this extent, the just rate of interest cannot be higher than the rate that attains this end, which in our time is the competitive rate.

The doctrine that capital has no right to more than the competitive rate is the just rate in the case of money loaned (cf. Tanqueray, "De Justitia", n. 906). Where the risk and other circumstances are the same, men do not valuate an investment higher than a loan; they will put their money into the one or the other indifferently; consequently, it would seem clear that, when the circumstances just referred to are the same, a fair return on invested money need not exceed a fair return on loaned money. To be sure, investors and business men do obtain more than the competitive rate of interest in some years and in some enterprises, even where competition is active and constant; but this advantage is either offset by exceptionally low rates in other years, or it is due to unusual business ability, or it arises from an increase in the value of the land connected with the enterprise. In all these cases the exceptionally high rate is undoubtedly lawful more or less as a result of the monopolistic price of capital pure and simple. Since the prevailing or competitive rate is sufficiently high to satisfy the demands of justice in businesses that are subject to competition, there seems to be no good reason why it is not, generally speaking, sufficiently high in monopolistic concerns. The owner of a monopoly has no more right to a larger profit than the investor to whose advantage it is a debarrement to have to pay a higher rate of interest on his investment than the money-lender has to exploit the distress of the borrower in order to exact an exorbitant rate of interest on the loan. It would seem that the only exception to this rule would occur when the monopoly, while paying a fair wage to labour and a fair price to those from whom it buys materials, introduces economies of production which enable it to sell its goods at less than the prices charged by its competitors, and yet make unusual profits and interest on its investment. In such a case it seems reasonable that a monopolistic concern (more properly, its active directors, who alone have affected the productive and marketing enterprises) should be exempt from the payment of the higher rate of interest on the cheaper methods of production. On the other hand, there is no good reason why the monopoly should appropriate all the benefits of the improvement. If it does not share them with the consumer by reducing prices below the competitive level, it renders no social service to compensate for the social danger which is inherent in the monopoly. In fact, in the matter of the fact, the great majority of existing monopolies do not pay higher wages nor higher prices for material than competitive concerns, and yet they charge the consumer higher prices than would have prevailed under competition (cf. Final Report of the Industrial Commission, pp. 621, 625, 690).

The passage in reference is had to monopolistic concerns that fix prices without any supervision or restriction by the State. When the public authority exercises adequate control over the charges of public service monopolies, such as gas and street-railway companies, and determines these freely and honestly, it would seem that the monopolistic concern no longer gains an unfair advantage by charging the public more than the charges established by the public authorities, even though they should yield unusual profits on the investment, for the presumption is that such charges are fair to both producer and consumer. No such presumption extends to those cases in which the state control over charges is only mildly corrective and partial, instead of fundamental and thorough.

II. MONOPOLISTIC METHODS.—The methods and practices employed by monopolies in dealing with their rivals did not occupy the attention of the older moral theologians who wrote on the subject of monopoly. Nor have recent writers given this phase of the subject the attention that it deserves. As a consequence, there is a passing and ethical treatment of this phase in the public opinion, which regards it as one of the worst practices by which monopolistic concerns harass and eliminate their competitors. Among the most notable of these methods are discriminatory underselling, the factor's agreement, and railway favouritism.

Discriminative underselling occurs, when the monopoly sells its goods at unprofitably low prices in the territory in which it wishes to destroy competition, while imposing unreasonably high prices elsewhere. While the independent dealer who is driven out of business by this device has no strict right to the patronage of the customers who are drawn away from him through the low prices established by the monopoly, he has a right not to be deprived of that patronage by unjust methods. According to a general and far-reaching moral principle, a man is unjustly treated when he is prevented by unjust means from obtaining an advantage which he has a right to pursue (cf. Lehmkühl, "Theologia Moralis", I, n. 974; Tanqueray, "De Justitia", n. 588). Among the unjust methods which enables the monopoly to force, fraud, deception, falsehood, intimidation, and extortion. Now when a manufacturer or a merchant is deprived of the patronage of his customers through ruinously low prices, which the monopoly is enabled to
maintain by means of the exorbitantly high prices that it establishes at another place or time, he is deprived of this advantage by unjust means. The unjustly high prices are as truly the means by which the independent dealer is injured, as the lying reports brought to a would-be benefactor are the means by which his intended beneficiary is deprived of a legacy. This is the stock example used by the moral theologians to illustrate the general principle stated above. When, however, a business concern eliminates a competitor by lowering prices universally, and keeping them low even after the latter has gone out of business, no injustice is done, because no unjust means are employed. Even when a monopolistic concern lowers prices everywhere, and employs the media of time and transportation, and has no competitors driven from the field, the latter would seem to be victims of injustice. For, although the unjust prices do not come into existence until after the injury has been accomplished, they are as certainly the means whereby the injury was done, as though they had been established simultaneously with the ruinously low prices. In both cases the exorbitant prices operate as the moral cause of the act by which the unprofitably low prices are established.

The factor's agreement is exemplified when a merchant engages to handle no goods, or no goods of a certain kind, except those manufactured by a monopoly; although in performing justice to the injured concern, the monopolistic concern will refuse to sell him any goods at all. If the agreement is established, the result is that the rivals of the monopolistic manufacturing concern are deprived of the patronage of the merchant through intimidation. It is a species of secondary boycott, inasmuch as the monopoly refuses to sell to the independent manufacturer. It is a violation of the law of the land and the courts. In a suit for breach of the contract, the seller may, unless the latter refuses to do business with the independent manufacturer. It seems sufficiently clear that boycotts of this kind are unreasonable and unjust whenever, as in this instance, there exists no sufficient reason for the intimidation and the refusal of intercourse (see Labour Unions, Moral Aspects of). Indeed, the motive of the monopoly is, as a rule, not merely lacking in reasonableness, but positively unjust; for its ultimate aim is not simply to acquire the patronage that now goes to its rivals, but in addition to raise prices to the consumer after its rivals have been eliminated.

Railway favouritism is the most important of all the meaner methods of business man through unjust prices. It has in all probability been as effective in creating and maintaining monopolies as all the other methods combined. It appears under many forms, but its essence is found in the fact that the goods dealt in by a monopoly are carried by the railroad at a rate so much below that charged to independent dealers that the latter must either go out of business or be satisfied with insufficient profits. This practice is undoubtedly immoral: (1) because it is forbidden by the civil law; (2) because the railroad, as a quasi-public agency, is under obligation to treat all its patrons with the same distributive justice that the state itself would be obliged to accord them if it were the owner of the railroads; (3) because the lower charges collected from the monopoly imply unjustly high charges extorted from the independent shippers. As a violation of the civil law, railway favouritism is against legal justice; as unequal treatment of different patrons, it is a violation of both distributive and commutative justice, precisely as the unequal imposition of taxes violates both these forms of justice. If the rate charged the monopoly for carrying its goods is sufficiently high to be just, the higher rate imposed upon its rivals exceeds the limits of justice. If the former rate is so low as to be unremunerative to the railroad, the injustice done to the independent dealers is still greater, inasmuch as they are compelled to bear a part of the charges that should be defrayed by the monopoly. The favours accorded to the latter are not deducted from the normal revenues and profits of the railroad company.

As a matter of purely natural justice, a railroad might concede somewhat lower carrying rates to a monopolistic concern because the monopoly ships goods in larger lots. The cost of such transportation is always smaller than when the same volume of goods is carried in separate lots for several different concerns. Nevertheless, even this degree of favouritism is a violation of legal justice, and frequently a violation of charity as regards the smaller shipping concerns. Inasmuch as the practice of railway favouritism to monopolies is seldom confined within these narrow limits, the question raised in this paragraph is not at all of much practical importance. Again, the railroad might be absolved from the charge of violating natural justice if the lower rates which it extended to the monopoly did not fall below the lowest level (pretium infimum) of justice, while the charges exacted from the independent shippers did not exceed the highest level (pretium summum) sanctioned by justice. A private enterprise, such as a mercantile concern, could probably be absolved from the stigma of injustice if it indulged in this practice toward its different customers. But, as we have seen above, a railroad is not a purely private concern. Since it performs a quasi-public function, it would seem to be bound by the same rules of distributive and commutative justice as governments, and, as such, it is now operating the business of transportation. The share of the monopoly in the immorality and injustice connected with railway favouritism consists in the fact that it requests, urges, and sometimes intimates the railway to indulge in the practice. The monopoly is therefore a co-operator. In the language of the moral theologians, it is a mediator, and likewise a participant, or beneficiary (frequently the only beneficiary) of the injustice done to its rivals through overcharges for transportation.

While monopoly is not necessarily unjust, and while any particular monopoly may be free from unjust practices, experience shows that the power to commit injustice which is included in monopoly cannot be unreservedly entrusted to the average human being or group of human beings. Consequently, it is the duty of public authority to prevent the existence of unnecessary monopolies, and to exercise such supervision over necessary monopolies as to render impossible monopolistic injustice, whether against the independent manufacturer or the consumer through unjust prices. Many of the moral judgments enunciated in this article will perhaps strike the reader as lacking in positiveness, inasmuch as they are modified by such phrases as "it would seem," "it is probable," "it is reasonable." Yet no other course was possible. Concerning most of the specific questions discussed in the foregoing pages, there exists no specific teaching by the Church, or even by the unanimous voice of theologians. There are not even well-defined bodies of theological opinion. All that can be done is to draw conclusions from, and make specific applications of, the more general principles of justice as found in approved Catholic sources.
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**John A. Ryan**

**Monotheism** (from the Greek μόνος "only", and θεός "god") is a word coined in comparatively modern times to designate belief in the one supreme God, the
Creator and Lord of the world, the eternal Spirit, All-powerful, All-wise, and All-good, the Rewarder of good and Punisher of evil, the Source of our happiest and most perfect bliss. On this point there can be no doubt. It is opposed to Polytheism, which is belief in more gods than one, and to Atheism, which is disbelief in any deity whatsoever. In contrast with Deism, it is the recognition of God's presence and activity in every part of creation. In contrast with Pantheism, it is belief in a God of conscious freedom, distinct from the physical world. Both Deism and Pantheism are religious philosophies rather than religions.

On the other hand, Monotheism, like Polytheism, is a term applying primarily to a concrete system of religion. The grounds of reason underlying monotheism have already been set forth in the article God. These grounds enable the inquiring mind to recognize the existence of God as a morally certain truth. Its reasonableness acquires still greater force from the positive data associated with the revelation of Christianity. (See Revelation.)

**Primitive Monotheism.**—Was monotheism the religion of our first parents, and hence the primitive form of religion? Many Evolutionists and Rationalist philosophers have considered it possible that the first revelation of positive, Divine revelation, they hold that the mind of man was in the beginning but little above that of his ape-like ancestors, and hence incapable of grasping so intellectual a conception as that of Monotheism.

They assert that the first religious notions entertained by man in his upward course towards civilization were superstitions of the grossest kind. In a word, primitive man was, in their opinion, a savage, differing but little from existing savages in his intellectual, moral, and religious life. Catholic doctrine teaches that the religion of our first parents was monotheistic and supernatural, being the result of Divine revelation, which they could not have received without the help of God to know and worship God. The first man, like his descendants to-day, had by nature the capacity and the aptitude for religion. Being a man in the true sense, with the use of reason, he had the tendency then, as men have now, to recognize in the phenomena of nature the workings of an unseen power. In primitive man, however, he lacked experience and scientific knowledge, it was not easy for him to unify the diverse phenomena of the visible world. Hence he was not without danger of going astray in his religious interpretation of nature. He was liable to miss the important truth that, as nature is a unity, so the God of nature is one. Revelation, then, was necessary for our first parents, it is for men to-day, to secure the possession of true monotheistic belief and worship.

The conception that Almighty God vouchsafed such a revelation is eminently reasonable to everyone who recognizes that the end of man is to know, love, and serve God. It is repugnant to think that the first man, in their view, had no such knowledge of God, being impossible for our first parents, was not without a fitting substitute. They were set right from the first in the knowledge of their religious duties by a Divine revelation. It is a Catholic dogma, intimately connected with the dogma of original sin and with that of the Atonement, that our first parents were raised to the state of sanctifying grace, that is, to the supernatural state, namely, the beatific vision of God in heaven. This necessarily implies supernatural faith, which could come only by revelation.

Nor is there anything in sound science or philosophy to invalidate this teaching that Monotheistic belief was imparted by God to primitive man. While it is true that human life in the beginning was, on a comparatively low plane of material culture, it is also true that the first men were endowed with reason, i.e., with the ability to conceive with sufficient distinctness of a being who was the cause of the manifold phenomena presented in nature. On the other hand, a humble degree of culture along the lines of art and industry is quite compatible with right religion and morality, as is evident in the case of tribes converted to Catholicism in recent times; while retaining much of their rude and primitive mode of living, they have reached very clear notions concerning God and shown remarkable fidelity in the observance of His law. As to the bearing of the Evolutionistic hypothesis on this question, see Friesius.

It is thus quite in accordance with the accredited results of physical science to maintain that the first man, created by God, was keen of mind as well as sound of body, and that, through Divine instruction, he began life with right notions of God and of his moral and religious duties. This does not necessarily mean that God communicated to them the moral and philosophically profound. Here it is that scholars are wide of the mark when they argue that Monotheism is a conception that implies a philosophic grasp and training of mind absolutely impossible to primitive man.

The notion of the Supreme God, notably life is not the highly metaphysical conception demanded by right philosophy. If it were, few could hope for salvation. The God of religion is the unspeakably great Lord on whom man depends, in whom he recognizes the source of his happiness and perfection; He is the righteous Judge, rewarding good and punishing evil; the loving and merciful Father, who withholds not the gifts of life and life itself, the needy and penitent children. Such a conception of God can be readily grasped by simple, unphilosophic minds—by children, by the unlettered peasant, by the converted savage.

Nor are these notions of a supreme being utterly lacking even where barbarism still reigns. Bishop Hugues, in his own country of France, quotes a testimony of a "sage" (Paris, 1909), and Mr. A. Lang, in his "Making of Religion" (New York, 1898), have emphasized a point too often overlooked by students of religion, namely, that with all their religious crudities and superstitions, such low-grade savages as the Pygmies of the Northern Congo, the Australians, and the natives of the Andaman Islands, have preserved notions of the Supreme Deity. To say, then, that primitive man, fresh from the hand of God, was incapable of monotheistic belief, even with the aid of Divine revelation, is contrary to well-ascertained fact. From the opening chapters of Genesis we gather that our first parents recognized God to be the author of all things, their God and Lord, the Giver of all good, the Father of all, the Source of all happiness, rewarding good and punishing evil. The simplicity of their life made the range of their moral obligation easy of recognition. Worship was of the simplest kind.

**MOSAIC MONOTHEISM.**—The ancient Hebrew religion, promulgated by Moses in the name of Jehovah (Jahweh), was an impressive form of Monotheism. That it was Divinely revealed is the unmistakable teaching of Holy Scripture, particularly of Exodus and the following books which treat explicitly of Mosaic legislation. Even non-Catholic Scriptural scholars, who no longer accept the Pentateuch, as it stands, as the literary production of Moses, recognize, in great part, that, in the Pentateuch, the mind of the time and set them, go to make up the Pentateuch, there are portions that reach back to the time of Moses, showing the existence of Hebrew monotheistic worship in his day.
Now, the transcendent superiority of this Monotheism taught by Moses offers a strong proof of its Divine origin. At a time when the neighbouring nations representing the highest civilization of that time—Egypt, Babylonia, Greece—were giving an impure and idolatrous worship to many deities, we find the insignificant Hebrew people professing a religion in which idolatry, impure rites, and a degrading mythology had no legitimate place, but where, instead, belief in the one true God was associated with a dignified worship and a lofty moral code. Those who reject the claim of Mosaic Monotheism to have been revealed have never yet succeeded in giving a satisfactory explanation of this extraordinary phenomenon. In the first place, the History of Personification of God in the Hebrew people, destined in the fullness of time to give place to the higher monotheistic religion revealed by Christ, in which all the nations of the earth should find peace and salvation. The Jewish people was thus God's chosen people, not so much by reason of their own merit, as because they were destined to prepare the way for the absolute and universal religion, Christianity. The God of Moses is no mere tribal deity. He is the Creator and Lord of the world. He gives over to His chosen people the land of the Chanaanites. He is a jealous God, forbidding not only worship of strange gods, but the use of images, which might lead to abuses in that age of almost universal idolatry. Lastly, there is the fact that God is truth, the predominant emotion. The religious sanction of the law is centred chiefly in temporal rewards and punishments. Laws of conduct, though determined by justice rather than by charity and mercy, are still eminently humane.

CHRISTIAN MONOTHEISM.—The sublime Monotheism of Jesus Christ has no parallel in the history of religions. God is presented to us as the loving, merciful Father, not of one privileged people, but of all mankind. In this filial relation with God—a relation of confidence, gratitude, love—Christ centres our obligations both to God and to our fellow-men. He lays hold of the individual soul and reveals to it its high destiny of Divine sonship. At the same time, He impresses on us the corresponding duty of treating others as God's children, and hence as our brethren, entitled not simply to justice, but to mercy and charity. To complete this idea of Christian fellowship, Jesus shows Himself to be the eternal Son of God, sent by His heavenly Father to save us from sin, to raise us to immortality, to the Delivered Life of God through the atoning merits of His life and death. The love of God the Father thus includes the love of His incarnate Son. Personal devotion to Jesus is the motive of right conduct in Christian Monotheism. Co-operating in the sanctification of mankind is the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of truth and life, sent to confirm the faith in faith, hope, love, and charity. These three Divine Persons, distinct from one another, equal in all things, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are one in essence, a trinity of persons in the one, undivided Godhead (see TRINITY, THE). Such is the Monotheism taught by Jesus. The guaranty of the truth of His teaching is to be found in His supreme moral excellence, in the perfection of His ethical teaching, in His miracles, especially His bodily resurrection, and in His wonderful influence on mankind for all time. (Cf. John, xvii, 3; 1 Cor., viii, 4.) As Christianity in its beginnings was surrounded by the polytheistic beliefs and practices of the pagan world, a clear and authoritative expression of Monotheism was necessary to combat the temptations of living in polytheism. It is open with the words: “I [we] believe in God [theos, deum]” or, more explicitly, “I [we] believe in one God [mon, unum deum].” (See Denzinger-Bannwart, “Enchiridion,” 1–40; cf. Apostles’ Creed; Athanasian Creed; Nicene Creed.) Among the early heresies, some of the most important and most directly opposed to Monotheism arose out of the attempt to account for the origin of evil. Good they ascribed to one divine principle, evil to another. (See Gnosticism; Manichaeism; Marcionites.) These dualistic errors gave occasion for a vigorous defence of Monotheism by such writers as St. Ireneaus, Tertullian, St. Augustine, etc. (see Bardenhewer-Shahan, “Patrology,” St. Louis, 1920, i, cols. 109–112.)

The same doctrine naturally held the foremost place in the teaching of the missionaries who converted the races of Northern Europe; in fact, it may be said that the diffusion of Monotheism is one of the most striking phenomena of the Church. In the various conciliar definitions regarding the person of Christ, the oneness of the Divine nature; e.g., Fourth Council of Lateran (1215), in Denzinger-Bannwart, “Enchiridion,” 428. The medieval Scholastics, taking up the traditional belief, brought to its support a long series of arguments based on reason; see, for instance, St. Thomas, “Contra Gentes,” i, 11, and St. Anselm, “Monol.,” iv. During the last three centuries the most conspicuous tendency outside the Catholic Church has been towards such extreme positions as those of Monism (q. v.) and Pantheism (q. v.), in which it is asserted that all things are really one in substance, and that God is identical with the world. The Church, however, has steadfastly maintained, not only the plurality of persons, but the unity of the Divine nature, else, but also that there is only one God. “If any one deny the one true God, Creator and Lord of all things visible and invisible, let him be anathema” (Conc. Vatican., Sess. III, “De fide,” can. 1).

MOHAMMEDAN MONOTHEISM.—Of Mohammedan Monotheism little need be said. The Allah of the Koran is practically one with the God of the Old Testament. Its keynot is islam, submissive resignation to the will of God, which is expressed in everything that happens. Allah is, to use the words of the Koran, “The Almighty, the All-knowing, the All-just, the Lord of the worlds, the Author of the heavens and the earth, the Creator of life and death, in whose hand is dominion and irresistible power, the great all-powerful Lord of the glorious throne. God is the Mighty, . . . the Swift in reckoning, who knoweth every ant’s weight of good and of ill that each man hath done, and who suffereth not the reward of the faithful to perish. He is the King, the Holy, . . . the Guardian over His servants, the Shelterer of the orphan, the Guide of the blind, the Unleashing of the captive, the Consoler of the bereaved, the Consoler of the afflicted, . . . the generous Lord, the gracious Hearer, the Near-at-hand, the Compassionate, the Merciful, the Forgiving” (cited from “Islam”, by Ameer Ali Syed). The influence of the Bible, particularly the Old Testament, on Mohammedan Monotheism is well known and need not be dwelt on here.
among peoples of inferior culture to-day. It is only since modern science has brought all these phenomena within the reign of physical law that the tendency to view them as manifestations of distinct personalities has been thoroughly dispelled. Now such a personification of nature's forces is compatible with Monotheism so long as these different intelligences fancied to produce such phenomena are viewed as the handiwork of God's creative mind, and hence not worthy of Divine worship. But where the light of revelation has been obscured in whole or in part, the tendency to deify these personalities associated with natural phenomena has asserted itself.

In this way polytheistic nature-worship seems to have arisen. It arose from the mistaken application of a sound principle, which man everywhere seems naturally to possess, namely, that the great operations of nature are due to the agency of mind and will. Professor George Fisher observes: "The polytheistic religions did not err in identifying the manifold activities of nature with voluntary agency. The spontaneous feelings of mankind in this particular are not belied by the principles of philosophy. The error of polytheism lies in the splintering of that will which is immanent in all the operations of nature into a plurality of personal agents, a throng of divinities, each active and dominant within a province of its own" ("Grounds of Christian and Theistic Belief," 1903, p. 29). The nature-worship is to be found among practically all peoples who have lacked the guiding star of Divine revelation. Such history of these individual religions as we possess offers little evidence of an upward development towards Monotheism: on the contrary, in almost every instance of known historic development, the tendency has been to degenerate further and further from the monotheistic idea. There is, indeed, scarcely a Polytheistic religion in which one of the many deities recognized is not held in honour as the father and lord of the rest. This is the result of an upward development, as non-Catholic scholars very generally assert, is speculative possible. But that it may as well be the outcome of a downward development from a primitive monotheistic belief cannot be denied. The latter view seems to have the weight of positive evidence in its favour. The ancient Chinese religion, as depicted in the oldest records, was remarkably close to pure Monotheism. The gross Polytheistic nature-worship of the Egyptians of later times was decidedly a degeneration from the earlier form of monotheistic belief. In the Vedic religion, a strong Monotheistic tendency asserted itself, only to weaken later on and change into Pantheism. The one happy exception is the upward development which the ancient Aryans introduced into the land of the Iranians. Through the wise reform of Zoroaster, the various gods of nature were subordinated to the supreme, omniscient spirit, Ormuzd, and were accorded an inferior worship as his creatures. Ormuzd was honored as the creator of all that is good, the revealer and guardian of the laws of religious and moral conduct, and the sanctifier of the faithful. The sense of sin was strongly developed, and a standard of morality was set forth that justly exalted human aspiration. In the final renovation of the world, including the bodily resurrection, were elements in Zoroastrian eschatology. A nobler religion outside the sphere of revealed religion is not to be found. Yet even this religion is rarely classed by scholars among monotheistic religions, owing to the polytheistic colouring of its worship of the subordinate nature-spirits, and also to the fact that the ancient Aryan spirit worship, justified by Zoroastrians of modern times as a form of symbolic worship of Ormuzd.

The so-called survivors in higher religions, such as Judaism and Christianity are but outgrowths of lower religions. The presence of the greater part of these superstitious beliefs and customs in the more ignorant sections of Christian peoples is easily explained as the survival of tenacious customs that flourished among the ancestors of European peoples long before their conversion to Christianity. Again, many of these beliefs and customs are such as might easily arise from faulty interpretations of nature, unavoidable in unscientific grades of culture, even where the monotheistic idea prevailed. Superstitions like these are but the rank weeds and vines growing around the tree of religion.

Charles F. Aiken.

Monotheism and Monothelitism (sometimes written Monothelites, from monothēλētai, but the u is more naturally transliterated into late Latin by i), a heresy of the seventh century, condemned in the Sixth General Council. It was essentially a modification of Monophysitism, propagated within the Catholic Church in order to conciliate the Monophysites, in hopes of reuniting them.

The Theological Question.—The Monophysites were habitually represented by their Catholic opponents as denying all reality to the human nature of Christ after the union. This was perhaps a logical deduction from some of their language, but it was far from being the real teaching of their chief doctors.

Yet at least it is certain that they made the unity of Christ (on which they insisted against real and supposed Nestorianists) imply only one principle of intention and will, and only one kind of activity or operation (eνεργεία). Personality seemed to them to be manifested in will and action; and they thought a single personality must unite will, intention, and a single category of action. The Person of Christ, being divino-human, must therefore involve one divino-human will and one divino-human activity (see Eutychianism; Monophysites and Monophysitism).

The two Wills.—The Catholic doctrine is simple, at all events in its main lines. The faculty of willing is an integral part of human nature: therefore, our Lord had a human will, since He took a perfect human nature. His Divine will on the other hand is numerically one with that of the Father and the Holy Ghost. It is therefore necessary to acknowledge two wills in Christ.

But if the word will is taken to mean not the faculty but the decision taken by the will (the will willed, not the will willing), then it is true that the two wills always acted in harmony; there were two wills willing and two acts, but one object, one will willed; in the phrase of St. Maximus, there were δύο εὐθυμίαν though μία υλή. The word will is also used to mean the decision of the will in each act of willing, voluntas ut natura (ἀνάλογος) as opposed to voluntas ut ratio (βολή). These are but two movements of the same faculty; both exist in Christ without any imperfection, and the natural movement of His human will is perfectly subject to its rational or free movement. Lastly, the sensitive appetite is also
sometimes entitled will. It is an integral part of human nature, and therefore exists in the perfect human nature of Jesus Christ, but without any of the imperfections by which it is possessed by original sin. He has no passions (in that sense of the word which implies a revolt against the reason), no concupiscence, no 'will of the flesh'. Therefore this "lower will" is to be denied in Christ, in so far as it is called a will, because it resists the rational will (it was in this sense that St. Bonaventure was said by St. John to have denied that Christ had a lower will); but it is to be asserted in Him so far as it is called will, because it obeys the rational will, and so is voluntas per participacionem: in fact in this latter sense the sensual appetite is less improperly called will in Christ than in us, for quo perfectior et volens, eo magis sensualitas in eo de voluntate habet. But the strict sense of the word will (voluntas, δύναμις) is always the rational will, the free will. It is therefore correct to say that in Christ there are but two: the Divine will, which is the Divine nature, and the human rational will, which always acts in harmony with and in free subjection to the Divine will. The denial of more than one will in Christ by the heretics necessarily involved the incompleteness of His nature, and, in the division of the faculty with the decision of the faculty. They argued that two wills must mean contrary wills, which shows that they could not conceive of two distinct faculties having the same object. Further, they saw rightly that the Divine will is the ultimate governing principle (arché), but free human will acting under its leadership seems to them to be a will, not a necessary omission prevents our Lord's actions from being free, from being human actions, from being meritorious, indeed makes His human nature nothing but an irrational, irresponsible instrument of the Divinity—a machine, of which the Divinity is the motive power. To St. Thomas, our Lord's knowledge was similarly of one kind. He has only divine knowledge without any cognitive faculty. Such thoroughgoing conclusions were not contemplated by the inventors of Monothelitism, and Sergius merely denied two wills in order to assert that there was no repugnance in Christ's human nature to the promptings of the Divine, and he certainly did not see the consequences of his opinion.

B. The two operations. Operation or energy, activity (δύναμις, operatio), is parallel to will, in that there is but one activity of God, ad extra, common to all the three Persons; whereas there are two operations of Christ, on account of His two natures. The word ἐνέργεια is not here employed in the Aristotelian sense (as it is when we speak of an instrument in the sense of an operator); but it is used in the same way as esse (existentia), and it is an open question amongst Catholic theologians whether there is one esse in Christ or two. Nor does ἐνέργεια here mean simply the action (as Vasquez, followed by de Lugo and others, wrongly held) but the faculty of action, including the act of the faculty. Pseudo-Dionysius speaks of duo genera operationum as equivalent to duo operationes, which introduces an unfortunate confusion between ἐνέργεια and ἔργον or έργα, that is between faculty of action and the multiple actions produced by the faculty. This confusion of terms is frequent in modern theologians, and occurs in the ancients, e. g. St. Sophronius. The actions of God are innumerable in Creation and Providence, but His ἐνέργεια is one, for He has one nature of the three Persons. The various actions of the incarnate Son proceed from two distinct and unquestionably separate natures, because He has two natures. All are the actions of a single divine nature, save the (quod), but are either divine or human according to the nature (principium quod) from which they are elicited. The Monophysites were therefore quite right in saying that all the actions, human and divine, of the incarnate Son are to be referred to one agent, who is the God-man; but they were wrong in inferring that consequently His actions are complex, and must be all called "theandric" or "divino-human," and must proceed from a single divino-human δύναμις, St. Sophronius, and after him St. Maximus and St. John Damascene, showed that the two δύναμες produce three classes of actions, since actions are complex, and some are therefore mingled of the human and the Divine. (1) There are Divine actions exercised by God the Son in common with the Father and the Holy Ghost (e. g. the creation of souls or the conservation of the universe) in which His human nature bears no part whatever, and these cannot be called divino-human, for they are purely Divine. It is true that it is correct to say that a child ruled the universe (or the community of众生), but this the matter by words, and is an accidental, not a formal predication—He who became a child ruled the universe as God, not as a child, and by an activity that is wholly Divine, not divino-human. (2) There are other Divine actions which the Word Incarnate exercised in and through His human nature, as to raise the dead by a word, to heal the sick, and the like. The Divine action is distinguished from the human actions of touching or speaking, though it uses them, but through this close connexion the word theandric is not out of place for the whole complex act, while the Divine action as exercised through the human may be called formally theandric, or divino-human. (3) Again, there are actions of Christ as a man, as walking or eating, but these are due to the free human will, acting in response to a motion of the Divine will. These are elicited from a human potentia, but under the direction of the Divine. Therefore they are also called theandric, but in a different sense—they are materially theandric, humano-divine. We have seen that in the expression of the Divine will the actions the word theandric cannot be applied at all; to some it can be applied in one sense, to others in a different sense. The Lateran Council of 649 anathematized the expression una desseinitas operativa, μία θεαρχή δύναμις, by which all the actions divine and human are performed. It is unfortunate that the respect felt for the writing of Pseudo-Dionysius has hitherto prevented theologians from proscribing the expression desseinitas operativa altogether. It has been shown above that it is correct to speak of desseinitas actus or actions ἐνέργεια και τροπάσχεσα, and that the expression theandric thus becomes a correct epithet of the Divine operation under certain circumstances, and that is all. Though the Monophysites in general spoke of "one theandric operation", yet a speech of St. Martin at the Lateran Council tells us that a certain Colluthius would not be even a Christian unless he believed that "theandric" might leave some operation to the human nature; he preferred the word theantos, θεον ἔστιν, and Deo decibitis (Manes, I. 892). The denial of two operations, even more than the denial of two wills, makes the human nature of Christ an inanimate instrument of the Divine will. St. Thomas points out that though an instrument participates in the action of the agent who uses it, yet even an inanimate instrument has an activity of its own; much more the rational human nature of Christ has an operation of its own under the higher motion it receives from the divinity. But by means of this higher motion, the two natures act in concert, according to the famous words of St. Leo's Constitution: "Agit enim Deus, cum utriusque divinitatis membra quod proprium est; Verbo silecit operante quod Verbi est, et carne exsequente quod carnis est. Unum hominum coruscavit miraculis, aliud succumbit in-
juris” (Ep. 28, 4). These words were quoted by Cyrus, Sergius, Sophronius, Honorius, Maximus, etc., and played a large part in the controversy. This interpretation of the divine ions filled the Catholic doctrine of the περιποιηθες, circuminstesios, of the two unconfused and inseparable natures, as again St. Leo: “Expiitit quidem sub distincta actionibus veritatem suam utraque natura, sed neutra sae alternius connexione dispusuit” (Serm. liv, 1). St. Sophronius (Mansi, XI, 480 sqq.) and St. Maximus (Ep. 19) expressed this truth at the very outset of the controversy as well as later; and it is insisted upon by St. John Damascene. St. Thomas (III, Q.xix, a.1) well explains it: “Motum participat operationem monentis, et movens utitur operatione moti, et sic utrumque agit cum communicatione alterius”. Kriger and others have doubted whether it could be said that the question of two operations was already decided (as Loofs held), in Justinian’s time. But it seems that St. Leo’s words, yet earlier, were clear enough. The writings of Severus of Antioch assumed that his Catholic opponents would uphold two operations, and an obscure monk in the sixth century, Eustathius (De duabus naturis, P. G., LXXVII, 909) accepts this interpretation of the Doctrine of the Greek and Latin Fathers adduced at the Lateran Council and on other occasions are inconclusive, but some of them are clear enough. Really learned theologians like Sophronius and Maximus were not at a loss, though Cyrus and Honorius were puzzled. The Patriarch Eulogius of Alexandria (350-607) had written on this subject in his will, but his work was unknown to Cyrus and Sergius.

HISTORY.—The origin of the Monothelite controversy is thus related by Sergius in his letter to Pope Honorius. When the Emperor Heraclius in the course of the war which he began about 619, came to Theodosiopolis (Erzeroum) in Armenia (about 622), a meeting was arranged of the Catholic and Monophysite bishops and Sergius made a speech before him in favour of his heresy. The emperor refuted him with theological arguments, and incidentally made use of the expression “one operation” of Christ. Later on (about 625) he inquired of Cyrus, Bishop of Phasis and metropolitan of the Lazi, whether his words were correct. Cyrus was unable to give him the information and Sergius wrote to the Patriarch of Constantinople, whom Heraclius greatly trusted, for advice. Sergius in reply sent him a letter saying that he had written by Mennas of Constantineople to Pope Vigilius and approved by the latter, in which several authorities were cited for one operation and one will. This letter was afterwards delivered to Cyrus and Sergius for forwarding to the Sixth General Council. Nothing more occurred, according to Sergius, until in June, 631, Cyrus was promoted by the emperor to the See of Alexandria. The whole of Egypt was then Monophysite, and it was constantly threatened by the Saracens. Heraclius was doubtless very anxious to unite all to the Catholic Church, for he had already denounced the heretics among themselves, and by their bitterness against the official religion. Former emperors had made efforts for reunion, but in the fifth century the Henoticon of Zeno had been condemned by the popes yet had not satisfied all the heretics, and in the sixth century the condemnation of the three Chapters had nearly caused a schism between East and West without in the least placating the Monophysites. Cyrus was for the moment more successful. Imagining, no doubt, as all Catholics imagined, that Monophysitism involved the assertion that the human nature of Christ was a nullity after the Union, he was delighted at the acceptance by the Monophysites of a letter in which nine Chapters were declared heretical, and in which it “in two natures” is asserted, the “one composite hypostasis”, and μονοθεῖος καὶ καθ' ὑποστάσιν ημῶν, together with the adverbs διἐκτιτος, ἐπιστρέφως, διελαύνως. St. Cyril, the great doctor of the Monophysites, is cited; and all is satisfactory until in the seventh proposition our Lord is spoken of as “working union of the divine and human natures”, according to the divine Dionysius. This famous expression of the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite is taken by modern critics to show that he wrote under Monophysite influences. But Cyrus believed it to be an orthodox expression, used by Mennas, and approved by Pope Vigilius. He was triumphant therefore at the reunion to the Church of a large number of Theodosian Monophysites, so that, as Sergius phrases it, all the people of Alexandria and nearly all Egypt, the Thebaid, and Libya had become of one voice, and whereas formerly they would not hear even the name of St. Leo and of the Council of Chalcedon, now they acclaimed them with a loud voice in the holy synodaries. But the Monophysites saw things clearly, and Anastasius of Mount Sinai tells us that they boasted “they had not communicated with Chalcedon, but Chalcedon with them, by acknowledging one nature of Christ through one operation”.

St. Sophronius, a much venerated monk of Palestine, soon to become Patriarch of Jerusalem, was in a similar strait. He apostrophised Sergius in a letter. He deplored the expression “one operation” and unconvinced by Cyrus’s defence of it, he went to Constantinople, and urged on Sergius, upon whose advice the expression had been used, that the seventh capitulum must be withdrawn. Sergius thought this too hard, as it would destroy the union so gloriously effected; but he was so far convinced that it would be best for the future to drop both expressions “one operation” and “two operations”, and he thought it necessary to refer the whole question to the pope. (So far his own story.) This last proceeding must warn us not to judge Sergius too harshly. It may be invention that he was born of Monophysite parents and educated at the school of the Monophysite opponent of the Monophysites, and he based his defence of “one operation” on the citations of Fathers in the spurious letter of his orthodox predecessor Mennas, which he believed to have had the approval of Pope Vigilius. He was a politician who evidently knew little theology. But he had more to answer for than that. He wrote a letter to the Emperor in which he says that Sergius sent him a letter of Mennas. Further, St. Maximus tells us that Sergius had written to Theodore of Pharan asking his opinion; Theodore agreed. (It is probable that Stephen of Dora was mistaken in making Theodore a Monothelite before Sergius.) He also worked upon the Severian Paul the one-eyed, the same with whom Sergius had disputed, and excommunicated him. Sergius had written to Arsas, a Monophysite follower of Paul the Black of Antioch, to furnish him with authorities for the “one operation”, saying in his letter that he was ready to make a union on this basis. The Alexandrian St. John the Almsgiver (609 or 619) had taken this letter from Arsas with his own hand, and was only prevented by the iniquity of the Saracens (619) from using it to obtain the deposition of Sergius.

In the letter to Honorius, Sergius unwittingly develops another heresy. He admits that “one operation”, though used by a few Fathers, is a strange expression, and might suggest a denial of the confused union of two natures. But the “two operations” are said to be two distinct but inseparable operations, and though when the Word of God wished to fulfil His saving Passion, His humanity resisted and contradicted His will, and thus two contrary wills would be
introduced, which is impious, for it is impossible that in the same subject there should be two wills at once, and contrary to one another as to the same thing. So far he is right; but he continues: "For the saving doctrine of the Church, which teaches that the naturally animated flesh of the Lord never performs its natural movement apart from, and by its own impetus conversely to, the direction of the Word of God hypothetically united to it, but only at the time and in the manner and to the extent that the Word of God wishes, just as our body is moved by our rational soul. Herein St. Leo published a similar error when he taught that the intellectually animated flesh of the Lord, the will of the flesh, and of the Divine will, but makes no mention of the higher free will, which indeed is wholly subject to the Divine will. He may indeed be understood to include this intellectual will in "the intellectually animated flesh", but his thought is not clear, and his words simply express the heresy of one will. He concludes that it is best simply to confess that "the only begotten Son of God, which is truly both God and Man, works both the Divine and the human works, and from one and the same incarnate Word of God proceed indivisibly and inseparably both the Divine and the human operations as St. Leo teaches: Agit enim utraque, etc." If these words and the quotation from St. Leo are taken seriously, it is clear that the doctrine of Honorius, but Sergius's error lies precisely in deprecating this expression. It cannot be too carefully borne in mind that theological accuracy is a matter of definition, and definition is a matter of words. The prohibition of the right words is always heresy, even though the author of the prohibition has no heretical intention and is not necessarily understood to imply a heretical interpretation. The words of Sergius are not approvingly quoted by St. Leo, and any theologian worthy of his name would reprovingly quote Sergius for rejecting his "new expression" of "two operations". He approves the recommendations made by Sergius, and has no blame for the capitula of Cyrus. In one point he goes further than either, for he uses the words: "Wherefore we acknowledge one Will of our Lord Jesus Christ." We may reasonably believe the testimony of Abbot John Synnapus, who wrote the letter for Honorius, that he intended only to deny a lower will of the flesh in Christ which contradicted His higher will, and that he was not referring at all to His Divine will; but in connexion with the letter of Sergius such an interpretation is scarcely the more obvious one. In a final devolution description of St. Leo's teaching as more heretic than was Sergius, but he was equally incorrect in his decision, and his position made the mistake far more disastrous. In another letter to Sergius he says he has informed Cyrus that the new expressions, one and two operations, are to be dropped, their use being more harmful than good.

In one of the last four months of 638 effect was given to the pope's letter by the issue of an "Exposition" composed by Sergius and authorized by the emperor; it is known as the Exposition of Heraclius. Sergius died 9 Dec., a few days after having celebrated a council in which the Exposition was acclaimed as "truly agreeing with the Apostolic teaching" and therefore "false and has been done away with" as referred to its being founded on the letter of Honorius. Cyrus received the news of this council with great rejoicing. The Exposition itself is a complete profession of Faith according to the five General Councils. Its peculiarity consists in adding a prohibition of the expression one and two operations, and an assertion of one will in Christ lest contrary wills should be held. The letter of Honorius had been a grave document, but not a definition of Faith binding on the whole Church. The Exposition was a definition. But Honorius had no cognizance of it, for he had died on 12 Oct. The envoys who came for the emperor's confirmation of the new Pope Severinus refused to receive any Act of the new pope unless it were sent to them to lay it before him for judgment (see MAXIMUS or CONSTANTINOPLE). Severinus, not consecrated until May, 640, died two months later, but not without having condemned the Ecthesis. John IV, who succeeded him in December, lost no time in holding a synod to condemn it formally. When Heraclius, who had merely intended to give effect to the teaching of Honorius, heard that the document was rejected in Rome, he disowned it in a letter to John IV, and laid the blame on Sergius. He died Feb., 641. The pope wrote to the elder son of Heraclius, saying that the Ecthesis would doubtless now be withdrawn, and apologizing for Pope Honorius, who had not meant to teach one human will in Christ. St. Maximus Constantinopolitanus published a similar letter to the emperor, but neither of these apologists says anything of the original error, the forbidding of the "two operations" which soon became the principal point of controversy. In fact on this point no definition of Honorius was possible. But Pyrrhus, the new Patriarch of Constantinople, was a supporter of the Ecthesis and confirmed it in a great council, which St. Maximus, however, reproves as irregularly convened. After the death of Constantine and the exile of his brother Hesitaneos, Pyrrhus himself was exiled to Africa. Here he was persuaded in a famous controversy with St. Maximus (q.v.) to renounce the appeal to Vigilius and Honorius and to condemn the Ecthesis; and sent a letter to Pope Theodore, John IV having died (Oct., 642).

Meanwhile protests from the East were not wanting. St. Sophronius, who, after becoming Patriarch of Jerusalem, died just before Sergius, had yet had time to publish at his enthronization a formal defence of the dogma of two operations and two wills, which was regarded as an authoritative approval of the doctrine of Honorius. The most remarkable document was the first full exposition of the Catholic doctrine. It was sent to all the patriarchs, and St. Sophronius humbly asked for corrections. His references to St. Leo are interesting, especially his statement: "I accept all his letters and teachings as proceeding from the mouth of Peter the Corypheus, and kiss them and embrace them with my soul." Further on he speaks of receiving St. Leo's definitions as those of Peter, and St. Cyril's as those of Mark. He also made a large collection of testimonies of the Fathers in favour of two operations and two wills. He finally sent to Rome Stephen, Bishop of Dora, the first bishop of the patriarchate, who has given us a moving description of how he was brought to Rome to the holy place of Calvary and there charged him, saying: "Thou shalt give an account to the God who was crucified for us in this holy place, in His glorious and awful advent, when He shall come to judge the living and the dead, if thou delay and allow the Faith to be endangered, since, as thou knowest, I am myself let, by reason of the invasion of the Saracens which is come upon us for our sins. Swiftly pass, then, from end to end of the world, until thou come to the Apostolic See, where are the foundations of the holy doctrines. Not once, not twice, but many times, make clearly known to all those holy men there all that has been done" and so forth to the religious and the bishop's exhortation to his followers. The letter is dated to the city fallen into the hands of the Arabs under Amru, and the unfortunate heretics have remained until today (save for a few months in 646) under the rule of the infidel. Thus the whole of the Patriarchates of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria were separated from Rome. There is no doubt, except in Egypt, the great number of the bishops of the East, whose flocks were orthodox and had no wish to accept the Ecthesis.
The bishops of Cyprus, independent of any patriarch, held a synod 29 May, 643, against the Ecthesis. They wrote to Pope Theodore a letter of entreaty: "Christ, our God, has instituted your Apostolic chair, O holy head, as a God-fixed and immovable foundation. Despise not then, Father, the Faith of our Fathers, tossed by waves and imperilled; disperse the rule of the foolish with the light of thy divine knowledge, O most holy. Destroy the blasphemies and insolence of the new heretics with their novel expressions. For nothing is wanting to your orthodox and pious definition and tradition for the augmentation of the Faith amongst us. For we—O inspired one, you who hold converse with the holy Apostles and sit with them—believe and confess from of old since our very swaddling clothes, teaching according to the holy and God-fearing Pope Leo, and declaring that 'each nature works with the communion of the other what is proper to it,' etc. They declare themselves ready to be martyred by fire to preserve the true name of Christ, but their Archbishop Sergius when the persecution arose, was found on the side of the persecutors, not of the martyrs. It is abundantly clear that St. Maximus and his Constantinopolitan friends, St. Sophronius and the bishops of Palestine, Sergius and his suffragans, had no notion that the Apostolic See had been condemned, nor that the synods of Cyprus, in condemning the Ecthesis, condemned Christians", and so forth. They enclose letters to the emperor and to the patriarch Paul, to be sent to Constantinople by the pope. They are afraid to write directly, for the former governor, Gregory (who had presided at the disputation of his friend St. Maximus with Pyrrhus) had revolted and made himself emperor; and they feared that this was a defection from orthodoxy, which it brought into discredit at Constantinople. Victor, elected primate of Carthage after the letters were written, added one of his own.

Paul, the patriarch whom the Emperor Constans had substituted for Pyrrhus, had not been acknowledged by Pope Theodore, who demanded of him that Pyrrhus should first be tried by a council before two representatives of the Holy See. Paul's reply is preserved: the views he exposes are those of the Ecthesis, and he defends them by referring to Honorius and Sergius. Theodore pronounced a sentence of deposition against him, and Paul retaliated by destroying the Latin altar which belonged to the Roman See in the palace of Constantine at Constantinople, in order that the papal envoys might be unable to offer the Holy Sacrifice; he also persecuted them, together with many orthodox laymen and priests, by imprisonment, exile, or stripes. But Paul, in spite of this violence, had no idea of resisting the definitions of Rome. Until now, Honorius had not been disowned there, but defended. It was said that he had not taught one will; but the prohibition of the Ecthesis, infallibly blessed, had an enforcement of the course Honorius had approved, and nothing had as yet, it seems, been officially published at Rome on this point. Paul, somewhat naturally, thought it would be sufficient if he dropped the teaching of one will, and prohibited all reference to one will or two wills as well as to one operation or two operations; it could hardly be urged that this was not in accordance with the teaching of Pope Honorius. It would be a measure of peace, and East and West would be again united. Paul therefore persuaded the emperor to withdraw the Ecthesis, and to substitute for that elaborate confession of Faith a mere discipline. All compromise measures were rejected: severe penalties; none of the emperor's orthodox subjects have any longer permission to quarrel over them, but no blame is to attach to any who may have used either alternative in the past. Transgression of this law is to involve deposition for bishops and clerics, excommunication and expulsion for monks, loss of office and dignity for officials, fines for rich persons, corporal punishment and permanent exile for the poorer. By this cruel law heresy is to be blameless and orthodoxy forbidden. It is known as the Type of Constans. It is not a Monothelite document, for it forbids that heresy just as much as the Catholic Faith. Its date falls between Sept. 645 and Sept. 648. Pope Theodore died 5 May of the latter year, and was succeeded in July by St. Martin I. In October St. Martin held a great council at the Lateran, at which 105 bishops were present. The pope's opening speech gives a history of the heresy, and condemns the Ecthesis, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and the Type. John IV had spoken of Sergius with respect; and Martin I had forbidden all representations of him; but it was impossible to defend him if the Type was to be condemned as heresy. Stephen of Dora, then on his third visit to Rome, presented a long memorial, full of devotion to the Apostolic See. A deputation followed, of 37 Greek abbots residing in or near Rome, who had apparently fled before the Saracens from their monasteries in Jerusalem and other places. They demanded the condemnation of Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Cyrus and the anathematizing of the Type by the Apostolic and head See. The heretical documents read were part of a letter of Theodore of Pharar, the seventh proposition of Cyrus, the letter of Sergius to Cyrus, excerpts from the synods of Cyzicus, the letter of Sergius to Paul, and excerpts in the name of Sergius (desired to be repented of his repentance), and the approval of the Ecthesis by Cyrus. The letter of Sergius to Honorius was not read, nor was anything said about the correspondence of the latter with Sergius. St. Martin summed up; then the letter of Paul to Pope Theodore and the Type were read. The council admitted the good intention of the emperor in promoting this decree, but declared it heretical, for forbidding the teaching of two operations and two wills. Numerous excerpts from the Fathers and from Monophysite writers were read, and twenty canons were agreed to, the eighteenth of which condemns Theodore of Pharar, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, the Ecthesis, and the Type, under anathema. A letter to the emperor was signed by all. An ecumenical letter was sent throughout the Church in the name of St. Martin and the council, addressed to all bishops, priests, deacons, abbots, monks, ascetics, and to the entire sacred fulness of the Catholic Church. This was a final and complete condemnation of the Constantinopolitan, or Roman, See (except in ex cathedra). Stephen of Dora had been before appointed as vicar in the East, but he had by error been informed only of his duty to depose heretical bishops, and not that he was authorized to substitute orthodox bishops in their place. The pope now gave this commission to John, Bishop of Philadelphia in Palestine, who was ordered to appoint bishops, priests, and deacons in the name of the patriarch; and Marcus, Archbishop of Alexandria, sent letters to these patriarchates, and to Peter, who seems to have been governor, asking him to support his vicar; this Peter was a friend and correspondent of St. Maximus. The pope deposed John, Archbishop of Thessalonica, and declared the appointments of Macarius of Antioch and Peter of Alexandria to be null and void. Constans retaliation by having St.
Martin kidnapped at Rome, and taken a prisoner to Constantinople. The saint refused to accept the Eptheas, after which he burned in the Chalcis and died a martyr in the Crimea in March, 655 (see MARTIN I, Porz). St. Maximus (662), his disciple the monk Anastasius (also 662), and another Anastasius, a papal envoy (666), died of ill-treatment, martyrs to their orthodox and devotion to the Apostolic See.

On 26th March, 667, Macarius was arrested and tortured at Constantinople, the patriarch Paul was dying. "Alas, this will increase the severity of my judgment," he exclaimed to the emperor, who paid him a visit; and Constanza was induced to spare the pope's life for the moment. At Paul's death Pyrrhus was restored. His successor Peter sent an ambiguous letter to Pope Boniface, saying that he would accept the orthodoxy and a heretic in the See of Rome (see ANASTASIUS I, Pope). The Council had set the example of condemning dead writers, who had died in Catholic communion, but George suggested that his dead predecessors might be spared, and only their teaching anathematized. The legates might have saved the name of Honorius also had they agreed to this, but they evidently had directions from Rome to make no objection to his condemnation if it seemed necessary. The final dogmatic decree contains the decisions of the five preceding general councils, condemns the Euthus and the Type, and heretics by name, including Honorius, and "greets with uplifted hands" the letters of Pope Agatho and his council (see ANASTASIUS II, Pope). The address to the emperor, which was composed by all the bishops, had followed Agatho, and he the Apostolic teaching. "With us fought the prince of the Apostles, for to assist us we had his imitator and the successor to his chair. The ancient city of Rome professed you a divinely written confession and caused the daylight of dogmas to rise by the Western parchment. And the ink shone, and you, Agatho, Peter, Chicago, and you, Rome, were voted with the Almighty who reigns with you." A letter to the pope was also signed by all the Fathers. The emperor gave effect to the decree in a lengthy edict, in which he echoes the decisions of the council, adding: "These are the teachings of the voices of the Gospels and the Apostles, these are the doctrines of Holy Synods and of decrees of the four councils, these have been preserved untainted by Peter, the rock of the faith, the head of the Apostles; in this faith we live and reign." The emperor's letter to the pope is full of such expressions; as for example: "Glory be to God, Who does wondrous things, Who has kept safe the Faith among you unharmed. For how should He not do so in that rock on which He founded His Church, and prophesied that the gates of hell, all the embattlements of heretics, should not prevail against it? From it, as from the vault of heaven, the word of the true confession flashed forth," etc. But St. Agatho, a worker of many miracles, was dead, and did not receive the letter, so that it fell to St. Leo II to perform the council's wish and send it to the West after an incomplete but deplorable scheme.

It would seem that in 687 Justinian II believed that the sixth council was not fully enforced, for he wrote to Pope Conon that he had assembled the papal envoys, the patriarchs, metropolitans, bishops, the senates and civil officials and representatives of his various armies, and made them sign the original acts which had recently been discovered. In 711 the throne was seized by Philippicus Bardanes, who had been the pupil of Abbot Stephen, the disciple "or rather leader" of Macarius of Antioch. He restored to the diptychs Sergius, Honorius, and the other heretics condemned by the council; he burned the acts (but privately, in the palace), he deposed the Patriarch Cyrus, and exiled some persons who refused to subscribe a rejection of the council. He fell, 4 June, 713, and orthodoxy was restored by Anastasius II (713–15). Pope Constantine had refused to recognize Bardanes. The intruder patriarch, John VI, wrote him a long letter of apology, explaining that he had submitted to him at his request, according to asserting in many words the headship of Rome over the universal Church. This was the last of Mono-

The chief ancient authorities for our knowledge of the Mono-

To be continued.
thelita are the acts of the Lateran synod and of the sixth council, the works of St. Maximus Confessor and Anastasius Sinaita, and the Collectanea of Anastasius Bibliothecarius. Of modern works only a few need be specially mentioned: Comenius, Ausdorium novum, II (Historia Monasticarum et Dissertatio apol. pro actis VI synodi (Paris, 1648); Peregrinus, De Incarnatione, VII (1671); Shute, Hist. of Tunstall, V (Eng. tr.).


JOHN CHAPMAN.

Monreale, Archdiocese of, in the province of Palermo, Sicily, on the skirts of Mount Caputo. The city is built in a commanding situation over the port of Monreale, which is a pleasure resort of the Norman kings, to whom it owes its foundation. In 1167 William II built there the church of Santa Maria Nuova, with its adjoining monastery for the Benedicines of Cava dei Tirreni—

the most superb monastic building of the Benedictine Order in Europe, famous for its cloister and its graceful Moresque colonnade. At the present time only the lower portion of the convent is in the possession of the monks. The church (now the cathedral) is the noblest in Sicily, though the portico of its façade has been restored in a style not in harmony with the remainder of the building. Its bronze doors, the work of Bonanno di Pisa (1180), are notable, as are also the ara-besques of the portals.

The interior has three naves, and the columns of Egyptian marble have foiled and figured capitals, each different from the others. The apse and the lateral walls are covered with beautiful mosaics, representing scenes from the Old and New Testaments. The high altar and the side altars are decorated with sheets of silver (seventeenth century), and, in a chapel to its right, are the tombs of William I the Wicked and of William II. The chapel of Saint Benedict contains sculptures by Marabitti (eighteenth century). In 1811 a fire destroyed the roof, which was restored in a way to leave the rafters exposed to view. On the mountain beyond the city is the monastery of San Martino of the Cassinese Benedictines, whose church is rich in works of art; farther on is the castle of San Benedetto, built by the Saracens. In 1174 the abbey of Monreale was declared a "pulera nullius"; two years later its abbots were vested with the title and jurisdiction of a bishop, and in 1182 he became the metropolitan of Catania and of Syracuse. At first the archbishops were elected by the monks, but were not always Benedictines; since 1275, however, the election has been reserved to itself by the Holy See. In time Girgenti and Caltagirone also became suffragans to Monreale; but Syracuse, in 1844, and Catania, in 1860, became archiepiscopal sees. The former having become the Metropolitan and the latter the See of Caltanissetta (1860), which see and Girgenti are now its only suffragans. Among the archbishops of this see have been Cardinal Giovanni Proccamazza (1278); Cardinal Aussio Despug de Podio (1458); Cardinal Pompeo Colonna (1531); Cardinal Ippolito de' Medici (1532); Alessandro Farnese (1538); Ludovico de Torres (1564), founder of the seminary; Cardinal Vitaliano Vincenzi (1670); Cardinal Traian d'Acquaviva d'Aragona (1739). From 1775 to 1802 Monreale and Palermo were united. The archdiocese has 30 parishes with 228,600 inhabitants; 352 secular and 66 regular priests; 26 convents of men and one of women; three educational institutes for male students and three for girls.

Cappelletti, Chiese d'Italia, XXI (Venice, 1857); Lelio, Historia della chiesa di Monreale (Rome, 1860).

U. BENIGNI.

Monroe, James, soldier, convert, b. in Albemarle county, Virginia, 6 Sept., 1799; d. at Orange, New Jersey, 29 Sept., 1830. He was the son of Andrew a brother of President James Monroe, and greatly resembled his illustrious uncle. After the usual course at the U. S. Military Academy at West Point, he graduated in 1815, and was commissioned a lieutenant of artillery. In the war with the Algerian pirates he was wounded, 17 June, 1815, while directing the guns of the frigate "La Guerrière" in a battle off the coast of Gata, Spain. As an aide to General Scott he served during 1817-22, and did garrison duty as a first lieutenant of the 4th Artillery on 20 Sept., 1832, when he resigned from the army. Settling in New York he entered public life, being elected to the Board of Aldermen, 1833-35, and to Congress, 1839-41. He was nominated to Congress also in 1846, but the election being contested and a new election ordered he declined to run again. In 1850-52 he was a member of the New York legislature, and then retired from public life on the death of his wife. Previous to the outbreak of the Civil War he was much sought by speeches and personal influence to prevent the secession of his native State, Virginia. All through the war he was a staunch upholder of the Union. His brother Andrew F. Monroe, b. at Charlottesville, Va., 5 March, 1824, after graduating at the U. S. Naval Academy served during the Mexican War, and while on a naval expedition to China, in 1853, also became a convert. He joined the Society of Jesus in 1854 and was ordained priest in 1860. He was for a number of years one of the faculty of St. Francis Xavier's College, New York, where he died 2 Aug., 1872.


THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Monsebré, Jacques-Marie-Louis, celebrated pulpit orator, b. at Blois, France, 10 Dec., 1827; d. at Havre, 21 Feb., 1907. He was ordained as a secular priest 15 June, 1851, but soon felt he had a religious vocation. On the thirty-first of July, 1851, the feast of St. Ignatius, he celebrated his first Mass and thought seriously of entering the Society of Jesus. Four days later, however, the feast of St. Dominic, he decided to become a Dominican and immediately
wrote a letter of application to Père Lacordaire. He had to wait four years for release from the diocese, as the bishop had received authorization a year earlier to see to withholding that long his permission for newly ordained priests to enter a religious order. In May, 1855, he received his dismissions, entered the novitiate at Flavigny, received the habit on the thirty-first of the same month and one year later made his simple profession. A few days later he was sent to the house of studies at Chalais, where he spent a year in solitude and prayer. In the winter he was appointed to preach the Lenten sermons in the church of St. Ni- sier, at Lyons, where he gave the first indication of that eloquence which was later to illuminate all France. After preaching the Lenten sermons in Lyons, Monsabré was assigned to the convent of St. Thomas, in Paris, where he began to give conferences. After interrupting this ministry for several years he took it up again. In the Advent of 1867 he gave conferences in the convent church. He preached then for a number of years in the principal cities of France, Belgium, and even in London, conducting retreats, novenas, and triduums. His reputation, however, was really first made by the course of Advent sermons which he preached in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, Paris, in 1869, as successor of the unfortunate Carmelite, Père Hyacinthe Loysen. The success of these conferences brought the invitation to preach the Lenten sermons in Notre Dame in 1870, succeeding Père Félix de la Société de Jesus. During the siege of Paris by the Prussian troops, the conferences at Notre Dame were interrupted. On the capitulation of Metz, Monsabré preached from one of its pulpits. Meanwhile the Archbishop of Paris, Monsignor Dar- boy, had fallen a victim to the Commune and was succeeded by Monsignor Guibert, who lost no time in inviting Monsabré to occupy the pulpit of his cathedral. From this time on, Père Monsabré preached in the Cathedral of Notre Dame for twenty years and proved himself a worthy successor of Bossuet, Lacordaire and all the other great preachers whom the French Church has produced. He conceived and executed the logical plan of expounding the whole of Catholic dogmatic theology. Not often, perhaps never before, did a preacher succeed in holding so large an audience completely under the sway of his eloquence for so long a time. The classic and elegant form of Monsabré's discourses attracted the educated class of France. His intense love of souls andapoietical zeal made his discourses move with life, and his clear and profoundly theological mind enabled him to shed light even upon the most abstruse tenets of the faith, while his earnest and impassioned appeals to all the noblest impulses of man always met with an enthusiastic response. Monsabré's published works consist of forty-eight volumes, of the Exposition du Dogme Catholique; and popular exposition of Catholic dogma. In 1890 he preached the Advent sermons in Rome. In 1891 he gave the same course in Toulouse. On the death of Monsignor Freppel, Bishop of Angers, he was invited to fill the vacancy in the Chamber of Deputies, but declined. In 1871 he was sent to the General Chapter of the Congregation of his province and in 1898 to that of Avila as Definitor. His apostolic labours closed with the magnificent oration delivered at Reims on the occasion of the fourteenth centenary of the baptism of Clovis, King of the Franks. Since 1903 he lived in retirement. In that year the Dominican convent in which he lived was suppressed by the government, and he was obliged to take refuge in a modest little home in which he died.

L'Annee Dominicaine, April, 1907, 146; July, 1907, 289; The Rosary Magazine, XXX, 459.

JOSEPH SCHOEDER.

**Monsieur** (from mon, "my" and seigneur, "elder" or "lord", like Lat. senior), a French honorific appellation, etymologically corresponding to the English "my lord", and the Italian **monsignore**. It is, after all, nothing but the French monsieur; but, while the latter has become current as applied to every man who is in good society, Monsignore has retained its honorific force. In ecclesiastical usage it is reserved for bishops and archbishops, and is chiefly employed when speaking or writing to them. It is used before the name (thus abridged: Mgr Dupanloup). Formerly it was not prefixed to the title of dignity, but it is now, the term Monsignore is also used as the equivalent of the Italian Monsignore, and as the latter title is given to Roman prelates, some confusion results; in Italy, however, no inconvenience arises from this usage as in that country bishops have the title of Excellenza, i. e., Excellency. In France, only the Archbishop of Reims, as legatus natus, has the title of Excellency (see Monsignor).

HÉRICOURT, Les lois ecclésiastiques de France, E. V. 22.

A. BOUDINON.

**Monsell, William, Baron Emly, b. 21 Sept., 1812; d. at Tervoe, Co. Limerick, Ireland, 20 April, 1894.** His father was William Monsell of Tervoe; his mother, Olivia, daughter of Sir John Walsh of Ballykilcavan. He was educated at Winchester (1826-1830) and Oriel College, Oxford, but he left the university without proceeding to a degree. As his father had died in 1822 he succeeded to the family estates on coming of age and was a popular landlord, the more so as he was resi- dent. In 1836 he married Anna Maria Quin, daugh- ter of the second Earl of Dunraven, but there was no issue of the marriage. After her death in 1836 he married Bertha, youngest daughter of the Comte de Martigny (1857), by whom he had one son and one daughter. In 1847 he was returned to Parliament as member for the County of Limerick in the Liberal interest and represented the constituency till 1874. In 1850 he became a Catholic and thereafter took a prominent part in Catholic affairs, especially in Parliament. As a friend of Wiseman, Newman, Montalambert, W. G. Ward, and other eminent Catholics, he was inti- mately acquainted with the various interests of the Church, and his parliamentary advocacy was often of great advantage to the hierarchy. In 1867 he was successful and filled many offices. He was clerk of the ordinance from 1852 to 1857; was appointed privy councillor in 1855; was vice-president of the board of trade in 1866; under-secretary for the colonies, 1868-1870; postmaster-general, Jan., 1871, to Nov., 1873. Finally he was raised to the peerage as Baron Emly on 12 Jan., 1874. He lost much of his popularity in Ireland during his later years, owing to his opposition to the land league and to the Home Rule movement. His work being chiefly parliamentary, he wrote little, but published some articles in the "Home and Foreign Review" and a "Lecture on the Roman Question" (1869).

MONSIGNOR


EDWIN BURTON.

MONSIGNOR (dominus meus; monseigneur, My Lord).

As early as the fourteenth century it was the custom to address Monsignor as His Highness or as the title Monsignore or Monsignore. In the intercourse of seculars, either of equals or of superiors with inferiors, there was no fixed rule. Until the seventeenth century French nobles demanded from their subjects and dependents the title of Monsigneur. In international intercourse two titles gradually won general recognition as the eldest brother of the King of France (if not his presumptive) and "Monsigneur" for the Dauphin, or eldest son of the French king, who was also crown prince, or for whatever male member of the family was recognized as his presumptive to the throne. Actually all Bourbon pretenders assume this title as a matter of course, e.g., the late Don Carlos Duke of Madrid, his son Don Jaime, the Count of Caserta, the Duke of Orleans, etc. Moreover, the custom often obtains, especially in Spain, France, and Italy, of extending by courtesy the title Monsieur to the adult members of the Bourbons and closely allied families usually addressed as "Your Royal Highness". In official usage, however, this would scarcely be the case. To a great extent the title is assumed by persons of civil rank, and, as far as the author of this article is aware, no one else lays claim to it. Among ecclesiastics the title Monsignore implies simply a distinction bestowed by the highest ecclesiastical authority, either in conjunction with an office or merely titular. In any case it bears with it a certain prestige. To counteract the widely spread conception we may state here that the pope does not bestow the title Monsignore, but a distinction of some sort to which this title is attached. Accordingly it is quite incorrect to say that any one has been appointed a Monsignor by the pope. If we may be permitted to use a comparison, Monsignor in the spiritual order corresponds to the word officer in the military. The highest general and the youngest lieutenant are equally officers, and the most venerable patriarch bears the title Monsignore as well as the simplest honorarv chaplain. Thus among prelates, both higher and lower, it is no badge of distinction except as it denotes in a very general way an elevation above their fellows. The chief title of Monsignor, who are familiari summi pontificis, those who, by virtue of some distinction bestowed upon them, belong as it were to the family and the retinue of the Holy Father. These familiari are entitled to be present in the cappella pontificia (when the pope celebrates solemn Mass), and to participate in all public celebrations of the pontiff or ecclesiastics in character, at which the pope, the cardinals, and the papal retinue assist. It is assumed that they will appear in the robes corresponding to their respective offices.

Up to 1630, when Urban VIII reserved the title Eminence (Eminentissimus) for the exclusive use of cardinals, the latter bore the title Monsignore in common with the other prelates of high rank, and in France it is still customary to address a cardinal as Monsignore. In all other languages this usage has completely disappeared, so that, practically speaking, cardinals are no longer to be counted among the Monsignori. All other prelates, from patriarchs downwards, receive a personal distinction or are archbishops, bishops, or mere abbots (among secular clergy only), have a right to this title. The fact that it has lapsed in usage in many countries, so far as these are concerned, does not affect the question. Instead of addressing patriarchs as "Vostra Beattitudine", archbishops as "Your Grace", bishops as "My Lord", abbots as "Gracious Lord", one may without any breach of etiquette salute all equally as Monsignor. Following is a list of official and honorary prelates exclusive of those already mentioned: (1) the college of the seven official prothonotaries Apostolic de numero participantium (of the number of participants); (2) the supernumerary prothonotaries (in such number as a College of the three patriarchal basilicas of Rome, (b) the prelate canons of certain cathedral churches, while in office; (3) prothonotaries Apostolic ad instar participantium (after the manner of participants), including, (a) prelate canons of certain cathedral churches, as above, (b) prothonotaries appointed ad personam (in individual cases). In the Church of Rome, the Sacra Rota Romana, these are officials or delegated prelates; (5) the college of official clergies of the Apostolic Camera; (6) all other prelates not members of any of the above named colleges, the numerous domestic prelates scattered throughout the world. All the above-mentioned prelates are entitled to wear the mantelletta and rochet; (7) the private chambers constituting the official college of pontifical masters of ceremonies; (8) the official private chambers known as participantes; (9) the supernumerary private chambers (camerieri segreti supranumerari), of whom there are several hundred in various parts of the Catholic world; (10) the honorary chaplain is no longer a supernumerary, but a private chaplain, who is not received in their official capacity in the papal court when held at Rome; (12) the official college of private chaplains; (13) the honorary private chaplains; (14) the honorary chaplains extra urbem (see 11); (15) the private clerics; and (16) the official college of private chaplains. In the case of certain of the above-mentioned classes the honorary office (together with the corresponding title and distinctive dress) lapses at the death of the pope. This is particularly true with regard to the supernumerary private and honorary Chambers. The reason for this is self-evident. It is possible to be prothonotary of the Holy Roman Church or cleric of the Apostolic Camera, etc., but one cannot be chamberlain to the Holy Roman Church, but simply chamberlain to a particular pontiff, whose death dissolves the relation between the two. Unless the newly elected pontiff renews the appointment the former chamberlain returns to his former rank. He does not HAVE the right to the rank of clergy. Nor is there inconsistency in the fact that only a few may chamberlains continue in the papal service immediately after a papal election. Their services are necessary to the new pontiff and he naturally recognizes such persons, which amounts practically to a tacit appointment. It is regrettable that occasionally persons thus distinguished by the pope either assume a dress arranged according to their own notion or being dissatisfied with the dress conceded, appropriate that of a higher office. The farther a country is from Rome, the more apt are such unfortunate things to occur. It should be noted that members of religious orders may use the title "Monsignor" only if they are bishops or archbishops. All other ranks of the prelacy are of course closed to them, if we except the Master of the Sacred Palace, who being always a Dominican, is one of the prelates, but may not be addressed as Monsignor. The custom introduced in the sixteenth century of giving the general religious orders the title "Monsignor" was of short duration.

Faul Maria Baumgarten.

Paul de Curci Romana (Paris, 1880); Bannen, Die römische Curie (Münster, 1954); Hennepet, Urbis et Orbis (London, 1890), 339-69; Sicken, Ein Buche von Familienschutz und Pia IV. Mitteilungen des Instituts für römische Geschichtsforschung, suppl. vol. IV (Innsbruck, 1983). See also London Tablet, March 12, 26, April 9, 16, May 14, 21, 1910.
PIETÀ

BARTOLOMMEO MONTAGNA, VATICAN GALLERY, ROME
Monstrat, Enguerrand de, a French chronicler, b. about 1300 or 1305; d. in July, 1453. He was probably a native of Monstrelet, a village situated in the present department of the Somme. His life was spent at Cambrai in the service of Philip, Duke of Burgundy, who was also Count of Flanders. The cartulary of the church of Cambrai proves that in 1348 he was the canons and the dean of the cathedral of Cambrai. He was of the patronymic of the gavennus, which was paid to Philip by the holders of the churches in return for the protection which he gave them. From 20 June, 1436, to January, 1440, he was bailiff (bailli) of the chapter of Cambrai and he was provost (provost) of Cambrai from 1440 to 1447. As lieutenant of the governor, as such it was his duty to collect in the Cambrais the called "gavenne," which was paid to Philip by the tenants of the churches, of which the treasury; as such he became bailiff of Walcourt on 12 March, 1445, an office which he held until his death. Monstrelet, who lived through an agitated period, did not take personal part in the conflicts of the day. To him, perhaps, applies a letter of pardon granted in 1424 to a certain Enguerrand de Monstrelet by Henry V of England.

The "Chronicle," according to this letter, had committed certain highway robberies, believing that he had a sufficient excuse because he robbed the Armagnacs, enemies of the Duke of Burgundy. However this may be, his attitude in his "Chronicle" is that of an impartial narrator. He speaks of himself but once, when he relates in the first chapter of the second book of the "Chronicle" of how he was present at the interview which Joan of Arc, taken prisoner before Compiègne, had with Philip of Burgundy; and with his usual sincerity and modesty he declares that he does not remember well the words of the duke. The "Chronicle" of Monstrelet opens with a mention of the coronation of Charles VI, which took place in 1380; but its true starting-point is Easter-day, 1400, when the history of Froissart begins, and it extends down to 1444. While Froissart confined himself almost entirely to events which took place in France, Monstrelet deals also with other countries, giving many documents. He treats not only of military history, but also of interesting details of great religious events such as the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle. We feel, moreover, that the ravages of war and the sufferings of the people therefrom cause him real pain, and he is not over-enthusiastic about great feats of arms. He is occasionally guilty of chronological errors and confusing proper names. For the literary form, the book is well written; the narrative is often heavy, monotonous, diffuse, and lacks the charm of Froissart. In the early editions of Monstrelet—which of the first, published at Paris towards 1470 in three folio volumes, goes back almost to the invention of printing—the chronicles contain a third book, relating the events which took place between April, 1444, and the death of the Duke of Burgundy in 1467. But the "Néologe des Cordeliers de Cambrai" and the "Memoriaux" of Jean le Robert prove that Monstrelet died in July, 1453, so that all this book could possibly have been written by him. Furthermore, the history of years 1444-53, given in this third book, is so brief that it contrasts singularly with the prolixity of the first two books. It is, besides, much more partial to the House of Burgundy than the first two, and, in contrast to these, scantly contains a single document. Whereas the first two books are preceded by a preface, the third has none; finally, the historian, Matthieu d'Escouy, who belongs to his own chronicle, states that Monstrelet's "Chronicle" ends at 20 March, 1444. Modern scholars unanimously accept the statement of Matthieu d'Escouy and hold that this so-called third book was not written by Monstrelet.

Chronique d'Enguerrand de Monstrelet, ed. of Arcq (6 vols., Paris, 1857-63); Chronique de Matthieu d'Escouy, ed. by Brancas (Venice, 1648); Crowe and Crowe, History of Italy (London, 1891).
Montagnais, Quebec, French for "Mountain-chiefs", the collective designation of a number of bands speaking dialects of a common language of Algonquian stock, and ranging along the shores of the St. Lawrence River and Gulf, from about the St. Maurice River to below Cape Whittle, and inland to about the main divide at the heads of the rivers. They are closely allied and considerably intermixed with the cognate Nascapée (q.v.), who wander generally farther inland in the interior of the Labrador Peninsula, but frequent the same trading and mission stations along the St. Lawrence. Among the Montagnais bands or tribes, when Champlain first met them at the mouth of the Saguenay, in 1603, they were the Attikameg, or "Whitefish", about the head of the St. Maurice; the Kakouchac, or "Porcupine", on Lake St. John; the Tadousac about the mouth of the Saguenay; the Bersamite, farther east; the Papinchois, north of the last-named; the Oumamiekew, farther east, along the St. Lawrence; the Chissedeck, about the Bay of Seven Islands. They were traders, cultivators or potter, subsisting entirely by hunting and fishing. Polygamy was common, with divorce at will, descent being held in the female line. Their dwellings, as well as their canoes, were of birch bark or brushwood. They were good tempered, patient, peaceable, honest, and musical under instruction.

The discovery of Christianity at Tadousac, a French trading post, regular missionary work was begun among them by the Recollet, Fr. Jean d'Albeau, in 1615. Ten years later the Jesuits were invited to help. Fr. Jean du Quen, S.J., established the mission at Tadousac in 1640; later, stations were erected by the Jesuits at Gaspe Bay, St. Lawrence, and from them to the St. Lawrence, and a smallpox epidemic, in 1670, greatly reduced them, practically destroying the Attikamek. In consequence, the Montagnais began to resort to the mission at Sillery, near Quebec. The whole tribe is now civilized and Catholic, with the exception of forty-eight officially reported (1899) as Anglicans. They are still dependent on the fur trade for subsistence, but also work at lumbering and the making of canoes, snow-shoes, and mocassins. A few of them are successful farmers. Apart from drunkenness, they are moral, devout, industrious, and said to be "improving every year". Their largest settlements are at Pointe Bleue, on the west shore of Lake St. John, on the Lot, and at Caribou. Their total number is probably at least 2500. Father Pierre Laure, S.J. (d. 1738), compiled a grammar, dictionary, and other works in the Montagnais language, most of which are still in manuscript.

Montagnais, Michel-Eugene de, writer, b. at the chateau of Montaigne, in Perigord, France, on Feb. 15, 1533. His grandfather had been a Bordeaux merchant of wines, salt-fish, etc., and it was he who purchased the estate of Montaigne. His first entry at the age of six and a half he was sent to the College of Guise at Bordeaux, where he remained seven years. Little is known of the ensuing years. It is believed that he studied logic and dialectics for two years at the Bordeaux Faculty of Arts, with Marc-Antoine de Muret as tutor. He afterwards studied law, probably at Poitiers, and at 23 set out for France. Having become counsellor at the Cour des Aides of Perigord, he was soon incorporated like his colleagues in the Parliament of Bordeaux. But the new counsellor had no liking for his profession, and he was often absent from the Parliament. From 1551 to 1553 he attended the court. From 1559 he knew La Babelle, his cousin, and the latter the first of Montaigne's counsellors in the Parliament of Perigord and his elder by six years; but death soon separated them (1563).

Two years later Montaigne married Françoise de la Chassaigne, the daughter of a parliamentary advocate. They had five daughters, only one of whom survived him. In 1570 at the age of thirty-seven he sold his estate, and retired to his chateau of Montaigne. For four years he did not leave his chateau. In 1574, he went to Venice and reached Rome, the end of his journey, where he received letters of citizenship. During his absence he had been made mayor of Bordeaux, which office he held for four years (1581–85), his duties coming to an end when the pest broke out. Montaigne being absent from the town did not feel obliged to return to it. In 1588 he published a new edition of his Essays, corrected and augmented by a third book. He continued to revise his work until his death. In 1595 Mlle de Gournay, the young woman who at the age of twenty-two became his enthusiastic admirer, and whom he called his daughter, issued a new edition, in which she inserted the revisions and additions which have since been made (1597). It is impossible to analyse the Essays. They are a long conversation in which the author sets forth his opinions and his reflections.
His memories are the result of his personal experience and especially of his very extensive reading. According to his own expression he himself is "the subject of his own thought" inasmuch as he is doubtless the fact that in depicting himself he often depicts human nature in general. He is a charming conversationalist, a writer full of pith and colour, artlessness, grace, and life. His literary merits add to the dangers of his book, which is deliberately lascivious and as a whole openly favourable to the Pyrrhonians. He has even written that which is "black" and "shackled". However, on the other hand, he thanked "our sovereign Creator for having stayed our trust on the everlasting foundation of His holy word". He also said that outside of the path pointed out by the Church reason is "lost, embarrased, shackled".

In a letter he relates in a Christian manner the Christian death of his friend La Boëtie. He himself, as soon as he became ill, would not send for a priest, and in his last illness did not depart from this custom. Pasquier relates that "he caused Mass to be said in his chamber and when the priest came to the elevation the poor gentleman raised himself as well as he could in bed with hands joined and thus raised his soul to God". He died therefore in a supreme act of faith.

Bonneton, Montalembert et ses édits (1902); Guerin, Montalembert (1899); Champion, Introduction aux Études de Montalembert (1900).

Georges Berthier.

Montalcino, Diocese of (Ilcinensis).—Montalcino is a small town about twenty miles from Siena, some 1900 feet above sea-level and over-looked by the Ombrone, and the Umbrone. In the neighbourhood are mineral springs and chalk quarries. In the ninth century it belonged to the abbey of San Antonio. In 1212 it was taken by the Sienese, but soon afterwards the inhabitants declared themselves in favour of Florence. In 1200, after the battle of Montaperti, it once more fell into the hands of the Sienese, who made it a strong fortress. It was besieged by the imperial troops; in 1555, when Siena was annexed by Tuscany, Pietro Strozzi with the aid of French troops endeavoured to set up a free republic at Montalcino, but in 1556 the French were obliged to retreat and the town submitted to Cosimo I.Earthquakes have not been unfrequent, the last being in 1908. Montalcino belonged to the Diocese of Arezzo; in the twelfth century the abbots of San Antonio had quasi-episcopal jurisdiction over it; in 1402 it was made a diocese and united with the See of Pienza, which, however, became in 1563 a separate diocese. Its first bishop was Giovanni Cinigghi; Francesco Piccolomini (Pius Ill) administered the see at one time. The diocese is directly subject to the Holy See; it has 34 parishes and 39,130 souls, 1 convent for men and two for women.

Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, XVIII (Venice, 1857).

U. Benigni.

Montalembert, Charles-Forbes-René, Comte de, b. in London, 15 April, 1810; d. in Paris 13 March, 1886. He was the son of a Scotch Protestant family and had made many important journeys to India, which he related in the four volumes of his "Oriental Memoirs", published in 1813; he also wrote in 1810 a volume entitled "Reflections on the character of the Hindus and the necessity of converting them to Christianity". Montalembert's mother, converted by Abbe Busson and Pere MacCarthy, made her abjuration of heresy to Cardinal de Latil in 1822. The early years of Montalembert's life were passed in England; afterwards he studied at the Lycee Bourbon and at the College Sainte-Barbe at Paris, where out of twenty pupils in the sixteenth year of their age hardly one was a practical Catholic. At Sainte-Barbe young Montalembert made a friend of Léon Cornet, who was also a Catholic, and the letters the boys exchanged in their seventeenth year have remained famous. At that early age Montalembert wrote: "Would it not be a splendid thing to show that religion is the mother of liberty!", a phrase which was to become the motto of his whole life. In 1829 he wrote to Rio: "My age, my tastes, my future call me to support the new ideal; but my religious beliefs and moral emotions cause me to lament bitterly the past days, the ages of faith and self-sacrifice. If Catholicism is to triumph it must have liberty as its ally and tributary subject!" Soon after its establishment in 1830 Augustin de Meaux, with the motto (borrowed from Champfleury): "Civil and Religious Liberty for the whole world", the review "Le Correspondant" had Montalembert as a contributor. In September and October, 1830, he travelled in Ireland, where he met O'Connell; he was thinking of assisting the cause for which O'Connell was struggling by writing a history of Ireland, when he learned that the House of Commons had passed the Irish Emancipation Act.

While he was in Ireland he received the prospectus of the new paper "L'Avenir", founded in October, 1830, by Lamennais. On 26 Oct., 1830, he wrote to Lamennais: "All that I know, and all that I am able to do I lay at your feet!" On 5 Nov., 1830, he met Lamennais in Paris, and on 12 November at Lamennais's house he met Lacordaire. At times, Montalembert had to smooth over some of the risky things Lamennais allowed himself to be led into writing against the royalists in the paper; on the other hand he was engaged in controversy with Lacordaire, whose idea of aristocracy and the past glory of the French nobles he considered too narrow. It was Montalembert who, the day after the sack of St. Germain l'Auxerrois by the Parisian mob, published in "L'Avenir" an eloquent article on the Cross of Christ, which has ruled over the destinies of the modern world." He especially distinguished himself in the "L'Avenir" by his campaign in favour of freedom for Ireland and Poland, and for these he received the congratulations of Victor Hugo and Alfred de Vigny. In 1831 he thought of going to Poland and joining the
When the "Agence générale pour la défense de la liberté religieuse" (Central committee for the safeguarding of religious liberty) founded by the last number of "L’Avenir", had solemnly declared war on the monopoly of the French University by opening a primary school (9 May, 1831), Montalembert was indicted. As at this time by his father's death on 20 June, 1831, he became a peer of France, he demanded that he be tried by the House of Peers; and the famous "Free School Case" was tried before that assembly, 19 and 20 September, 1831.

The speech delivered by Montalembert on that occasion was a gem of eloquence. The trial ended in his condemnation to a fine of one hundred francs; but his eloquence succeeded in calling public attention to the question of freedom of teaching, which was destined not to be solved until 1850. The name of "L'Avenir" appeared (15 November, 1831), Montalembert accompanied Lacordaire and Lamennais to Rome. While in March, 1832, Lacordaire divined the wishes of Gregory XVI, and returned to France, Montalembert persisted in remaining in Rome with Lamennais, who insisted on a public decision on the pope concerning "L'Avenir". It was not until July that they left Rome, and the Eucyelic "Mirari Vos", which overtook them at Munich, was a cause of great sorrow to them. Montalembert submitted at once, and when early in 1833 Lamennais announced his intention of again taking up his editorial work, excepting the field of theology, and concerning himself only with social and political questions, Montalembert did all he could to dissuade him from so imprudent a step. When Gregory XVI by his Brief dated 5 October, 1833, found fault with the "long and violent frente" Montalembert had written for Mickiewicz's "Livre des Pelerins Polonais" and when this attack on the Holy See was condemned by the Holy See to Rossi, whom Guizot had sent to Rome, had brought about the partial dispersion of the French Jesuits, he loudly expressed his surprise and sorrow. "You are our father, our support, our friend", wrote Père de Ravigan to him. In the House he, moreover, defended the interests of foreign Catholics; in 1843 at the synod of Lyons, again mentioned Guizot as to what France was doing to protect Christians in the East; in 1846 he questioned him concerning the massacres committed by Austria in Galicia, and the cruelties practised against the Poles of that province; on 11 January, 1848, he enthusiastically praised the hopes Pius IX held out to the poor people, when he said that France for the lukewarm support it gave the new pope against Metternich; on 14 January, 1848 in a speech on the Sonderbund, the finest, perhaps, he ever uttered, he impeached European radicalism, and proclaimed that France, in the face of Radicalism, was destined to uphold the flag and safeguard the rights of liberty." But it was especially to secure liberty of teaching (see France and Falloux du Courray) that Montalembert devoted his efforts. In 1839 he addressed an eloquent letter to Villemain, minister of public instruction, demanding that liberty; in 1841 under pressure from the episcopate, he compelled Villemain to withdraw a bill on education because it was not sufficiently liberal; in his pamphlet "Du Devoir des Catholiques dans la question de la liberté d'enseignement", published in 1843, he summoned the Catholics to take part in the struggle. On 16 April, 1844, in the House of Peers, he undertook the defence of the bishops who were attacked at the end of the year 1844, and he replied to Dupin, who demanded the punishment of the bishops: "We are the sons of the crusaders; and we shall never yield to the sons of Voltaire"; then again he took an active part in the discussion of the bill, which owing to Villemain's mental infirmity was abandoned. Between 1845 and 1846 he solicited donations among the laity for the support of religious education, and he succeeded in having 140 supporters of educational liberty elected as deputies in 1846. In 1847 he renewed the attack on the bill introduced by Salvandy and declared it unacceptable. The July monarchy fell before the question was settled. The Revolution of 1848 respected the rights of the Church and Pius IX, 26 March, 1848, wrote to Montalembert: "We gladly believe that it is in part owing to your eloquence, which has endeared your name to your generous countrymen, that no harm has been done to religion or its ministers".

Under the Second Republic Montalembert, in reply to Victor Hugo, who questioned the right of the Church to own property; in Dec., 1848, when ecclesiastical burial had been refused to Montalembert by Pius IX, declared amid the applause of two-thirds of the Constituent Assembly that the Church is "a mother, the mother of Europe, the mother of modern society". Once more he took up the struggle for liberty of education; in 1849, together...
with Dupanloup he was the chief instigator of the negotiations between the Catholics and a number of liberals such as Thiers, which resulted in spite of the sharp attacks of Louis Veulliot in the definitive grant of liberty of education by the Falloux Law. When in October, 1850, Montalembert went to Rome, Pius IX congratulated him, and caused him to be named "Romanus" by the municipality of Rome. After the Coup d'État, 2 Dec., 1851, in an open letter to the "Unvers", he invited the Catholics to rally to Louis Napoleon; this manifesto, which he afterwards regretted, was the result of an idea he had that it was unwholesome for Catholics to abstain from taking part in the destinies of the State. But when in 1852 he had appealed in vain to Louis Napoleon to abrogate the organic articles, to grant liberty of higher education, and freedom of association, he refused to enter the Senate.

He was deputy for Besançon to the legislature of 1852–1857, but failed to be re-elected in 1857 owing to the defection of many Catholic voters. He cut himself off entirely from Louis Veulliot and the "Unvers", which he thought adequate with too great complacency all the acts of the new government curtailing certain political liberties.

The break began in 1852 when Montalembert's pamphlet "Les Intérêts Catholiques au XIXe Siècle" was published by Dominique Guéranger and Louis Veulliot; it became more marked in 1855 when Montalembert, taking from Lenormant's hands the management of the "Correspondant", which had at the time only 672 subscribers, made that review an organ of the political opposition, and took up the side known as "liberal" in contradistinction to the views supported by Louis Veulliot. As an organ of the opposition "Le Correspondant" was often at odds with the imperial government: in 1858 an article Montalembert wrote entitled "Un débat sur l'inde au Parlement anglais" led to his prosecution, and in spite of the defence set up by Berryer and Dufaure, he was sentenced to three months' imprisonment, which the emperor remitted. In 1859 his article on "Pius IX et la France en 1849 et 1859", in which he attacked the partiality of the empire towards Italy and all the opponents of the temporal power, caused some dissiquit in court circles, and won for him the congratulations of Pius IX. His two letters to Cavour, Oct., 1890, and April, 1891, in which he attacked the centralising spirit of Garibaldi and took up the defence of the Holy See, drew from Pius IX the enthusiastic exclamation "Vivat, vivat! our dear Montalembert has surpassed himself!" But the hostility between the "Correspondant" and the "Univers" was growing, and in the heat of the struggle Montalembert wished to profit by the Congress of Belgian Catholics at Mechlin (August, 1863) to pour out his whole soul concerning the future of modern society and the Church.

His first speech aimed to show the necessity of Christianizing the democracy by accepting modern liberties. His second speech dealt with liberty of conscience, and the conclusion he drew was that the Church could be in perfect harmony with Protestant liberty and with the modern state which is founded on that liberty, and that everyone is free to hold that the modern state is to be preferred to the one which preceded it. The future Cardinal Pie, Bishop of Poitiers, the future Cardinal Ledochowski, Nuncio at Brussels, Mgr. Talbot, Chamberlain to Pius IX, Louis Veulliot, and the Jesuits who edited the "Clair Matin", were alarmed at these declarations. On the other hand Cardinal Sterck, Archbishop of Mechlin, the future Cardinals Guibert and Lavigerie, many well-known Paris Jesuits, such as Péres de Ponlevoy, Ouilvaint, Matignon, and especially Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans, who had supported him and worked up his defence. At the end of March, 1864, he received a letter from Cardinal Antonelli finding fault with the Mechi speeches. When, on 8 Dec., 1864, the Encyclical "Quanta Curas" and the Syllabus were issued, Montalembert resisted the advice given him by the Protestant Léon de Malleville to protest publicly against these pontifical documents as a political measure; and the commentary on the Syllabus which Dupanloup published, and Pius IX approved of, 4 Feb., 1865, met with his joyous adhesion.

When the Vatican Council drew near he feared that the council would infer from the Syllabus and define as articles of faith certain affirmative propositions concerning liberty and touching on the State. He encouraged the authors of the Coblenz manifest to doubt the infallibility question, and he drew up under the heading "Questions au futur concile" a great number of disquieting grievances which he circulated among the bishops. The three hundred pages he wished to insert in the "Correspondant" on the causes of Spanish decadence, and in which he made a lively attack on the "Civilta Cattolica", were refused by the "Correspondant", and so Montalembert broke off his connexion with that review.

His letter to the lawyer Lallemand, published in the "Gazette de France", 7 March, 1870, was intended to reconcile his former "ultramontanism" with his present state of feeling; which had justified Coblenzism. In that year he wrote of "The power which the lay theologians of absolutism had set up in the Vatican." The impression left by this letter, which Abbé Combatot in the pulpit of San Andrea della Valle styled a "satanic work", was still fresh in the mind of Pius IX, when Montalembert died, 13 March, 1870. Pius IX himself now a solution service to be held for him in the Ara Coeli; but a few days later he gave orders that an office should be sung in Santa Maria Traspontina, and he attended there himself in one of the barred galleries.

The letter (published very much later) which on 28 September, 1869, he wrote to M. Hyacinthe Loyson to dictate him from leaving the Church, in the opinion of M. Emile Ollivier "one of the most pathetic appeals that ever came from the human heart"; and the future Cardinal Perraud, when pronouncing the panegyric of Montalembert in the Sorbonne, could say that even his latest writings, however daring they might be, were filled with "a noble passion of love for the Church."

A member of the French Academy from 9 January, 1851, Montalembert was both an orator and a historian. As early as 1835 he had planned to write a life of St. Bernard. He was led to publish in 1860, under the title "Les Moines d'Occident", two volumes on the origin of monasticism; then followed three volumes on the monks in England; he died before he reached the period of St. Bernard. But he left among his papers, on the one hand, a manuscript entitled "Influence de l'ordre monastique sur la noblesse féodale et la société latine jusqu'à la fin du XIème siècle", and on the other a work on Gregory VII and the conflict of investitures; and these two MSS., published in 1877 and 1879, are a decided study. The bishop of Meaux, made up the sixth and seventh volume of the "Moines d'Occident". His work on "L'Avenir politique de l'Angleterre", published in 1856, drew a brilliant picture of the parliamentary institutions of England, and rejoced in the ascendant march of Catholicity in the British Empire.

Finally, Montalembert was one of the writers who did most to foster in Europe regard and taste for Gothic Art. His letter to Victor Hugo on "Vandalisme en France", published 1 March, 1833, made a strong impression everywhere, and helped to save many Gothic monuments from impending ruin. Auguste Rechensperger and the Catholics of Rheinland Prussia profited by the artistic lessons of Montalembert. In 1838 he addressed to the French clergy an
the eastern portion, and the confluents of the Columbia the western. The former is formed by the junction of the Jefferson, Madison, and Gallatin, the two last named having their source in the Yellowstone National Park and the other in the mountains in the extreme south-western part of the state. The main tributary of the Missouri, the Yellowstone, likewise takes its rise in the park, in a lake of the same name. Another tributary of the Missouri, the Milk River, has its origin in the north-western section of the state, which is noted for its scenic beauty. From the summit of the mountains there one may overlook a country within which are the head-waters of three great continental river-systems—the Mississippi-Missouri, the Saskatchewan, and the Columbia. This region has lately been made a national reservation under the name of Glacier Park. The Missouri traverses the state from Three Forks, named from its location at the confluence of the three rivers mentioned above, a distance of approximately 550 miles. The Yellowstone, following a course roughly parallel to the main stream, makes a waterway within Montana's borders 450 miles long. The Kootenai drains a portion of the extreme northwestern part of the state, but the great bulk of the western waters in that region comes south, by the Flathead, to meet with those from the southern portion which flow north and east. These two streams unite to form the Clark's Fork of the Columbia. The Flathead feeds and empties, in its course, Flathead Lake, the largest fresh-water lake between the Mississippi and the Pacific.

The climate is very similar in character throughout the state, except, of course, on the lofty mountains, at the extreme north, and in the summer—a providential condition, in consequence of which water for irrigation is supplied in comparative abundance in the period of drought. The extremes of temperature are not quite so great and rain falls somewhat more abundantly on the western slope of the mountains. The climate, except for brief periods in the winter season, is remarkably agreeable. In the northern part of the state the severity of the colder months is tempered by an occasional warm west wind, known as the chinook, which tempers the climate without bringing excessive moisture. A very low temperature is endured with much less discomfort than in regions where the atmosphere is more dense, the humidity greater, and the temperature at Helena is 65° (Fahr.) for the months of June, July, and August; 44° for September, October, and November; 22° for December, January, and February, and 41° for March, April, and May. The mean annual rainfall for the entire state, based on reports for ten years, is 15.57 inches.

The highest mountain in the state has an interesting history. About a third of a century before the Revolution, in 1742, it was visited by a party of French explorers headed by two young sons of Pierre Gauthier de Varennes de la Verendrye, on a quest for a river leading to the Pacific. They started from Fort La Reine, one of the most remote of a chain of posts, which the explorers called la Vérendrye had established in the wilderness north and west of Lake Superior in an effort to reach the western sea. The wanderings of the youthful adventurers led them from Fort La Reine on the Assini-
boine, west of Winnipeg, to the village of the Mandans on the Missouri River near the present city of Bismarck, North Dakota, whither their father had preceded them four years before. Thence, proceeding in a general southwesterly direction through the counties of Custer and Rosebud, they crossed the rivers falling into the Yellowstone until they reached the Big Horn Mountains, near or across the Wyoming line. Sixty-two years later, the exploration of Lewis and Clark gave to the world authentic information of the country. It followed the Missouri to the Three Forks, then ascended the Jefferson to its source in the Bitter Root range, and crossed the mountain barrier. Returning, the leaders traveled together until they reached the Big Blackfoot, a tributary of the Missouri. Here they parted, Lewis ascending that stream to its source, Clark going to the southwest to the river of the same name. The expedition descended the river near the mouth of the Cheyenne and set out over the plains with the aid of horses purchased from the Mandans. After proceeding some distance to the northeast, doubled less than twenty miles from the Missouri, Clark ascended the Missouri, taking the route followed in the construction of the Northern Pacific Railroad to the Yellowstone river near Livingston, and, descending that stream, rejoined his companion at its mouth.

The Astor expedition, which set out for the mouth of the Columbia in 1811, pursued the route which had been opened up by the Lewis and Clark party. By the 1830's the Blackfeet were on the Northern Pacific Railroad near the mouth of the Yellowstone. In 1832 the steamboat "Yellowstone" owned by the American Fur Company, which had absorbed its rival, ascended the Missouri to Fort Union, near the mouth of the river after which the company was named. The region east of the mountains was a part of the Louisiana Purchase, over which the United States acquired dominion by the Missouri Compromise. The western portion was constituted a part of the Oregon Territory. The conflicting claims of the United States and Great Britain to this country were not settled until 1846. Meanwhile hunters and trappers bearing allegiance to both nations overrun the country. A few homebuilders established themselves within the borders of the Oregon country. The history of the development of the commonwealth begins with the discovery of gold at Gold Creek and Bannack in 1862. The Alder Gulch placers were discovered in 1863, giving rise to Virginia City, and those of Last Chance Gulch in 1864, bringing Helena into existence. The story of the fabulous wealth of these deposits attracted a great multitude, who made the journey either by ox-teams from Omaha, or came up the river by boat to Fort Benton, which was established in 1846. Every promising gulch in the state was quickly prospected, many of them proving very remunerative. The source of the placer deposits was soon sought in the lead, and quarts-mining speedily began. The excitement was so great that the country was denominated as an incentive to those having some skill in agriculture to engage in ranching, and the fertile valleys of the Gallatin, the Deer Lodge, the Bitter Root, and the Prickly Pear were subjected to tillage. The abundant nutritious grasses of the plains, that had supported immense numbers of buffalo and antelope, and of the parks in the mountains, where deer and elk abounded, invited the pursuit of raising cattle, sheep, and horses.

Long before this period, however, as early as 1840, Father Peter J. De Smet, S.J., had come from St. Louis in response to an invitation conveyed by a delegation from the Flathead Indians to Christianize that tribe. He established St. Mary's Mission in the Bitter Root valley near the present town of Stevensville. In 1844 he founded the Mission of St. Ignatius in the midst of a beautiful valley, within what is now the Flathead Reservation. Father Nicholas Point preached to the Blackfeet in the winter of 1846-7, laying the foundations of St. Peter's Mission which however was not permanently established until 1858. Father A. Racalli, who shared the residence of St. Ignatius, the founder of St. Mary's, was called to that mission in 1845. The county in which it was located is named in his honour. The western part of the state was successively a part of Oregon Territory, Washington Territory, and Idaho Territory. The eastern portion became a part of the Louisiana Territory on the cession of the latter to Mexico, its seat being attached to various territories organized out of that region. But there was no organized government anywhere. Even after the rush consequent upon the gold discoveries, though nominally subject in those parts to the government of Idaho Territory, the constituted authorities were so remote that the people themselves administered a form of government in the manner of miners' courts and vigilance committees. In 1864 the Territory of Montana was organized with boundaries identical with those which now define the state. Hon. Sidney Edgerton was appointed governor. The first legislative assembly convened at Bangor on 12 December, 1864. The capital was held at Virginia City in 1866, from which place the capital was moved to Helena in 1874, the migrations of the seat of government indicating to some extent the variations in the centres of population. General Thomas Francis Meagher was appointed secretary of the territory in 1865 and, in the absence of the governor, assumed, under the law, the duties of that office, which he continued to discharge until his unfortunate death by drowning in 1867. Samuel McLean was the first delegate to Congress from the territory. The state was admitted to the Union by proclamation of President Harrison on 8 November, 1889, pursuant to an Act of Congress approved on 22 Feb., 1889, the constitution having been meanwhile framed and adopted.

In 1880 the Utah and Northern Railroad Company, subsequently merged in the Union Pacific system, built into Butte from Ogden. Three years later the Northern Pacific completed its line across the territory aided by a grant made by Congress in 1884, by which it acquired every alternate section of land within forty miles of its line. The Great Northern was completed to the coast across Montana in 1891, and the year 1909 witnessed the construction of another transcontinental line crossing the state from east to west,—that of the Chicago, Milwaukee, and Puget Sound Railway Company. The Montana Central, since a part of the Great Northern system, was built in the very heart of the mountain country in 1887, to connect the mines at Butte with the smelters at Great Falls. Since the opening of the railroads, resulting in the extinction of the buffalo, the main reliance of the Indians for subsistence, the task of keeping them in check on the reservations has become comparatively easy. In the struggle with them to secure the peace, local events attain special prominence—the brush with General Sully at the Bad Lands in 1864, while escorting a party of 250 emigrants from Minnesota bound for the mines of Montana; the Custer Massacre in 1876, and the raid of Chief Joseph after the Battle of
the Big Hole and his masterly retreat, followed by his capture in the Bear Paw Mountains in 1877 by General Miles.

RESOURCES.—The industry which gave rise to the original settlement of Montana was mining. In 1863 gold valued at $8,000,000 came from the sluices. The next year produced double that amount. The total production of gold up to and including the year 1876 is conservatively estimated at $140,000,000. About that time silver mining became paramount, but about 1890 it yielded pre-eminence to copper, which is at present the chief metal produced. The copper mines are at Butte, while the smelters are located at Anaconda and Great Falls. A silver and lead smelter is in operation at East Helena. In 1891, there was produced copper to the value of $40,021,756, with silver and lead to the extent of $3,286,212. Montana's stores of ore are very great. Estimates made by the authorities of the United States Geological Survey give the area of bituminous and lignitic-bituminous coal at 13,000 square miles, and the lignite areas at from 25,000 to 50,000 square miles. Coal-mining is extensively carried on in the counties of Carbon, Cascade, and Lewis. Lumbering is an industry of the western portion of the state, where there are dense forests of pine, fir, larch, cedar, and hemlock. It is, however, by no means confined to that region, as all the mountains of any considerable height bear a more or less abundant growth of timber. Nearly 20,000,000 acres of the public domain, or about $21,148,619, and gold, are included within the national forest reserves. Stock-raising early assumed an important place in the business life of the state. Vast herds of cattle, horses, and sheep were reared and matured on the open range with little or no provision for feeding even in the depth of winter. The appropriation of the public lands to settlers has occurred, but that is not the present method, however, as to enforce a radical change in the method by which the business is carried on. Provision for feeding is now almost universally made, but, except in stormy weather, sheep especially thrive without much regard to temperature on the native grasses that cover the plains and foot-hills, cured by the hot sun of the summer season when comparatively little rain falls. The annual production of wool in the state is about 40,000,000 pounds, the clip of approximately five and a half million sheep. The number of cattle in the state is in excess of 600,000. Agriculture is undergoing a marvellous development, both as to the area under cultivation and the methods of farming. As the result yields bountifully. Recent immigration to the state has been markedly to the more promising agricultural sections which, within the past two years, have received an influx hitherto unknown. In earlier years irrigation was universally resorted to, but more recently great areas have been cultivated with marked success by the "dry farming" system. Eight great works of irrigation are being carried on, or have been completed by the government reclamation service. The state is directing others under the Carey Land Act, and private corporations are engaged in many similar enterprises. Montana produced in 1905: 3,703,000 bushels of wheat on 135,000 acres; 10,566,000 bushels of oats on 254,000 acres; and 875,000 bushels of barley on 25,000 acres. Fruit-raising is a profitable business in many parts of the state, particularly in the counties of Ravalli, Missoula, and Flathead, where it is extensively carried on. Apples are the staple fruit crop, the quality being excellent and the yield large. The culture of sugar beets has been stimulated by the construction of a factory at Billings, which went into operation in 1898. The supply is itself supplied (in 1910) with over 115,000 tons of beets. The abundance of sunshine and the character of the soil gives to the Montana beet an exceptionally high percentage of saccharine matter. Manufacturing is still in its infancy, but is destined to a great growth owing to the extent of available water-power. Three large dams now turn the power of the Missouri River, and three more are in process of construction. Another large dam utilizes in part the energy of the Madison River. The Flathead River tumbles over seven miles of cascades, as it issues from Flathead Lake, offering stupendous opportunities for power development.

State Institutions.—The capitol at Helena was erected in 1900 at a cost of $350,000. The growth of the state is shown by the fact that additions were authorized by the last session of the legislature to cost half a million dollars. The funds for the original construction, as well as the work now to be undertaken, are derived from lands donated to the state on its admission to the Union by the general government. The state maintains a university at Missoula, an agricultural college at Bozeman, a school of mines at Butte, a normal school at Dillon, a soldiers' home at Columbia Falls, a deaf, dumb, and blind asylum at Boulder, a reform school at Miles City, and a penitentiary at Deer Lodge. The insane are cared for at a private institution in Great Falls, and the feeble-minded public schools prevails, and nearly all the towns of consequence maintain public libraries.

Education.—In 1908 there were enrolled 61,928 of the 77,039 children of school age. The total expense for all school purposes was $2,178,322.90. The average monthly salary paid to male teachers was $99, and to female teachers $91. The value of the state's endowment about $24,148,619, and gold, is held by the state are under the direction of a state superintendent and a state board of education, consisting of that officer, the governor and the attorney-general, and eight other members appointed by the governor. County superintendents supervise the administration of the school system in the rural communities, and city superintendents in the cities. These officers are derived from taxes collected by the county treasurer. The school fund consists of the revenues from grants of land made by the general government, and other grants from the federal authority, the avails of escheated estates, and fines for violations of various laws. The fund must be kept intact and only the interest used. The state university has a grant of 45,000 acres from the nation, which may be sold at not less than $10 per acre. The avails constitute a fund the income of which only is subject to use. For the year 1909 there were appropriated for its support $67,500, and it has other revenues amounting to about $120,000. Its corps of professors numbers twenty. In 1908 it had 184 students, 126 being special work and not including those taking the course at the biological station, which is maintained in connexion with it.

Early Missionaries and Missions.—It is not improbable that Father C. G. Coquart, S.J., accompanied the Vérendyres brothers on their expedition into Montana in 1804. He was a member of the party when they set out from Montreal on their great enterprise and is quoted as saying that the Vérendyres on some of their excursions went beyond the great falls of the Missouri, and as far as the Gate of the Mountains near Helena. The establishment of the early missions has been mentioned. Besides those referred to, the Holy Family Mission among the Blackfeet, originally a dependency of St. Peter's, became a fixed establishment in 1885. St. Paul's, another offshoot of St. Peter's, was established about the same time among the Gros Ventres and Assiniboines on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation. St. Labre, the mission among the Cheyennes, dates from 1854, when Rev. Joseph Weier came to the Missouri. St. Xavier, under the leadership of the Ursuline Sisterhood, with Mother Amadeus at their head in response to a call issued by Bishop Gilmore at the appeal of Bishop Brondel, lately appointed to the newly created See of Montana. St. Xavier's, among the Crowds, dates
from 1887. Schools, as a matter of course, are maintained at all the missions, those at St. Ignatius particularly being models. The Ursulines have convents at St. Peter's. The Jesuits were the pioneer missionaries to both Indians and whites in Montana. The missions of Father De Smet extended to all the tribes that have been mentioned, and he, as well as all of his associate 'black robes', was held in the highest reverence by them. His labors were prodigious. In 1835 he induced five sisters of the community of Leavenworth to come to Helena, where they founded St. Vincent's Academy.

Dioceses.—In the earlier territorial days, the western part of the state was included in the Vicariate of Idaho, and the eastern part in that of Nebraska. An episcopal visit was made to those then remote regions by Bishop James O'Connor of Omaha in 1877, and by Archbishop Charles J. Seghers of the Province of Oregon in 1879 and again in 1882. Upon the urgent recommendation of the last-named prelate, Montana was made a vicariate on 7 April, 1883, and the Rt. Rev. John B. Brondel, then Bishop of Victoria, Vancouver Island, was appointed to that charge. On 7 March, 1884, the Diocese of Helena was created, embracing the whole of Montana, and Bishop Brondel was appointed to the see. He was at the head of its affairs until his death in 1903, when the diocese was divided, the eastern part of the state becoming the Diocese of Great Falls and the remainder continuing as the Diocese of Helena. The Rt. Rev. Mathias Lenihan, D.D., was then appointed bishop of the latter, and the Rt. Rev. Mathias Lenihan, D.D., of the former diocese.

Catholic Population.—The Catholic population of the Great Falls diocese is about 15,000; of the Helena diocese about 50,000. Thirty priests minister to the people of the new, fifty-three to those of the old diocese. If all were to arrive from the old diocese in the future, the Catholic population of the state would be about one-third of that of the whole people of the state. Among the former, the dominant blood is probably Irish, a very large percentage of the adults being native Americans. But almost every Catholic country of Europe has contributed to the truly cosmopolitan citizenship of Montana. China and Japan have added to some extent to the population. In recent years Italians, Austrians, Bulgarians, and Servians have come in considerable numbers. Most of these are more or less closely attached to the ancient faith.

Charitable Institutions.—Hospitals are conducted by sisters of various orders at Great Falls, Billings, Helena, and Butte. There is a House of the Good Shepherd and an orphanage at Helena, and academies at Lewistown, Miles City, St. Peter's, Helena, and Deer Lodge. The parochial schools enrolled 5536 pupils in 1908, not including those attending the mission schools on the reservations.

Distinguished Catholics.—The spirit of religious intolerance has had scant encouragement in Montana, and many Catholics have occupied prominent positions in her industrial development and political history. Among those who have served in high official station are General Thomas Francis Meagher, acting governor from 1865 to 1867; Hon. James M. Cavanaugh, delegate in Congress from 1877 to 1878; Hon. Martin Maginnis, delegate in Congress from 1873 to 1885; Hon. Thomas H. Carter, delegate in Congress from March to November, 1889, and representative from the admission of the state to 1891; afterwards, from 1895 to 1901 United States Senator, and now serving his second term, having been again elected in 1906; Hon. H. S. Hinkley, delegate from 1889 to 1895. Among those who have written their names large in the industrial history of the state are Marcus Daly, Thomas Cruse, Peter Larson, and John D. Ryan, the latter being at present at the head of the Amalgamated Copper Company.

Freedom of Worship.—Freedom of religion is guaranteed by the following provision of the constitution: "Art. III, Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever hereafter be guaranteed, and no person shall be denied any civil or political right or privilege on account of his opinions concerning religion, but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with the duties of oaths or affirmations, except as a conscientious belief, by bigamous or polygamous marriage, or otherwise, or justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace or safety of the state, or opposed to the civil authority thereof, or of the United States. No person shall be required to attend any place of worship or support any ministry, religious sect or denomination, against his consent; nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship." The diversion of the public funds to the promotion of sectarian purposes is forbidden by the following: "Art. V, Sec. 35. No appropriation shall be made for charitable, industrial, educational or benevolent purposes to any person, corporation or community not under the absolute control of the state, or denominational or sectarian institution or association." Oaths.—Every court or officer authorized to take testimony or decide on evidence may administer oaths or affirmations, the witness being entitled to elect whether he shall be sworn or shall simply affirm.

Sunday Observance.—No law against the observance of the Sabbath as Sunday, as is Christmas, New Year's, and Columbus Day (12 October). If Christmas or New Year's Day falls on Sunday, the day following is a holiday. Whenever any secular act, other than a work of necessity or mercy, is appointed by law or contract to be done on a certain day, and it so happens that such a day is a holiday, it may be done on the day following with like effect as if done on the day appointed. It is a misdemeanour to keep open or maintain on Sunday any barber-shop, theatre, play-house, dance-house, race-track, concert saloon, or variety hall. It is likewise a misdemeanour to disturb any assembly of people met for religious worship by profane discourse or in any other manner. Neither blasphemy nor profanity is otherwise made punishable.

Prayer in the Legislature.—The law provides for the election of a chaplain of each house of the legislature and the daily sessions are opened with prayer by that officer. The Bannack session seems to have had no chaplain, but Rev. Joseph Giorda, S.J., officiated in that capacity at Butte during the second session held at Virginia City in 1866. Rev. L. Palladino, S.J., the historian of the Montana Missions, universally revered for his saintly life, who came to Saint Ignatius in 1867, acted in the same capacity at the ninth session.

Seal of Confession.—Disclosures made in the confessional are held sacred by express statute. A clergyman will be neither compelled nor permitted to testify as to them.

Incorporation of Churches.—Special provision is made for the incorporation of religious bodies and congregations. The method is simple. At a meeting, trustees are elected and they are authorized by resolution to file articles with the county clerk or the secretary of state, according as the organization is to be local or general in its nature. The articles state the name of the corporation, its purpose, and the number of trustees. It then has continual succession, and the usual powers of a corporation. Another act provides for the organization of corporations sole 'whenever the rules, regulation, discipline, or denominational, society or Church, permit or require the estate, property, temporalities, and business thereof, to be held in the name of, or managed by a bishop, chief priest, or presiding elder, of such religious denomination, society or church.' The passage of this
act was procured by Bishop Brondel who incorporated under the name of the "Roman Catholic Bishop of Helena".

Exemption of Clergymen and Church Property.—All clergymen are exempt from jury duty. The constitution declares that "such property as may be used exclusively for agricultural and horticultural societies, for educational purposes, places for actual religious worship, hospitals and places of burial not used or held for private or corporate profit, and institutions of purely public charity may be exempt from taxation" (Art. XII, Sec. 2), and the statutes declare the exemptions in the same terms.

Marriage and Divorce.—Marriage may be contracted by mutual consent followed by a solemnization or public assumption of the marital relation. The marriageable age is eighteen in the case of males, and sixteen in females. Marriages between ancestors and descendents of every degree, between brothers and sisters of the half as well as the whole blood, and between aunts and nephews or uncles and nieces, are declared void ab initio. So likewise are marriages between a white person on one side, and a negro or a person part negro, or a Chinese or Japanese, on the other side. Marriages contracted without the state and valid where contracted are valid within the state. Marriage certificates are required of the clerk of the court of the county where the marriage is to be solemnized, and a return must be made by the officiating clergyman or officer. Licences cannot be granted to minors without the written consent of the parents or guardian. Marriage may be solemnized by a justice of the Supreme Court, judge of the circuit, justice of the peace, priest or minister of any denomination, or mayor of the city or by religious societies. It need not be solemnized at all if the parties make and file a joint declaration giving their names, the fact of marriage, the date of marriage, and that it has not been solemnized. Marriages licensed and not solemnized as provided are forbidden, but are expressly declared not to be void.

Divorces are authorized for six causes, viz.: adultery, extreme cruelty, wilful desertion, wilful neglect, habitual intemperance, and conviction of felony. The constitution forbids the passage by the legislature of any special law granting divorce, or separation a month. The same process for separate maintenance, a power the early territorial legislatures freely exercised. Residence in the state one year by the plaintiff is a requisite of jurisdiction.

Liquor.—The sale of liquor is permitted under licences issued by counties and cities. Local option is authorized by law, but the traffic is not prohibited in any county. The employment of women in places where liquor is sold is forbidden, as is its sale in places of public amusement, or at any camp meeting, or near any cemetery. A law, known as the "Wine Room Law", makes it punishable to have in connexion with a saloon any room or apartment into which females are permitted to enter.

Wills and Testaments.—Wills may be made by any person over eighteen. If in his own handwriting it need be neither witnessed nor attested; if not, it must bear the signatures of two witnesses. A nuncupative will may be made orally disposing of an estate less than $1000 in value, when the testator is in actual military service in the field, or doing duty on shipboard and in peril or fear of death, or when he is expecting death, or has received the same in writing. A wife has a dower right in her husband's real estate, but he has no interest in her property except that she cannot without his written consent deprive him by will of more than two-thirds of her estate. The will of an unmarried woman is revoked by her subsequent marriage, as is that of a man made before he marries by his subsequent marriage, unless his wife is provided for by contract or in the will, or unless the will expressly excludes her from taking.

Charitable Bequests.—Charitable bequests contained in wills made within thirty days of the death of the testator are void. If the aggregate of such bequests in any will will exceed one-third of the value of the estates, and the testator has legal heirs they are scaled down until their sum does not exceed such amount.

Cemeteries.—A law applicable specially to that subject authorizes the incorporation of cemetery associations. Burial without a certificate of death is made punishable, as is violation of sepulchres, defacing of graves or monuments, or neglecting to bury the bodies of dead kindred.

Montañés, Juan Martínez (d. 1649), a noted Spanish sculptor of the seventeenth century, sometimes called "the Sevillian Phidias". Like many of his countrymen, he confined himself almost exclusively to the figure of the Virgin, to which he gave effects of great tenderness and sentiment. He was born at Seville; according to Cordiello, his contemporary, at Alcalá la Real. He studied under Pablo de Rojas at Granada; and later settled at Seville where most of his works are to be found. One of the earliest is a charming Infant Jesus (cathedral sacristy, Seville) bearing the date 1607 and the sculptor's signature. In 1610 he modelled the head and hands of the statue of St. Ignatius Loyola — used in the religious celebrations of the beatification of the saint (chapel of the university, Seville). This image, clothed and coloured by Pacheco, is esteemed one of the truest and most aesthetic representations ever made of the soldier saint. The St. Francis Xavier in the same place is attributed to Montañés. He was executed for the Hieronymite monastery of St. Iadius del Campo, near Seville, the life-size penitent St. Jerome, one of his most masterly productions, and the reedos and statues for the altar; in 1614 the famous large crucifix for the Carthusians of St. Maria de las Cuevas; 1617 to 1618 two reedos in the lay choir of the same monastery, 1619 the image of Our Lady of Bonavena; 1625 three figures representing the theological virtues, and lovely reliefs of the Adoration of the Magi and Shepherds; the expressive St. Bruno, now in the museum, was made for the Carthusians in 1620. In 1635 the sculptor went to Madrid and spent seven months there modelling a portrait of Philip IV, which was to be used by Pietro Tacca for his equestrian statue of the king, finished in Florence, 1640, and now in Madrid (Plaza del Oriente). The likeness of Montañés by Velasquez (Prado Gallery), was probably painted at this time. As a reward for his services the king granted Montañés the rights in a merchant ship "whether in the fleet of the Continent or of New Spain" (America). This promise was fulfilled. He sculptured the head of the Virgin for the church of the Jesuits at Seville, and the pedestal for the statue of St. Ignatius in the Sagrario, and in 1649 other works at Seville are the St. Dominic of heroic size in the museum, the convent of Portaceli; a beautiful St. John Evangelist in the church of San Juan de las Palmas; the high altar of the church of San Lorenzo and a statue of the patron saint; and, at the cathedral (Seville), a very fine life-size Immovable Conception of the Virgin in the Sacristy of the Chalices, and that renowned "Christ bearing the Cross" carried in Holy Week processions, so vivid and sorrowful, the sculptor would station himself at the corners of streets to see it pass, "absorbed and wondering at the work of his own hands". Montañés is noted for the majesty and religious character of his types, his profound sense of beauty, and his elegant and correct
modelling. His child forms, infant and cherub, are peculiarly happy. He would not consent that any of his figures should be tinted except under his own supervision.
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M. L. HANDLEY.

MONTANISTS. Scematics of the second century, first known as Practipients, or "those training in Philosophy" (el ἐκτός Φάσης), then as Montanists, Pepusians, and (in the West) Cataphrygians. The sect was founded by a prophet, Montanus, and two prophetesses, Maximilla and Priscilla, sometimes called Prisica.

CHRONOLOGY. An anonymous anti-Montanist writer, cited by Eusebius, addressed his work to Abercius Marcellus, Bishop of Hierapolis, who died about 200. Maximilla had prophesied continual wars and troubles, but this writer declared that he wrote more than thirteen years after her death, yet no war, general or partial, had taken place, but on the contrary the Christians enjoyed perpetual peace through the mercy of God (Eusebius, "Chronicle," vii, 39). This writer could identify only the seven and a half years of Commodus (17 March, 180—31 December, 192). The wars between rival emperors began early in 192, so that this anonymous author wrote not much later than January, 193, and Maximilla must have died about the end of 197, not long before Marcus Aurelius, Montanus and Priscilla had died in 198. Consequently the date given by Eusebius in his "Chronicle"—eleventh (or twelfth) year of Marcus, i. e. about 172—for the first appearance of Montanus leaves insufficient time for the development of the sect, which we know further to have been of great importance in 177, when the Church of Lyons wrote to Pope Eleutherius on the subject. Again, the Montanists are co-ordinated with the mar-tyr Thraseas, mentioned chronologically between Poly- carp (155) and Sagaris (under Sergius Paulus, 166—7) in the letter of Polycrates to Pope Victor; the date of Thraseas is therefore about 160, and the origin of Montanism must be yet earlier. Consequently, Zahn, Harnack, Duchesne, and Voigt (again) date it about 190. In any case the late date given by Eusebius, regard St. Epiphanius (Hær., xviii, 1) as giving the true date of the rise of the sect, "about the nineteenth year of Antoninus Pius" (that is, about the year 156 or 157).

Bonwetsch, accepting Zahn's view that previously (Hær., xvi, 1) Epiphanius had given the twelfth year of Antoninus Pius where he should have said M. Aurelius, wishes similarly to substitute that emperor here, so that we would get 179, the very date of the death of Maximilla. But the emendation is unnecessary in either case. In "Hereses," xvi, 1, Epiphanius clearly meant the earlier date, whether right or wrong; and in xvi, 1, he is not dating the death of Maximilla but the first appearance of the sect. From this passage (Hær., V, xvi, 7, we learn that this was in the proconsulship of Gratus. Such a proconsul of Asia is not known. Bonwetsch accepts Zahn's suggestion to read "Qua- dratus," and points out that there was a Quadratus in 155 (if that is the year of Polycarp's death, which was about Quadratus), and another in 168, so that one of these years was the real date of birth of Montanis- m. But 166 for Quadratus merely depends on Schmid's chronology of Aristides, which has been rejected by Ramsay and others in favour of the earlier chronology worked out by Waddington, who obtained 155 for the Quadratus of Aristides as well as for the Quadratus of Polycarp. Now it is most probable that Epiphanius's authority counted the years of emperors from the September preceding their accession (as Hegesippus seems to have done), and therefore the nineteenth year of Pius would be Sept., 155—Sept., 156. Even if the later and Western mode of reckoning from the January after accession is used, the year 157 cannot be reconciled with Quadratus in 155, if we remember that Epiphanius merely says "about the nineteenth year of Pius," without vouching for strict accuracy. He tells us further on that Maximilla prophesied: "After me there shall be no prophetess, but the end," whereas he was writing after 290 years, more or less, in the year 375 or 376. He directs the evidence to show that 157 is the year in which brings us roughly to the death of Maximilla (385 for 379). But ἄντικριτος for ἄντίκριτος is a big change. It is more likely that Epiphanius is calculating from the date he had himself given. 19th of Pius—156, as he did not know that of Maximilla's death; his "more or less" corresponds to his former "about." So we shall with Zahn adopt Scaliger's conjecture ἄντικριτος for ἄντικριτος, which brings us from 156 to 375—219 years. As Apollonius wrote forty years after the sect emerged, his work must be dated about 196.

MONTANISM IN ASIA MINOR.—Montanus was a re- cent convert when he first began to prophesy in the year of Arbaces the Phrygian. He was certainly not to have been previously a priest of Cybele; but this is perhaps a later invention intended to connect his ecstasies with the dervish-like behaviour of the priests and devotees of the "great goddess." The same prophetic gift was believed to have descended also upon his two companions, the prophetesses Maxi- milla and Priscilla. The latter's headquarters were in the village of Pepus. The anthropo- omen of the sect describes the method of prophecy (Eusebius, V, xxvii, 2—3): first the prophet appears dis- traught with terror (ἐπενεχθέναι), then follows quiet (ἄξια καὶ ἀποβολα, fearlessness); beginning by studied vacancy of thought or passivity of intellect (ἐκείνου ὧν ἀδύνα, he is seized by an uncontrollable madness (ἐκείνου ἡράκλετος ἕχει). The prophets did not speak as messengers of God: "Thus saith the Lord," but described themselves as possessed by God and spoke in His Person. "I am the Father, the Word, and the Paraclete," said Montanus (Didymus, "De Trin.," III, xii); and again: "I am the great God omnipotent from the beginning of time, and neither an angel, nor an ambassador, but I, the Lord, the Father, am come" (Epiphanius, "Hær.," xlviii, 11). And Maximilla said: "Hear not me, but hear Christ" (ibid.); and: "I am driven off from among the sheep like a wolf [that is, a false prophet—cf. Matt., vii, 15]; I am not a wolf, but I am he, the living spirit, and power." This possession by a spirit, which spoke while the prophet was incapable of resisting, is described by the spirit of Montanus: "Behold the man is like a lyre, and I dart like the plectrum. The man sleeps, and I am awake" (Epiphanius, "Hær.," xlviii, 4).

We hear of no false doctrines at first. The Para- clete ordered a few facts and abstinence; the latter was to be strict zor хозио—eating, fasting, and prayer; and then, in 157, a first act of discipline: before the second assembly, and even then the Saturdays and Sundays did not count (Tertullian, "De jej.," xv). Not only was virginity strongly recommended (as always by the Church), but second marriages were disapproved. Chastity was declared by Priscilla to be a preparation for ecstasy: "The holy [chaste] minister knows how to guard his heart holiness. Of Montanus, in whose sanctum sanctorum [reading purificandas enim corda, by conjecture for purificanda enim concordia] both see visions, and placing their head downwards (!) also hear manifest voices, as saving as they are secret" (Tertullian. "Ex- hor." X, in one MS.). It was rumoured, however, that Priscilla had been married, and had left her hus-
band. Martyrdom was valued so highly that flight from persecution was disapproved, and so was the buying off of punishment. "You are made an outlaw?" said Montanus, "it is good for you. For he who is not outlawed among men is outlawed in the Lord. Be not confounded. It is justice which hales you in public. Why are you confounded, when you are sowing praise? Power comes, when you are stared at by men." And again: "Do not desire to depart this life in beds, in miscarriages, in soft fevers, but in martyrdoms, that He who suffered for you may be glorified." (Tertullian, "De fuga", ix; cf. "Acta Anima", i). Tertullian says: "Those who receive the Paraclete, know neither to flee persecution nor to bribe." (De fuga, 14), but he is unable to cite any formal prohibition by Montanus.

So far, the most that can be said of these didactic utterances is that there was a slight tendency to extravagance. The people of Phrygia were accustomed to the orgiastic cult of Cybele. There were doubtless many Christians there. The contemporary accounts of Montanism mention Christians in otherwise unknown villages: Ardabau on the Myssian border, Pepuzu, Tymion, as well as in Otrus, Apamea, Cumeane, Eumenea. Early Christian inscriptions have been found at Otrus. (Ptolemy's Geography, 260), Trajanopolis (of 279), Eumenea (of 249) etc. (see Harnack, "Expansion of Christianity", II, 360). There was a council at Synnada in the third century. The "Acta Theodoti" represent the village of Malus near Ancyra as entirely Christian under Diocletian. Above all we must remember what crowds of Christians came to Pepuzu in the winter of 257-258. The numbers were 112, not only in the cities but in country places. No doubt, therefore, there were numerous Christians in the Phrygian villages to be drawn by the astounding phenomena. Crowds came to Pepuzu, it seems, and conviction was provoked. In the very first days Apollinaris, a successor of St. Papias as Bishop of Hierapolis, who also wrote against Montanus, Eusebius knew this letter from its being enclosed by Serapion of Antioch (about 191-212) in a letter addressed by him to the Christians of Caria and Pontus. Apollinaris related that Elius Publius Julius of Debellum (now Burgas) in Thrace, knew that "Sotas the blessed who was in Ancyra, heard the Lord and saved. The Lord and the prophet (and he wished to be saved) took the demon from Sotas; but the hypocrites would not allow it." Clearly Sotas was dead, and could not speak for himself. The anonymous writer tells us that some thought Montanus to be possessed by an evil spirit, and a troubler of the people; they rebuked him and tried to stop his prophecy, but a companion of Maximilla, who had such a prophetic standing, denounced them as impious, and condemned the heresy, so that the discipulc were thrust out of the Church and its communion.

It is difficult to say how soon this excommunication took place in Asia. Probably from the beginning something must have been said. But it is clear that Montanus and his followers were growing commoner before the death of Maximilla; but it was hardly a general rule much before the death of Maximilla in 179; condemnation of the prophets themselves, and mere disapproval of their disciples was the first stage. We hear of holy persons, including the bishops Zoticus of Cumana and Julian of Apamea, attempting to exorcize Maximilla and Julian, but without success. But Themison prevented them (Eusebius, V, xvi, xviii, 12). This personage was called a confessor but, according to the anonymous writer, he had bought himself off. He published "a catholic epistle, in imitation of the Apostle", in support of his party. Another so-called martyr, called Alexander, was for many years a companion of Maximilla, who as such a prophet, did not know that it was for robbery, and not "for the Name", that he had been condemned by the proconsul Eumelius Frontinius (date unknown) in Ephesus; in proof of this the public archives of Asia are appealed to. Of another leader, Alcibiades, nothing is known. The prophets are accused of taking gifts under the guise of offerings. Montanus sent our salaried preachers; the prophetesses painted their faces, dyed their eyelids with stibium, wore ornaments and played at dice. But these accusations may be untrue. The great point was the manner of prophesying. It was denounced as contrary to custom and to tradition. A Catholicus, Epiphanius, wrote a book to which the anonymous author refers, "How a prophet ought not to speak in ecstasy". It was urged that the phenomena were those of possession, not those of the Old Testament prophets, or of New Testament prophets like Silas, Agabus, and the daughters of Philip the Deacon; or of prophets recently known in Asia, Quadratus (Bishop of Athens) and Ammia, prophetess of Philadelphia, of whom the Montanist prophets boasted of being successors. To speak in the first person as the Father or the Paraclete appeared blasphemous. The older prophets had spoken "in the Spirit", as mouthpieces of the Spirit, but to have no free will, to be helpless in a state of madness, to be without soul and without spirit, to be subject to the prophets. Montanus declared: "The Lord hath sent me as the choicer, the revealer, the interpreter of this labour, this promise, and this covenant, being forced, willingly or unwillingly, to learn the gnosia of God." The Montanists appealed to Gen., ii, 21: "For the Lord hath sent me as Peter, and I will prophesy in my ecstasy"; Acts, x, 10: "There came upon him [Peter] an ecstasy"; but these texts proved neither that an ecstasy of excitement was proper to sanctity, nor that it was a right state in which to prophesy.

A better argument was the declaration that the new prophecy was of a higher order than the old, and therefore did not need the consent of the Apostles, and even beyond the teaching of Christ. Priscilla went to sleep, she said, at Pepuzu, and Christ came to her and slept by her side "in the form of a woman, clad in a bright garment, and put wisdom in me, and revealed to me that this place is holy, and that here Jerusalem above comes down". "MySQ. of Eusebius, vii, 29, 11. Eusebius, v, xviii, 27, 11. In Epiphanius's time Pepuzu was a desert, and the village was gone. Marcellina, surviving the other two, prophesied continual wars after her death—no other prophet, but the end.

It seems on the whole that Montanism had no particular doctrine, and that his prophetesses went further than he did. The extravagances of his sect were due to the deaths of all three; but it is difficult to know how far we are to trust our authorities. The anonymous writer admits that he has only an uncertain report for the story that Montanus and Maximilla both hanged themselves, and that Themison was carried into the air by a devil, flung down, and died. The text is fragmentary. It seems also that some Churches were wholly Montanist. The anonymous writer found the Church at Ancyra in 153 greatly disturbed about the new prophecy. Tertullian's lost writing "De Festa", in defence of their trances, is said by Frædestinus to have been an answer to Pope Soter (Hier., xxvi, xxxvi, 2), who had condemned or disapproved them; but the authority is not certain. He has presumably confounded Soter with Sotas, Bishop of Anchialus. In 177 the Churches of Lyons and Vienne sent to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia their celebrated account of the martyrdoms that had been taking place. Eusebius tells us that at the same time they enclosed letters which had been written in prison by the companions of the Montanists. They sent the same by Trenesium to Pope Eleutherius. Eusebius says only that they took
a prudent and most orthodox view. It is probable that they disapproved of the prophets, but were not inclined to extreme measures against their followers. It was not denied that the Montanists could count many martyrs; it was replied to their boast, that all the heretics had many, and especially the Marcionites, but that true martyrs like Gaius and Alexander of Eusebians had not. The comunions of the Montanist martyrs who had approved the new prophecy (Anon. in Eusebius, V, xvi, 27). The acts of Carpus, Pappus, and Agathonice (the last of these threw herself into the fire), martyrs of Thyatira under Marcus Aurelius (about 161-9), may exhibit an influence of Montanist on the martyrs.

Montanism in the West.—A second-century pope (more probably Eleutheros than Victor) was inclined to approve the new prophecies, according to Tertullian, but was dissuaded by Praxeas (q. v.). Their defender in Rome was Proculus or Proculus, much revered among Tertullian. A disputation was held by Gaius against him in the presence of Pope Zephyrinus (about 202-3, it would seem). As Gaius supported the side of the Church, Eusebius calls him a Churchman (II, xxxv, 6), and is delighted to find in the minutes of the discussion that Gaius rejected the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse, and attributed it to Cerinthus. But Gaius was the worse of the two, for we know from the commentary on the Apocalypse by Eusebius, that Gaius had probably borrowed material from it (see Theodore H. Robinson in "Expositor," VII, sixth series, June, 1906), that he rejected the Gospel and Epistles of St. John as well, and attributed them all to Cerinthus. It was against Gaius that Hippolytus wrote his "Heads against Gaius" and also his "Defence of the Gospel and the Apocalypse of John" (unless the first following of that of Epiphanius used for his fifty-first heresy (cf. Philastrius, "Her.", Ix), and as the heresy had no name he invented that of "Algae", meaning at once "the unreasoning" and "those who reject the Algae". We gather that Gaius was led to reject the Gospel out of opposition to Proculus, who taught (Pseudo-Tertullian, "De Praxe.", iii) that the Holy Ghost was in the Apostles, but the Paraclete was not, and that the Paraclete published through Montanists more than Christ revealed in the Gospel, and not only more, but also better and greater things; thus the promise of the Paraclete (John, xiv, 16) was not to the Apostles but the Holy Ghost, and thanks to Eve for making him (II, xi, 9): "Others, in order that they may frustrate the gift of the Spirit, which in the last days has been poured upon the human race according to the good pleasure of the Father, do not admit that form [the lion] which corresponds with the Gospel of John in which the Lord promised to send the Paraclete; but they reject the Gospel and with it the prophetic Spirit. Unhappy, indeed, in that, in wishing to have no false prophets [reading with Zahn pseudo prophetae esse vultur for pseudo prophetae esse vultur], they drive away the grace of prophecy from the Church; resembling persons who, to avoid those who come in hypocrisy, withdraw from communion even with brethren who dwell at the right side of the Father, as were an Asiatic sect (see Alon) no longer tenable; they were the Roman Gaius and his followers, if he had any. But Gaius evidently did not venture to reject the Gospel in his dispute before Zephyrinus, the account of which was known to Dionysius of Alexandria as well as to Eusebius (cf. Eusebius, III, xx, 1-4). It is true that he especially denied the episcopate of St. John in Asia, since he considers the Johannine writings to be forgeries, attributed by their author Cerinthus to St. John; hence he thinks St. John is represented by Cerinthus as the ruler of the Asiatic Churches. Another Montanist (about 200), who seems to have separated from Proclus, was Eshines, who taught that "the Father is the Son", and is counted as a Montanist of the tradition of Natus of Sabellius.

But Tertullian (q. v.) is the most famous of the Montanists. He was born about 150-5, and became a Christian about 190-5. His excessive nature led him to adopt the Montanist teaching as soon as he knew it (about 202-3). His writings from this date onwards grow more and more bitter against the Church, from which he definitively broke away about 207. He died about 223, or not much later. His first Montanist work was a defence of the new prophecy in six books, "De Ecstasy", written probably in Greek; he added a seventh book in reply to Apollonius. The work is lost, but a sentence preserved by Prædentinus (xxvi) is important: "In this we have to bear in mind that we do not receive second marriage, and that we do not refuse the prophecy of Montanus concerning the future judgment." In fact Tertullian holds as an absolute law the recommendations of Montanus to eschew second marriages and flight from persecution. He denies the possibility of forgiveness of sins by the Church; he insists upon the newly ordained fasts and abstinences. Catholics are the Psychics as opposed to the "spiritual" followers of the Paraclete; the Catholic Church consists of gluttons and adulterers, who hate to fast and love to remarry. Tertullian evidently exaggerated those parts of the Montanist teaching which appealed to himself, caring little for the past, but retreating to the extreme on Pepoza, but he speaks of joining in spirit with the celebration of the Montanist feasts in Asia Minor. The Acts of Sts. Perpetua and Felicitas are by some thought to reflect a period at Carthage when the Montanist teaching was arousing interest and sympathy, but had not yet formed a schism. Tertullian himself describes them as having been large; but a Tertullian sect survived him and its remnants were reconciled to the Church by St. Augustine (Her., lxxvi). About 392-4 an African lady, Octaviana, wife of Hesperius, a favourite of the Duke Arbogastes and the usurper Maximus, brought to Rome a Tertullianist priest who raved as possessed. He obtained the use of the church of Sts. Processus and Martinianus on the Via Aurelia, but was turned out by Theodosius, and he and Octaviana were heard of no more. Epiphanius distinguished a sect of Montanists as Pepuzians or Quintillians (he calls Priscilla also Quintilla). He says they had some foolish sayings which were the greeting of the tree of knowledge. They used to sleep at Pepuzia in order to resemble Priscilla had done. Often in their church seven virgins would enter with lamps, dressed in white, to prophesy to the people, whom by their excited action they would move to tears; this reminds us of some modern missions rather than of the Irvingites "speaking with tongues", with which the Montanist ecstasies have often been compared. These heretics were said to have women for their bishops and priests, in honour of Eve. They were called "Artotyrites", because their sacrament was of bread and cheese. Prædentinus says the Pepuzians did not really differ from other Montanists, but despised all who did not virtually "speak with tongues". There is a well-known story that the Montanists (or at least the Pepuzians) on a certain feast took a baby child whom they stuck all over with brazen pins. They used the blood to make cakes for sacrifice. If the child died it was looked upon as a martyr; if it lived, as a high priest. This story was no doubt a pure invention; but it is in the "De Ecstasy" of Tertullian. An absurd nickname for the sect was Tarratæa, from Thargyrian words meaning peg and nose, because they were said to put their forefinger up their nose when praying "in order to appear dejected and pious" (Epiphanius, Her., xlviii, 14).

It is interesting to take St. Jerome's account, written in 384, of the doctrine of Montanism as he be-
lived them to be in his own time (Ep., xii). He describes them as Sabellians in their idea of the Trinity, as forbidding second marriage, as observing three Lents "as though three Saviours had suffered!" Above bishops they have "Cenones" (probably not σωματικόν, but a Phrygian word) and patriarchs above these at Paphos. They close the door of the Church to almost every sin. They say that God, not being able to abide the words of Christ, and the prophet,"took flesh of the Virgin Mary, and in Christ, His Son, preached and died for us. And because He could not accomplish the salvation of the world by this second method, the Holy Spirit descended upon Montanus, Priscas, and Maximilla, giving them the plenteud which St. Paul had not (I Cor., xiii, 9). St. Jerome refuses to accept the words of the bishop of Miletus, but it is clearly unjust to set the account is already exaggerated beyond what the Montanists would have admitted that they held. Origen ("Ep. ad Titum" in "Pamp. Apol.", I fin.) is uncertain whether they are schismatics or heretics. St. Basil is amazed that Dionysius of Alexandria admitted their baptism to be valid (Ep., cxxxvii). According to his heart, he wore a black cassock (xix). The bishop of Miletus (sozomen, xviii) tells us that they observed Easter on 6 April or on the following Sunday. Germanus of Constantinople (P. G., XCIII, 44) says they taught eight heavens and eight degrees of damnation. The Christian emperors from Constantine onwards made laws against them, which were scarcely put into execution, as its power was not yet general. Later they became a small and secret sect. The bones of Montan was dug up in 861. The numerous Montanian writings (βιβλία τοῦ προφήτη, "Philosophumenen", VIII, xix) are all lost. It seems that a certain Asterius Urbanus made a collection of the prophecies (Euseb., V, xvi, 17).

The notion of the origin of Montanism, originated by Ritschl, has been followed by Harnack, Bonwetsch, and other German critics. The secularising in the second century of the Church by her very success and the disappearance of the primitive "Enthusiasmus" made a difficulty for "those believers of the old school who protested in the name of the Gospel against this secular church, and who wished to gather together a people prepared for their God regardless alike of numbers and circumstances". Some of these "joined an enthusiastic movement which had originated amongst a small circle in a remote province, and had at first a merely local importance. Then, in Phrygia, the cry for a strict Christian life was reinforced by the belief in an imminent coming of Christ. The"wish was, as usual, father to the thought; and thus societies of 'spiritual' Christians were formed, which served, especially in times of persecution, as rallying points for all those, far and near, who sighed for the end of the world and the euruscos e aculco, and who wished in these last days to lead a holy life. These sects halted the spread of the Paraclete in Phrygia, and surrendered themselves to his guidance" (Harnack in "Encycl. Brit.", London, 1878, s. v. Montanism). This ingenious theory has its basis only in the imagination, nor have any facts ever been advanced in its favour.


FUNK in Kirchenle. (1893), s. v. Montanismus: JUTTEN, Er.


JOHN CHAPMAN.

Montauban, Diocese of (Monts Albari), suffragan of Toulouse, comprises the entire department of Tarn and Garonne. Suppressed in 1802 and divided between the three neighbouring dioceses of Toulouse, Agen, and Cahors, Montauban was re-established by imperial decree of 1809, but this measure was not approved by the Holy See. Re-established by the concordat of 1817, it was filled only in 1824. In 820 the Benedictine monks had founded the Abbey of Montauriul under the patronage of St. Martin; subsequently it adopted the name of its abbot St. Theodard, Archbishop of Narbonne, who died at the abbey in 893. The Count of Toulouse, Alphonse Jordan, a nephew of Charlemagne, was buried on the heights overlooking the right bank of the Tarn, and founded there the city of Montauban; a certain number of inhabitants of Montauriul and serfs of the abbey formed the nucleus of the population. The monks protested, and in 1149 a satisfactory agreement was concluded. Notwithstanding the sufferings of Montauban during the Albigensian Crusade, the abbey flourished. The Council of 1215 is to be considered the abbey's consti
d sail. With the Bull "Salvator" (25 June, 1317), separated from the ecclesiastical province of Narbonne, the See of Toulouse, made it an archiepiscopal see, and gave it as suffragans four dioceses created within its territory: Montauban, St.-Papoul, Rieux, Lombez, Bertrand de Puy, abbot at Montauriul, was first Bishop of Montauban; and among its bishops: Cardinal Georges d'Amboise (1484-1491), minister of Louis XII, and Jean de Lettes (1539-1556), who married and became a Protestant. Despite the resistance of Jacques de Prés-Montpezat (1556-1589), a nephew of Jean de Lettes who succeeded him as bishop, the Calvinists became masters of the city; in 1561 they interdicted Catholic worship; the destruction of the churches, and even of the cathedral, was begun and carried on until 1567. In 1570 Montauban became one of the four strongholds granted the Protestants and in 1578, 1579, and 1584 harboured the synods held by the députés of the Reformed Churches of France. For a short time the Spirit of Reformation was established but was soon suppressed; Bishop Anne Carrion de Murvilo (1600-1652) withdrew to Montech during the greater part of his reign and administered thence the Church of Montauban. In spite of the unsuccessful siege of Montauban by Louis XIII (August-November, 1621), the fall of La Rochelle (1627) entailed the subjection of the city, and Richelieu entered it on 20 August, 1629. Other bishops of note were: Le Tonnellier de Breteuil (1762-1794), who died during the Reign of Terror in the prison of Rouen, after converting the philosopher La Harpe to Cathol
cism; the future Cardinal de Cheverus (q. v.), 1824-

The Church of Moissac, whose portal built in 1107 is a veritable museum of Romanesque sculpture, de

notices; its cloister (1100-1108) is one of the most remarkable in France. Legend attributes to Clovis the foundation of the Abbey of Moissac in 596, but St. Amand (594-675) seems to have been the first abbott. The abbey grew, and in a few years its posses
sions extended the suburbs of Toulouse. The threats and incursions of the Saracens, Hungarians, and Northmen brought the monks of Moissac to elect "knight abbots" who were laymen, and whose mission was to defend them. From the tenth to the thirteenth century several of the counts of Toulouse were knighth-
abbeys of Moissac; the death of Alfonso II (1271) made the King of France the legitimate successor of the counts of Toulouse, and in this way the abbey came to depend directly on the kings of France, henceforth its "knights-abbeys". Some of the abbots were saints: St. Aubert (983-978); St. Léonardis (678-693). The Abbey of Cluny was begun by Abbot Stephen as early as 1047, and completed in 1063 under Abbot Durand. Four filial abbeys and numerous priories depended on the Abbey of Moissac. Among the commendatory abbots were Louis of Lorraine, Cardinal de Guise (1556-1578); Charles of Lorraine, Cardinal de Vaudemont (1578-1590). In 1618 Moissac was united with the priory of Les Arques in the church which had, among other titulars, Cardinal Mazarin (1644-1661), and Cardinal de Loménie de Brienne, minister of Louis XVI (1775-1788). On 25 July, 1753, fifteen inhabitants of Moissac, after they had made a pilgrimage to Compostella, grouped themselves into a confraternity "à l'heur de Dieu de Notre Dame et Monseigneur Saint Jacques". This confraternity, reorganized in 1616 by letters patent of Louis XIII, existed for many years. As late as 1830 "pilgrims" were still seen in the Moissac processions. In fact Moissac and Spain were long closely united; a monk of Moissac, St. Géraud, was Archbishop of Braga from 985 to 1009. The general synod of the Regulars held at Montpellier in 1145 was to give meaning to the creation of an academy at Montauban; it was opened in 1600, was exclusively Protestant, and gathered students from other countries of Europe. In 1632 the Jesuits established themselves at Montauban, but in 1659 transferred the Academy to Puylaurens. In 1816, a faculty of Protestant theology was created at Montauban.

The principal pilgrimages of the diocese are: Notre Dame de Livron or de la Déléverance, visited by Blanche of Castille and Louis XIII; Notre Dame de Lorm, at Castelferrus, dating from the fifteenth century; Notre Dame de la Peyrouse, near Lafrançaise. Before the application of the law of 1901 as to associations, the diocese counted 127 parishes, and various orders of School Brothers. Among the congregations of women which originated in the diocese we mention: Sisters of Mercy, hospitaliers and teachers, founded in 1804 (mother-house at Moissac); Sisters of the Guardian Angel, hospitaliers and teachers, founded in 1839 at Quillan in the Diocese of Cambrai; Sisters of the Daughters of Wisdom, whose mother-house was transferred to the château de La Molle, near Montauban in 1858. At the beginning of the twentieth century the religious congregations had charge of: 1 creche, 24 day nurseries, 10 girls' orphanages, 1 refuge (œuvre de réhabilitation), 2 houses for the relief of the poor, 11 hospitals or ancillaries, 30 houses for the care of the sick in their own homes. In 1905 the Diocese of Montauban counted 188,563 inhabitants, of whom 7000 were Protestants; 31 parishes; 296 curing parishes; 85 vicariates.

Montaut, Xavier Barbière de, b. at Loudun, 6 February, 1850; d. at Blasay, Vienne (France), 29 March, 1901. He came of a noble and large family, and, when only eight years old, was confided to the care of his great-uncle, Mgr Montaut des Isles, Bishop of Angers. He studied theology at the Seminary of St. Stupice, and went to Rome to continue his studies in theology and archaeology at the Sapienza and the Roman College. After four years his health obliged him to return to France (1887), where he was appointed historiographer of the Diocese of Angers. He searched the archives of the diocese with great diligence, studied its inscriptions and monuments, and founded a diocesan museum, a project in which de Crévecœur took a lively interest. After fourteen years in Rome (1881-1905) enabled him to augment his already extensive knowledge of liturgy and Christian antiquities. Meanwhile he was of great service to different French bishops as canonical consultant, and at the Vatican Council acted as theologian to Mgr Desfleurs, Bishop of Angers. His first archeological study appeared in 1858 in the "Annales archéologiques," and Didron assigned him the task of making an index for this publication. Mgr Barbier de Montaut was one of the most prolific contributors to the "Revue de l'art chrétien" from the inception of this periodical, his articles continuing to appear until 1903 (two years after his death). He also wrote numerous articles for other reviews as well as several separate works on iconography, ecclesiastical furniture, liturgy, canon law, etc. In 1889 he began to reprint his scattered works, classifying them according to subjects. This publication was to comprise sixty volumes, but went not further than the sixteenth, and is to be recommended more for its erudition than for its critical value. Works: "Œuvres complètes" (unfin.) I. "1598, dossier du concile du Vatican." II. "Le Pape." IV-V. "Droit papal." VI-VIII. "Dévotions populaires." IX-XVI. "Hagiographie" (Rome, 1889-1902). "Traité d'iconographie chrétienne" (2 vols., Paris, 1890); "Collection des décrets authentiques des ss. congrégations romaines" (8 vols., Rome, 1872). Barbière, Mgr Xavier Barbière de Montaut in Revue de l'art chrétien, (1901), 357-60; Girou, Mgr X. B. de Montaut, bio-bibl., Hommes (1910).

R. MAERE.

Montboissier, Peter of (better known as Peter the Venerable), Blessed, born in Auvergne, about 1092; died at Cluny, 25 December, 1156. His mother, Blessed Rainarde, offered him to God in the monastery of Sauxillanges of the Congregation of Cluny, where he made his profession at the age of seventeen. He was only twenty years old when he was appointed professor and prior of the monastery of Vézelay, and he discharged his duties in that house, and later in the monastery of Domène, with such success that at the age of thirty he was elected abbot of Cluny, which then counted not less than 2000 houses throughout Europe, was in need of reform. The abbot had begun this work when his predecessor, the Abbot Pontius, who had been deposed by the pope, attempted to be reinstated in his office by violence. Our saint had to face other attacks made on his order by St. Bernard himself, who did not fall however to acknowledge the eminent virtue of Peter and was the first to call him Venerable. Peter resisted the attacks with both firmness and meekness, and took occasion of them to write the rules of the Congregation of Cluny, one of the most complete and perfect codes of religious life. He was prominent in resisting the schism caused by the Antipope Anacletus II, after the death of Honorius II (1130). With St. Bernard, he was the soul and the light of the General Council of Pisa (1134), and having encouraged Innocent II to stand firm in the midst of persecutions, he predicted the end of the schism, which happened in 1138.

During a visit to Spain (1139) he became interested in Mohammadanism and had the first time translated into Latin. He made several journeys to Rome, where the popes entrusted him with delicate missions, and he accompanied Eugene III to the Council of Reims (1147), where the doctrines of Gilbert de la Porte were condemned. Kings and emperors came to him for advice and in the midst of his
labours he found time to write numerous letters, valuable theological works on the questions of the day, the Divinity of Christ, the Real Presence, against the Jews and the Mohammedans, and concerning the statutes and privileges of his church. He succeeded in his task after a sublime sermon to his brethren on the mystery of the day". Honoured as a saint by both the people and his order, he was never canonized; Pius IX confirmed the cult offered to him (1862).


A. Fournet.

Montcalm-Gozon. Louis-Joseph, Marquis de, a French general, b. 28 Feb., 1712, at Candiac, of Louis-Diégo de Gozon, lord of Montcalm, a rich merchant, and his wife. He was descended from Gozon, Grand Master of Rhodes of legendary fame. The warlike spirit of his ancestors had given rise to the saying: "War is the tomb of the Montcalms." Though less clever than a younger brother, a prodigy of learning seven, Louis-Joseph was a classical scholar. A soldier at fifteen, he served as a lieutenancy in the corps of Grenadiers and German. He served successively at the sieges of Kehl and Philippsbourg, and became a knight of St. Louis (1741) after a campaign in Bohemia, and was appointed colonel of the Auzerrois regiment (1743). He received five wounds at the battle of Piacenza. In 1756 he had married Angélique-Louise Talon de Boylay, grand-niece and heiress of the intendant Talon, bearing that name. Of this union were born ten children. In 1755 he succeeded the ill-fated Dieskau, in the command of the French army in Canada, under governor Vaudreuil. The dissonance of character between the two chiefs was to cause much friction during this trying period. Unlike his superior, Montcalm was quick in conception, genial and gregarious, relying and decisive in action. Intendant Bigot's unscrupulous dishonesty, the apathy of the French court for the "few arpents of snow", an impoverished colony, an ill-fed, ill-clad and badly provided army, all this enhances Montcalm's heroism courage and faithfulness to duty. He was ably seconded by the skilful, patient and wise intendant de Lévis. The disparity in numbers and resources between the belligerent forces rendered more arduous the problem to be solved. Yet it was only after a record of three brilliant victories that he was to end his glorious career on the Plains of Abraham. First in order of time comes the capture of Chouaguen (Oswego), an undertaking wherein all toiled and laboured, all diffidence, Montcalm succeeded (14 Aug., 1758), thereby winning the region of Ontario to the domination of France, and with a few badly armed troops taking 1600 prisoners, 5 flags, 100 guns, at the cost of only 30 killed and wounded. Attributing his success to God, he raised a cross with the inscription: "In hoc signo vincent." In connexion with a later triumph, the capture of Fort William Henry (9 Aug., 1757), Montcalm has been accused of tolerating the massacre by the Indians of the English prisoners. Yet, even Bancroft admits that he exposed himself to death to stop the savages infuriated by the rum given them by the English contrary to his orders. The ill-fated and great city of Quebec, ceded by Lévis and Bourlamaque, was at Carillon (Ticonderoga), a battle which was to result either in the salvation or destruction of New France. Although a first encounter (5 July, 1758) had proved disastrous to the French, the death of the valiant young Lord Howe, the real head of the English troops, deprived Abercorn of his chief support. On the 9th the onslaught of the entire Anglo-American army was rendered impossible by the earthworks and complicated barricade of felled trees protecting Fort Carillon; while a deadly fire decimated the assailants. When the fray was over 2000 English soldiers lay killed or wounded, while the French losses were only 104 killed and 248 wounded; 4000 men had repulsed 15,000. In thanksgiving to the God of Hosts, Montcalm raised a cross with an inscription.

After arresting the invasion by land, Montcalm had to face the attack of the naval forces. During the siege of Quebec by Wolfe, Montcalm with Lévis won a first victory at Montmorency Falls, with a loss of 450 to the English (31 July, 1759). But the final act was drawing nigh, which was to seal the fate of New France. On 13 Sept. the enemy stealthily scaled the Heights of Abraham, and at early morn was ranged in battle. Montcalm, thunderstruck by the unexpected tidings, hurried from Beaufort and arrayed his troops. Though about equal in numbers, they were deficient of discipline, ignoring the principles of surprise, hardship, privation, fatigue, and a disadvantageous position. Both generals fell, Wolfe dying on the battle-field, and Montcalm the next morning. This battle, considered in its results, was one of the greatest events of the eighteenth century. It saved Canada from the French Revolution and heralded the dawn of American Independence. A brave and generous commander, a high-minded and disinterested patriot; a faithful Christian giving to God the glory of his victories. His memory is cherished in the Old and the New World. In Canada he shares the honours awarded to his victor, as the following inscription on their joint monument testifies:

Communem famam historia Monumentum posteritatis dedit.

—a tribute duly anticipated by the French Academy in the last words of the hero's epitaph in the chapel of the Ursuline monastery:

Galli jugentes depopuerunt et generosae hostium fidei
Commune furores spectantes novis
(26 June, 1759) (The French mourned and buried him and commended him to the enemies' generosity).

Lionel Lindsay.

Monte Cassino, Abbey of, an abbey nullius situated about eighty miles south of Rome, the cradle of the Benedictine Order. About 529 St. Benedict left Subiaco, to escape the persecutions of the jealous priest, Florentius (see BENEDICT OF NURSIA, SAINT). Accompanied by a chosen band, among them Sts. Maur and Placid, he vowed to erect a monastery on the lands which the emperor gave to him by Tertullian, Placid's father. The town of Cassino (Cassino), lying at the foot of the mountain, had been destroyed by the Goths some thirty-five years earlier, but a temple of Apollo still crowned the summit of the mountain, and the few remaining inhabitants were still sunk in idolatry. Benedict's first act was to break the image of Apollo and destroy the altar, on the site of which he built a church dedicated to St. John the Baptist, and an oratory in honour of St. Martin of Tours. Around the temple there was an enclosing wall with towers at intervals, the arx (cittadel) of the destroyed city of Cassinium. About one of the towers the saint took up his abode, and to this fact its preservation is due, for, while the rest of the Roman arx has been destroyed, this tower has been carefully pre-
served and enclosed in the later buildings. Outside
the existing monastery, however, there still remains a
considerable part of a far more ancient enclosure, viz.
a cloistered wall some twenty-six feet high and four-
teen and a half feet in thickness, which once ran down
the mountain side enclosing a large triangular space
that contained the Cassinum of pre-Roman times.
Once established at Monte Cassino, St. Benedict never
left it. There was written the Rule whose influence
was to spread over all Western monachism; there he
received the visit of Totila in 542, the only date in his
life of which we have certain evidence; there he died,
and was buried in one tomb with his sister, St. Schol-
astica. After the saint’s death, the abbey continued to
flourish until 580, when it was pillaged and burned by
the Lombards, the surviving monks fleeing to Rome.
Here, welcomed by the pope, Pelagius II, and
permitted to establish a monastery beside the Lateran
Basilica, they remained for a hundred and thirty
years, during which time Monte Cassino seems not to
have been entirely deserted, though nothing like a
regular community existed there. To this period also is
assigned the much discussed translation of St.
Benedict’s body to Fleury in France, the truth of
which it seems almost impossible to doubt. (See
FLEURY, ABBEY OF.)

The restoration of Monte Cassino took place in 718,
when Abbot Petronax, a native of Brescia, was
entrusted with this task by Gregory II. Helped by some
of the Lombard monks, Petronax restored the buildings at Monte Cassino and built a
new church over the tomb of St. Benedict. This
was consecrated in 748 by Pope Zachary in person,
who at the same time confirmed all the gifts made to
the monastery and exempted it from episcopal juris-
diction. The fame of the abbey at this period was
great, and, among the monks professed, may be men-
tioned Caribon, the son of Charles Martel, Racis,
brother of the great Lombard Duke Astolf, and Paul
Warnefrid (usually called Paul the Deacon), the his-
torian of the Lombards. Towards the middle of the
ninth century the Saracens overran this part of Italy
and Monte Cassino did not escape. In 884 Abbot
Bertarius and some of his monks were killed, the rest
fleeing to Teano. Within two years the restoration of
Monte Cassino was begun, but Teano retained the
being brought from Amalfi, Lombardy, and even Con-
stantinople to supervise the various works. The
abbey church, rebuilt and decorated with the utmost
splendour, was consecrated in 1071 by Pope Alexan-
der II, who was assisted by ten archbishops, forty-
four bishops, and so vast a crowd of princes, abbots,
monks, etc. that, the enthusiastic chronicler declares,
“it would have been easier to number the stars of
heaven than to count so great a multitude.” A de-
tailed account of the abbey at this date exists in the
“Chronica monasterii Cassinensis” of Leo of Ostia

From this date a decline set in. The unsettled
condition of Italy and the great strategical value of
Monte Cassino involved the abbey in the constant
political struggles of the period. In 1239 the monks
were driven out of their cloister by Frederick II, but
returned thither under Charles of Anjou. In 1294
Celestine V endeavourd to unite Monte Cassino to
his new order of Celestines (q. v.), but this scheme
collapsed on his abdication of the papacy. In 1321
John XXII made the church of Monte Cassino a
cathedral, the abbot becoming bishop of the newly
constituted diocese, and his monks the chapter. There
is no doubt that this was done with the best of in-
ten tions, as an additional honour to the great abbey;
in practice, however, it proved disastrous. The
bishops of Monte Cassino, collected monks from other
dioceses to reinforce the community, and in 1370 ap-
pointed Andrew of Faenza, a Camaldolese, as superior.
The revival, however, was short-lived; in 1454 the
system of commendatory abbots was reintroduced and
lasted until 1504, when Julius II united Monte Cas-
sino to the recently established Congregation of St.
Justina of Padua (see BENEDICTINES), which was
thenceforth known as the Cassinese Congregation.
In 1799 the abbey was taken and plundered by
the French troops who had invaded the Kingdom of
Naples, and in 1866 the monastery was suppressed in
common with all other Italian religious houses. At

The bulk of the community until 949, when Abbot Alig-
erus effected the return. The autograph copy of
St. Benedict’s Rule, which had been preserved till now
through all the vicissitudes of the community’s exist-
ence, perished in a fire during the stay at Teano. The
high state of discipline at Monte Cassino about this
time is vouched for by St. Nilus, who visited it in the
latter half of the tenth century and again by St. Odilo
of Cluny some fifty years later. The abbey’s reputa-
tion reached its zenith, however, during the reign of
the present day Monte Cassino is the property of the Italian Government, which has declared it a national monument; the abbey, however, is recognized as Guardian in view of his administration of the diocese. The reigning abbot is Dom Gregorio Diamare (elected 1909); the community (1909) consists of thirty-seven choir monks and thirty lay brothers. The present building, a monastery, a lay school with 126 boarders and two seminaries, one open to all and the other reserved for the Diocese of Monte Cassino with 76 and 50 pupils respectively. In the management of these institutions the monks are assisted by a number of secular priests.

The present buildings form a vast rectangular pile externally more massive than beautiful. The ancient tower of St. Benedict, now a series of chapels elaborately decorated by monastic artists of the Beuron school, is the only portion dating back to the foundation of the abbey. The entrance gate leads to three square court-yards opening out of one another with arcades in the Doric order. These date from 1515 and are attributed, on somewhat slight evidence, to Bramante. From the middle court-yard an immense flight of steps leads to the atrium or forecourt of the basilica. This quadrangle has an arcade supported by ancient columns taken from the basilica of Abbot Desiderius, and probably once in the devotees of the abbey. The vast buildings contain, besides the present church stands. The existing church, the fourth to occupy the site, is from the designs of Cosimo Fanzaga. It was begun in 1649, and was consecrated in 1727 by Benedict XIII. In richness of marbles, the interior is said to be surpassed only by the Certosa of Pavia, and the first impression is one of stinging magnificence. On closer inspection, however, the style is found to be somewhat decadent, especially in the plasterwork of the ceiling, while the enormous profusion of inlaid marble and gilding produces a slightly restless effect. Still it is undoubtedly the finest example of Florentine mosaic work in Europe, and the general colour scheme is excellent. The church is cruciform in plan, with a dome at the crossing, beneath which is the high altar. Behind this altar is the choir with its elaborately carved stalls. The tomb of St. Benedict is in a crypt chapel beneath the eastern portion of the church, but it is extremely doubtful whether any relics of the saint now remain there. This church has recently been redecorated with frescoes from designs by artists of the Beuron school, the severity of which contrasts markedly with the slightly Rococo paintings by Luca Giordano in the church above. The sacristy contains the ancient pavement of opus alexandrinum, which was formerly in the basilica of Abbot Desiderius. In the left transept is the monument of Pietro di Medici, son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, and brother of Leo X. This tomb, which is by the great architect Antonio di Sangallo, is unquestionably the most beautiful and dignified work in the whole building. The west door, a bronze piece of the twelfth century, is engraved with the names of all the parishes in the Diocese of Monte Cassino. The kitchens are approached from the ground-floor by a long covered passage on an inclined plane, large enough for two mules laden with provisions to pass. This curious structure dates from the twelfth century and is lit by an exquisite marble window of four arches in the style known as Cosmatesque. The buildings as a whole produce an effect of great dignity and magnificence, and are isolated from the inaccessibility of the monastery and the extreme severity of the exterior. The view from the "Loggia del Paradiso" or forecourt, is one of the most famous in Southern Italy.

The archives (archivium), besides a vast number of documents relating to the history of the abbey, contains some 1400 manuscript codices chiefly patristic and historical, many of which are of the greatest value. The library contains a fine collection of modern texts and apparatus criticus, which is always most courteously put at the disposal of scholars who come to work on the manuscripts. When the abbey was declared a national monument, orders were given that no building or transport of building material, not even the National Library at Naples; but, owing to the personal intercession of Mr. Gladstone, then Prime Minister of England, the order was reversed, and instead one of the community was appointed as Archivist with a salary from the Government, an arrangement which still continues.

The Diocese of Monte Cassino includes most of the Abruzzi, and is one of the most extensive in Italy. It was formed by uniting seven ancient dioceses, a fact which is borne in mind by the interesting custom that, when the abbot sings pontifical High Mass, he uses seven different precious mitres in succession. As ordinary the abbot is directly subject to the Holy See, and the choir monks take rank as the chapter of the diocese, of which the abbatial basilica of Monte Cassino is the cathedral. The conferring of sacred orders, blessing of Holy Oils, and administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation are the only pontifical functions which the abbot does not exercise. The vicar-general is usually one of the community.

G. ROGER HEDSTON.

Montefeltro, Diocese of (Forlì-terna), in the province of Urbino, in the Marches, Central Italy. The earliest mention of it, as Mons Feretri, is in the diplomas by which Charlemagne confirmed the grants of Pepin the Short to the Holy See. Montefeltro was then the seat of counts, who became imperial vicars in 1135, and Counts of Urbino in 1213. Their rule was interrupted from 1322 to 1375, when Ederigo I of Montefeltro and Urbino succeeded in recovering the territory. This prince and his successors made several attempts to recover Montefeltro, from which Cardinal Albornoz (1359) again expelled them in the person of Nofilo. The elder Guido of Montefeltro, a famous Ghibelline captain, finally became a Francisan, and died in 1268. The first known bishop of Montefeltro was Agahto (839), whose residences were at Pesaro, Urbino, and Ravenna; he was Valentino (1173), who finished the cathedral; Benvenuto (1219), deposed as a partisan of Count Ederigo; Benedetto (1390), a Benedictine monk, rector of Romagna and Duke of Spoleto; the Franciscan Giovanni Seclani (1413), who built the episcopal palace of Calamelle; Cardinal Ennio Filonardi (1549); Giovanni Francesco Sarmani (1567), founded by the commendatory of Pennabili, thenceforth residence of the bishops, the episcopal see having been transferred to that town from San Leo, an important fortress of the Pontifical States. Under Bishop Flaminio Dondi (1724) the see was again transferred to San Leo, but later it returned to Pennabili. This diocese is suffragan to Urbino, and has 19 parishes, 33 vicariates, 30 regulars, 69,350 Catholics, 9 religious houses of men, 9 of women, 2 educational institutions for male students, and 3 for girls.

CAPPENETTI, La Chiesa d' Italia, III (Venice, 1857).
Montefiascone, Diocese of (Montis Falsici), in the province of Rome. The city is situated nearly 2000 feet above sea-level, on a tufa mass that overlooks the Lake of Bolsena; it is famous for its wine. The town is of Etruscan origin and was called Falsicorum. Tradition believes that it is the ancient Fanum Volturnum. For the Falsicans, and later for the popes, it was a most important strategic position; Gregory IX fortified it in 1235 against Frederick II, but the town surrendered to that prince in 1240, and thenceforth never regained its earlier importance. The castle, now in ruins, was restored by Leo X. The cathedral is the work of Sanmichieli (1519). Outside the city, on the road to Bolsena, is the famous double basilica of San Flaviano, the lower portion of which dates from 1030, while the upper basilica, dating from 1262, presents the interesting feature of alternating ogive and round arches. There also is the tomb of that famous drinker whom the wine of Montefiascone brought to his death (Est, Est, Est), and who, contrary to report, was neither a canon nor one of the Fugger family of Augsburg. Montefiascone is the birthplace of the poet Giambattista Casti, who died in 1802. This city, originally in the Diocese of Bagnaia, was made an episcopal see in 1369; its first bishop was the French Augustinian Pierre d'Anguiscen (1376), a partisan of the antipope Clement VII. In 1435 the see was united with that of Corneto, and so remained until, in 1584, Corneto became a part of the Diocese of Civitavecchia.

Among its bishops were Alessandro Farnese (1490), later Paul III; the two brothers and cardinals Paolo Emilio Zaccaria (1601) and Ludovico Zaccia (1605), both of whom did much for the building of the cathedral; Cardinal Paluzio Albertoni Altieri (1660), founder of the seminary and restorer of the cathedral, which was damaged by a fire in 1670; the learned cardinal M. Antonio Barbarigo (1687), who was transferred later to Padua; he gave great assistance after the earthquake of 1695; Cardinal Pompeo Aldobrandini (1734); the learned Giuseppe Garangi (1776), who gave his library to the seminary, and Cardinal Giovanni Sifredo Manzy (1794); the attitude of this prelate towards Napoleon was not imitated by his clergy, who therefore suffered imprisonment and exile. The diocese is directly dependent on the Holy See; it contains 18 parishes, 14 secular priests, 21 regulars, 26,147 inhabitants, 3 religious houses of men, 14 of women, and 3 convent schools for girls.

U. BENIGNI

Montemayor (Montemór), Jorge de, writer, b. at Montemór, province of Coimbra, Portugal, about 1520; d. at Turin, 26 February, 1561. Although of Portuguese birth, Montemayor occupies a prominent place in the history of Spanish letters. Little is known of his life. We are informed, however, that he was not a man of university training, being not even acquainted with Latin.

The work which has given him fame is his pastoral novel “La Diana”, published, according to common report, at Valencia, in 1542, but thought by others, from allusions in the work itself, to have been published after 1564, probably in 1558 or 1559. This book, which for a long time served as a model for novels of its kind, is written in good Spanish prose, and in it the author describes certain incidents in his own life, among others an unfortunate love affair. The portions written in verse are not so meritorious as those written in prose. The author promises a sequel which never appeared. Three other “Dianas” appeared, however, which purported to be continuations of Montemayor’s. One by Alonso Perela, who claimed that Montemayor had entrusted to him his plans for finishing the work, appeared in 1564 and was a failure. The two others, by Gaspar Gil Polo in 1564 and by Jerónimo de Tajadas in 1567, were more deserving of praise.

The “Diana” enjoyed great popularity and led to many imitations by famous authors, notably “La Arcadia” of Lope de Vega, and “La Galatea” of Cervantes, and it is said that Shakespeare used his “Two Gentlemen of Verona” upon an episode in “La Diana”. It went through many editions both in and out of Spain. There are six French, two German, and one English translation of the book, the latter the work of Bartholomew Wilde (London, 1598). Montemayor has also left a number of lyric poems, published in 1554 under the title of “Cancionero”, and reprinted in 1562, 1572, and 1588. These are also written in Spanish, but are not of any particular merit.
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VENTURA FUENTES

Montenegro, a kingdom in the Balkan Peninsula, on the east coast of the Adriatic Sea; the territory was in ancient times a portion of the Roman province of Dalmatia. Emperor Diocletian made Southern Dalmatia a separate province, Prevalis (Diocles, Dicletiania) with Diocles as its capital. From the seventh century the north-western portion of the peninsula began to be invaded by Slav tribes; one of these, the Serbs, settled in the territory which they still possess, and founded there severai principalities (Zupanate), the most southern of which was that of (or on the site of the ancient Diocles) Duklja. From Zeta sprang the Nemanjiden family, under whose autocracy the Servian Empire attained its greatest power (see Servia). Stefan I Nemanja was recognized as Chief Zupan by Emperor Manuel I, in 1165; having reduced into submission the stubborn lesser Zupans, he embraced the Orthodox Faith, and then began to organize the Servian Church. His youngest son, Sava, or Sabas, after being appointed first Orthodox Archbishop of Servia in 1221, founded a see for Zeta in the monastery of St. Michael near Cattaro. In the Empire of the Serbs, each heir apparent to the throne was first appointed administrator of the Province of Zeta. However, under King Stefan Dušan (1331-55) a member of the Balacica family was named Governor...
of Zeta. From 1380 to 1421 this family ruled in Zeta, notwithstanding the constant opposition of the Cner-
nojević family, settled in Upper Zeta. On the de-
solution of the Great Serb Empire by the Turks
the battle of Amsfeld in 1389 Zeta became the
refuge of the most valiant of the Serbs, who refused to
submit to the Turkish yoke.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century, the Ve-
etianans established a settlement on the eastern coast of
the Adriatic, and conquered a portion of the Ser-
bian Empire in Asian Albania, which had been in the
possession of the opposition of the people.

As vassal of the Venetians, Ivan Cernojević, the son
of Stefan (brother-in-law of Skanderbeg), secured for
himself sovereign authority. He founded the mon-
astery of Cetinje about 1478 or 1485. It was dur-
ing this period that the land received the name of
Crnauga, or Montenegro. Under Ivan's son, George
(1493-5), the first Slav liturgical books were printed
at Obod (1493-5). In 1516 he abdicated and the
people invested the bishop (vladika), who was also
superior of the mon-
astery at Cetinje,
with supreme secular
authority. Subse-
quently the bishop,
who until 1697 was
always chosen by the
National Assembly,
was both spiritual and temporal ruler of the little state,
although he named a secular governor of the opposition of the people.
The Turks made re-
peated attacks dur-
ing the fifteenth cen-
tury on the freedom of the Montenegrins, and kingdom. The Montenegrins,
notwithstanding their heroic opposition, were fi-
nally forced to make their submission, and from 1430 to 1530 had to pay tribute to the Sanjak
of Scutari. In domestic affairs, however, they re-
mained independent, and the sovereignty of the
Porto was mostly of a purely nominal character.

Frequently the little nation, which (according to the
description of the Italian Mariano Bolissia in 1611)
then contained 90 settlements and 9077 armed men,
engaged in war with the Turks, being often assisted
with money and arms by the Venetians.

In 1696 Danilo Petrović, of the Njepeš family, was
elected vladika, and made the episcopal dignity hered-
itary in his house, the vladika, who as bishop could
not marry, being succeeded on his death by his
nephew or brother. As prince of a nation recognizing
the Porto as its Church, Danilo inaugurated closer rela-
tions with Russia, which held the same religious beliefs,
and Peter the Great undertook the protectorate of
Montenegro in 1710. Since that date the Montene-
grins have always shown themselves the faithful allies
of Russia in its wars against the Turks, although at
the end of these wars they usually reaped no advan-
tages. They, however, often made large con-
tributions of money to their poor allies; in 1714 Peter
I contributed 10,000 rubles towards the relief of those
whose property had been burnt and for the rebuilding
of the destroyed monasteries; in 1715 he assigned an
annual contribution of 500 rubles and other presents
to the monastery of Cetinje; and in 1857 Emperor
Nikola I contributed 400 rubles in the prince a fixed annual in-
come of 9000 ducate.

The most prosperous era of Montenegro opened
with the reign of Vladika Peter I Petrović (1777-
1830), who repelled unaided a fierce attack of the
Turks in 1796 and rendered valuable aid to the Rus-
sians against the French during the War of 1813.
Because of his glorious reign, Peter was proclaimed
a saint by the people in 1834. He was succeeded by
Peter II Petrović (1830-51), who was educated at
St. Petersburg; this monarch, who was a distinguished
poet, rendered valuable services to his country by
raising its intellectual and commercial condition.
Having abolished the office of vojvoda, which had
been too frequently the occasion of strife, he took into
his own hands the secular administration, founded
schools, instituted a system of taxation, organized
a guard as the nucleus of a standing army, and es-
tablished a senate of twelve members. His successor
and nephew, Danilo (1851-60), transformed Montenegro
from a secular state, disturbed by ecclesiastical con-
fusion, and undertook the administration of a
secular prince. At a national assembly held at
Cetinje on 21
March, 1852, the
separation of the
spiritual and secular powers of the
vladika was
taken. The
supreme ecclesiasti-
cal authority
entrusted to the archi-
mandrite of the mon-
astery of Ostrog.
In the same year Russia and Austria recog-
nized Montenegro
as an hereditary,
secular, and indepen-
dent state. The
Porto, however,
which still regarded
the vladika as a
"portion of its Ra-
jahs temporarily in
revolt," refused its
recognition and sent
an expedition of 60,
000 men against it.
When the land seemed about to be overwhelmed by
such huge forces, Austria interfered in its behalf, and com-
pelled the Porto to discontinue the war. The politi-
cal position of the land, however, remained still
undefined. In 1858, when the Turks attacked Monte-
negro without any declaration of hostilities, the Euro-
pean Great Powers, especially France and Russia,
came forward as its protectors, and a compromise of
the Powers fixed the frontiers of the country, whose
territory was increased by a few districts.

In 1860 Danilo was shot by a Montenegrin deserter
and, as he left behind only a daughter two years old,
his widow secured on 14 August, 1860, the election of
the youngest son of Danilo's brother, who still
ruins. Montenegro's participation in the
emergence of Herzegovina led in 1862 to a war with Turkey,
during which the Turks invaded the land and occu-
pied Cetinje. The Peace of Scutari conceded to the
Turks various fortresses along the road leading from
Herzegovina through Montenegro to Scutari. In
1870, however, the Porto surrendered its right to oc-
cupy these fortresses. In 1875, when the war again occurred in Bosnia, Nikita, who controlled an army of 15,000 well-armed troops, formed an alliance with the Bosnians against the Turks, and prosecuted the
war with success until 1878. Not only did he repel
all the Turkish attacks, but he even succeeded in
capturing Anti-vari (thus securing a long-desired
maritime outlet for his country) and Danilo in 1879.
At the Congress of Berlin Turkey recognized
the political independence of Montenegro (13 July, 1878),
the territory of which was now more than doubled. According to Article 29 of the Treaty of Berlin, however, Montenegro might neither keep ships of war, nor fortify the coast, and was obliged to recognize the right of Austria to police the coast. It was only in 1909 that the country secured a release from these conditions. When Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina in October, 1908, and thereby annulled the dreams of Montenegro and Servia of a United Servian Empire, Montenegro protested in common with Servia and, encouraged by Russia, demanded from Austria the annulment of Article 29 of the Treaty of Berlin and the evacuation of Spizza. In April, 1909, Austria agreed to the abrogation of Article 29, but refused to surrender Spizza, and secured the retention of that portion of the Berlin Treaty, which forbade the transformation of Antivari into a naval station. In 1905 Nikita granted the country a constitution and a national assembly elected by popular suffrage. Although the economical resources of the land are small, and its cultural conditions, notwithstanding the great progress made in the last fifty years, leave much to be desired, it occupies a position of increased consideration and importance with regard to the Balkan politics of the European powers on account of the ability of its ruler and its intimate relations with Russia, Italy, and Servia. In 1900 Prince Nikita received the title of Royal Highness, and in August, 1910, with the assent of all the people, crowned himself king. On that occasion Russia gave expression to the ancient friendship existing between the countries by naming the new king General Field-Marshal, the heir-apparent Major General, and Prince Mirko Lieutenant Colonel of the Russian Army.

Monte is 230 square miles and a population of 260,000 inhabitants, of whom the great majority are of unmixed Serb stock. About 223,500 belong to the Greek Orthodox Church; 12,900 are Catholics (mostly Albanians), and about 14,000 are Mohammedans. The capital is Cetinje. The earlier plenary power of the prince has not been substantially lessened by the Constitution of 0 (19) December, 1906. The members of the popular assembly (Skupetschina) are elected by public direct suffrage every four years; the assembly includes twelve ex-officio members, among whom are the Orthodox metropolitan, the Catholic Archbishop of Antivari, the Mufti of Montenegro, the president of the Supreme Court of Justice, etc. The state religion is the Greek Orthodox; other religious bodies recognized by the State are at liberty to practice their religion, but every attempt on their part to gain converts from among the Orthodox is forbidden. The Orthodox Church of Montenegro is autocephalous, i.e., independent of the Patriarch of Constantinople; its spiritual head, who bears the titles of Metropolitan of Skanderia and Paralaseda, Archbishop of Tuzlina, etc., is chosen by the National Assembly from the ranks of the native unmarried secular clergy or monks, and is consecrated by the Russian Holy Synod at St. Petersburg. He resides at the monastery of St. Peter at Cetinje. In 1877 a second see, that of Buda and Ostrog, was erected. The protopresbyter numbers 17, and the parishes about 180. The priest's office is a rule hereditary, since each priest trains his son for the priesthood; the office of protopresbyter is similarly in the possession of certain families.

Since the convention between the Holy See and the Prince of Montenegro of 18 August (ratified 8 October), 1886, the Catholic Church enjoys full official recognition; the chief is the Archbishop of Antivari, who is immediately subject to the Holy See. There are 13 secular priests, 10 regular priests, 27 churches and chapels, and eleven elementary schools. The number of parishes is thirteen, but a law recently passed by the Skupetschina, in contraven-

The earlier literature will be found in Valentinii, Bibliografia della Dalmazia e del Montenegro (Zagabria, 1856; Supplement, 1862). Consult Andrei, Gesch. des Fürstentumes Montenegro bis 1859 (Vienna, 1853); LIEBERMANN, Cartes et Monténégriens (Paris, 1866); DENTON, Montenegro, its People and History (London, 1867); CHIVAUDIN, Saggio del Montenegrina da tempi antichi fino a nostra (Spalato, 1828); COQUELLE, Histoire du Monténégro et de la Bosnie (Paris, 1893); CAPPELLATI, Il Montenegrino ed i suoi principi (Livorno, 1890); MACSWINEY DE MRRHAGHAGHLE, Le Monténégro et la Sainte-Suzie (Rome, 1922); RUMINGER, Montenegro in Vorgeschichte und Gegenwart (St. Petersburg, 1905), in Russian; SCHWARZ, Montenegro (Leipzig, 1888); HABERMONT, Biographie physiques des Geographes de Montenegro (Gotha, 1888), with bibliography; MARTINI, Il Montenegro (Rome, 1897); WYON and FRANCÉ, The Land of the Black Mountain (London, 1903); RAMARO, Dalmazia und Mont. (Leipzig, 1904); Montenegro und sein Herrscherhaus (1906); PAOLINO, La constitution del Mont. (Rome, 1906); NOZIE, Des port en le Mont. (Paris, 1907).

Joseph Lins.
Saint Agostino and of the Oratorio della Misericordia are worthy of mention. Among the civic buildings are notable the Tarugi palace, like the Mercato a work of Pignola; the Contucci palace designed by Sangallo, and the fourteenth-century Palazzo Municipale, which contains a small gallery of Sienese and of Umbrian art. The most famous men of Montepulciano are Cardinal Bellarmine, Pope Marcellus II, Cervini, Angelo Ambrognini, better known as Poliziano (1454-1494), and the humanist Bartolomeo of Montepulciano. St. Agnes of Montepulciano died in 1137.

The city belonged originally to the Diocese of Arezzo, and had a collegiate church, whose archpriest became a mitred abbot in 1400; in 1480 it became a prelatura nuda, and in 1561 was made the seat of a bishop. Its first bishop was Spinello Beni (1562); among the others the following are well known: Talento de' Talenti (1640), a great savant; Antonio Cervini (1663), who did much for the cathedral and the episcopal palace; Pietro Franceschi (1737) opposed the novelties of the Council of Florence in 1787; Pellegro Maria Carletti (1802), author of several works and of eighteen letters on the National Council of Paris of 1810, at which he assisted. The diocese is immediately dependent on the Holy See, and has 18 parishes, 15,879 inhabitants, two religious houses of men, and two of women.

The cathedral, Montepulciano. 

CAPPENITTI, La Chiesa d'Italia, XIII (Venice, 1887). 

U. BENIGNI.

Monterey and Los Angeles, Diocese of (Montereyensis et Angelorum), comprises that part of the State of California which lies south of 37° 5' N. lat. and covers an area of 80,000 square miles. It thus embraces in its bounds the twenty-one Indian missions which made California famous. Originally the whole state with the peninsula of Lower California formed the Diocese of Both Californias whose first bishop was the Rt. Rev. Francisco Garcia Diego y Moreno. On his arrival in Upper California he established his residence at Santa Barbara Mission. On 1 May, 1850, the pope organized the Diocese of Monterey and named Rt. Rev. Joseph Sadoc Alemany, O.F.M., its first bishop, but Lower California was not withdrawn from his jurisdiction until 21 Dec., 1851. In 1853 the peninsula was placed under the administration of the Metropolitan of Mexico. When on 29 July, 1853, the Archdiocese of San Francisco was erected, the boundaries of the Monterey Diocese were drawn as they exist at present. Archbishop Alemany on 29 July, 1853, was promoted to the See of San Francisco, and on the same date Rt. Rev. Thaddeus Amat, C.M., was appointed Bishop of Monterey. The new bishop resided at Santa Barbara, however, until 9 July, 1859, on which date the pope permitted him to reside in Los Angeles, but with instructions to retain the old title.

Around the former missions and the four military garrisons in the course of time immigrants from almost every part of the world took up their abode and founded cities, but the names of the saints under whose invocation the Indian missions had been estab-
Angeles, San Luis Obispo, and San Bernardino. In 1871 Bishop Amat laid the cornerstone for the cathedral; he started the home for the diocese, under the patronage of St. Vibiana (Bibiana), virgin and martyr. The building was completed and dedicated 30 June, 1876. In 1870 he attended the Vatican Council. Owing to constant ill-health he asked for a coadjutor who was given him in the person of Rt. Rev. Francis Mora. Bishop Amat died 12 May, 1878. His remains lie buried in the cathedral which he erected.

Rt. Rev. Francis Mora was born at Vich, Catalonia, Spain, 25 Nov., 1827; he attended the seminary of his native city; in 1855 he accompanied Bishop Amat to California, and was ordained priest at Santa Barbara 19 March, 1856. From July of that year to the end of 1860 he was stationed at the Indian mission of San Juan Bautista, and from September, 1861, to July, 1866, he had charge of Mission San Luis Obispo. After that he resided at Los Angeles. On 20 May, 1873, Father Mora was consecrated Bishop of Moynoplis in partibus infidelium and made coadjutor of Bishop Amat. At the death of the latter he succeeded to the seat of the episcopal see, and when Rome, 20 June, accepted his resignation he returned to Spain. He died at Sarria, Catalonia, 3 August, 1905. During his administration the Sisters of St. Joseph and of St. Marys were organized in the city. Bishop Mora was remarkable for his financial ability, and succeeded in paying off many of the important debts of the diocese, and by his careful investments left it in a splendid financial condition.

Rt. Rev. George Montgomery was born in Daviess County, Kentucky, 20 December, 1847, and was ordained priest at Washington, D.C., 20 December, 1879. He held the post of Chancellor of the Archdiocese of San Francisco until his consecration as titular Bishop of Tumi 8 April, 1894, when he became coadjutor to Bishop Mora. Two years later he succeeded to the see and at once displayed remarkable energy. At this period immigrants from the eastern States began to flock to California in great numbers, and the population of Los Angeles more than doubled its population. New needs arose which it was the endeavour of the bishop to meet by building churches and schools, and by calling to his aid more priests and religious. In season and out of season Bishop Montgomery insisted on the necessity of educating children in Catholic schools. In 1900 he was appointed by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to recognize the right of Indian parents and guardians to send their children to the schools of their choice independent of the reservation agent. Subsequently this same view was adopted by the Government, and made the rule for all the Indians in the United States. The bishop thus in every way manifested a watchful solicitude for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the diocese. His personality won friends for the Church on all sides, whilst his vigorous defence of Catholic doctrine, as well as his clean-cut, outspoken advocacy of American rights and duties, gave to the Church in southern California a great onward movement and prepared the way for Bishop O'connor's administration. In 1903 Bishop Montgomery was appointed Archbishop of Osino in partibus and made coadjutor to the Archbishop of San Francisco. He died 10 January, 1907, sincerely lamented by all classes, especially by the poor. During his administration the following congregations of religious were received into the diocese: Congregation of the Holy Cross, Sisters of the Holy Names, Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of the Presentation, and the Ursuline Sisters.

Rt. Rev. Thomas James Conaty was born in Killanleck, County Cavan, Ireland, 1 August, 1847, and came to America with his parents in 1850. He attended the College of the Immaculate Conception, graduated from Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass., in 1869, was ordained priest at Montreal Seminary 21 December, 1872, was made assistant at St. John's Church, Worcester, Mass., 1 January, 1873, and pastor of the church of the Sacred Heart, Worcester, 10 January, 1880. During these years he was actively engaged in the cause of total abstinence and education. He was president of the Total Abstinence Union of America, and for several years president of the Catholic Summer School at Cliff Haven. At different times he was elected to public positions of trust in the city of Worcester. On 10 January, 1897, he was appointed Rector of the Catholic University, Washington, D. C., by Leo XIII. On 1 November, 1903, he was made domestic prelate, and 14 July, 1901, named titular Bishop of Samos, and was consecrated at the cathedral, Baltimore, 21 November, 1901, by Cardinal Gibbons. On 27 March, 1903, he was appointed Bishop of Monterey and Los Angeles to succeed Bishop Montgomery. The influx of immigrants from the eastern States, especially from the city of New York, has been phenomenal. From his arrival in the latter part of 1903 to the latter part of 1912 twelve new parishes have been added to the episcopal see, and nine parish schools have been erected in various parts of the diocese for 2500 additional pupils. The number of priests has increased from 101 in 1893 to 206 in 1911, 75 of whom belong to the Order of the Holy Cross. The character of the Catholic population numbering 100,000, of whom 60,000 live in Los Angeles, is cosmopolitan. The percentage of Catholics to the inhabitants of the diocese is about one-sixth. Besides the English-speaking races, there are large colonies of Spaniards or Mexicans, Germans, Italians, Portuguese, Poles, Slavonians, Slovaks, Roumanians, and Syrians. Churches and priests are caring for the spiritual interests of these different nationalities. One feature of the diocesan work is the care of the Indians, most of whom are descendants of the former Mission Indians. About 4000 are cared for by seven priests who devote themselves entirely or to a great extent to this work. There are 32 schools for young people in English and to their elders in Spanish, which is generally understood by the natives. Churches have been built for them at all reservations. A church and parochial residence have also been erected near the Government Indian School at Sherman, and a priest acts as chaplain for the Catholic children of that institution. The Church is also in charge of a large boarding school for Indian children at Banning which is in charge of the Sisters of St. Joseph. As the diocese annually receives its share of the Pious Fund of Mexico, it has been able to provide for many of the religious necessities of the Indians, but there are many demands calling for diocesan help. The rapidly growing population of the diocese impelled Bishop Conaty to call to his assistance the following additional religious orders and congregations: Benedictine Fathers for the Basques, Fathers of the Society of the Divine Saviour for the Poles, Sons of the Immaculate Heart of Mary for the Mexicans, Jesuit Fathers, Redemptorist Fathers, Sisters of the Good Shepherd, Little Sisters of the Poor, Missionary Sisters of the Immaculate Heart (Italian), and Sisters of St. Francis.

STATISTICS.—Besides the items already mentioned above, there are 166 churches and chapels, 43 stations without churches, 33 ecclesiastical students, 1 seminary for Franciscan Fathers, 2 colleges for young men with 407 students, 1 college and 16 academies for girls (seven of the latter are for the education of the pupils of the academies) 5424 children, 9 orphan asylums with 1048 inmates, 1 Catholic Indian boarding school with 118 pupils, 2 Government Indian schools with 355 Catholic pupils, 5 hospitals and 3
homes for the aged. A new cathedral is contemplated which will be worthy of the city of Los Angeles.

Sancta Barbara Mission Archives; Bishop's Archives (Los Angeles, 1894); Financial History of California (Harbor Springs, Mich., 1897); Remy's Biog. Cyclopaedia of the History of the U.S. (Milwaukee, 1898); Catholic Directory.

ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT.

Montessa, Military Order of.—This order was established in the Kingdom of Aragon to take the place of the Order of the Temple, of which it was in a certain sense the continuation. It derived its title from St. George of Montessa, its principal stronghold. The Templars were received with enthusiasm in Aragon from their very foundation (1128). Berenger III, Count of Barcelona, wished to die in the habit of a Templar (1130). King Alfonso I, "The Fighter," having no direct heir, bequeathed his dominions to be divided among the Templars, the Hospitalers, and the Canons of the Holy Sepulchre, but naturally this bequest was annulled by his subjects (1131). The Templars had to be contented with certain castles, the chief of which was Montson. Although the Aragonese branch of the order was pronounced innocent at the famous trial of the Templars, Clement V's Bull of suppression was applied to them in spite of the protests of King James II (1131). By way of compensation, however, this monarch obtained from Pope John XXII authority to dispose of the possessions of the Templars in his Kingdom of Valencia in favour of a military order not essentially differing from that of the Templars, which should be charged with the defence of his frontier against the Moors and the pirates. It was affiliated to the Order of Calatrava, from which its first recruits were drawn, and it was maintained in dependence upon that order. The first of the fourteen grand masters, who ruled the Order of Montessa until the office was united with the Crown by Philip II in 1557, was Guillermo d'Erl.

LaFALER, Montesita illustrata (Valencia, 1909); Definiciones de la orden y caballeria de Montessa (Valencia, 1573); LA FUENTE, Hist. Real de España (Madrid, 1874).

CH. MOELLER.

Montesino, Antonio, Spanish missionary, date of birth unknown; d. in the West Indies, 1545. Of his early life little is known. He entered the Order of St. Dominic and made his religious profession in the convent of St. Stephen, Salamanca, where in all probability he studied. He was noted for his exemplary piety, his love of strict observance, his eloquence, and moral courage. In September, 1510, under the leadership of Pedro de Cordova, he landed with the first band of Dominicans in Hispaniola. He was the first, in 1511, to denounce publicly in America the enslavement and oppression of the Indians as sinful and disgraceful to the Spanish nation. Being censured for this, he was cited to Spain in 1512, where he pleaded the cause of the Indians so successfully that the king took immediate measures towards ameliorating their condition.

In June, 1526, with Father Anthony de Cervantes, he accompanied several hundred colonists under the leadership of Ayllon to Guanape, probably where the English subsequently founded Jamestown; or, as some are inclined to think, proceeded even as far as New York. In either case, however, we are safe in asserting that Holy Mass was celebrated for the first time in the present territory of the United States by these Dominicans. On the death of Ayllon (Oct., 1526) the colony abandoned the country and returned to San Domingo. According to Helpe, "Spanish Conquest in America," he went to Venezuela about 1528 with twenty of his brethren. Nothing more is known of him except the slight information furnished by a note in the margin of the register of his profession in the convent of St. Stephen, in Salamanca, which says: "Obit martyr in Indiis." He is the author of "Informatio juridica in Indorum defensionem".


JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Montesinos, Luis de, Spanish theologian, date and place of birth unknown; d. 7 Oct., 1621. He entered the Dominican Order and studied philosophy and theology in the Spanish universities where he gained a reputation for sound scholarship and solid piety that made him illustrious among the savants of his time. Beginning his career as a professor of philosophy he was gradually promoted to the most important chairs. He was the foremost exponent of Thomistic theology at the University of Alcalá. His vast erudition, power of penetration, and clearness of exposition won for him the surname Doctor clarus. He possessed a singular charm of manner which secured for him at once love and respect. Such was his respect for his intellectual power that his lecture hall, though one of the largest in Spain, was too small to admit his audiences. For thirty years he taught with untiring zeal and devotion, refusing all ecclesiastical honours. Though threatened with total blindness in his latter years, he continued to teach till his death. He is the author of "Commentaria in primam secundae S. Thomae" (Alcalá, 1622).

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Montes Piotatis are charitable institutions of credit that lend money at low rates of interest, or without interest at all, upon the security of objects left in pawn, with a view to protecting persons in want from usurers. Being charitable establishments, they lend only to people who are in need of funds to pass through some financial crisis, as in cases of general scarcity of food, misfortunes, etc. On the other hand, these institutions do not seek financial profit, but use all profits that may accrue to them for the payment of employees and to extend the scope of their charitable work. Formerly there were not only monasterly montes (dem. monasterio monte), but also grain montes (granatieri), flour montes, etc. In the history of these establishments it may be observed that the word mons, even in ancient Latin (Plautus, Prudentius), was used to signify a "great quantity," or heap, with reference to money, while the juridic term for a monetary "fund" was rather massa: and long before the term montes pietatis the word mons (in Italian, monte) was used to designate collected funds, destined to various ends, which in time came to be called montes profani. Thus the public debt that was contracted by the Republic of Venice between 1164 and 1178 was called Mons or Impresta, and similar montes were created by Genoa (1300) and by Florence (1436); the stock companies of the Middle Ages, also, were
called montes, as, for example, the "monse aluninarius", which operated the alum deposits of Tofla. The same was true of insurance societies and of the banks of exchange or of credit that for the greater part were in the hands of Jews or of the so-called Lombards. As these banks often lent money on objects delivered to them in pawn, the charitable institutions which were created for transactions of that class also took the name of mons, pietais being added to express the fact that the establishments in question were beneficent and not speculative.

In the Middle Ages it was very difficult to obtain money, as much on account of its scarcity as of the prohibitions by which Christians were bound in relation to Jews, the secondaries of monopoly of the credit business to the Jews, who were excluded from all other kinds of trade or industry, and who were often accorded great privileges by the towns, on condition of the establishment of pawn banks. They lent money at excessive rates of interest as much as 60 per cent—or, when that was prohibited, as at Florence, where they were not allowed to charge more than 20 per cent, they resorted to subterfuges that made it possible for them to obtain as high rates as elsewhere. And in this way, they soon became rich and hated. Not less hated, however, were the so-called coaraini (named not after the city of Cahors in France, but after the Jews, who were a kind of travelling bankers, and whose exactions were often even greater than those of the Jews, their usual rate of interest being 43½ per cent, and frequently as high as 80 per cent. It was often a question, during the Middle Ages, of finding a remedy for the misfortune of others. As they were all not true Jews, Padua founded a mons pietais. The celebrated Doctor Durand de Saint Pourçain, Bishop of Mende, proposed that the magistrates of cities be compelled to lend money at low rates of interest. It is not known whether this proposition was accepted or not, but, in either event, it did not suggest the idea of the mons, for there lacked the condition of objects pawned, which was the case, also, in the institution of the "Mont de Salins", established later than 1350. The first real mons pietais was founded in London, where Bishop Michael Nothburg, in 1361, left 1000 marks of silver for the establishment of a bank that should lend money on pawned objects, without interest, for the period of one year. As the first of the institutions of this kind was founded, however, was not realized. Finally (1462), the first mons pietais was established at Perugia, and in a few years there were similar institutions throughout Italy. The establishment and dissemination of montes pietais is one of the brightest glories of the followers of the "Poverello" of Assisi, for the mons pietais of Perugia was founded in consequence of the preaching at that city of the Franciscan Michele Carcano of Milan, who inveighed against the usury of the Jews (1461). The fund for that charitable establishment was made up in part by voluntary contributions and in part by money lent by the Jews themselves. But the idea of the mons pietais was developed in the region of Tuscania, and of Teramo, and of the Genoese of Favorino Coppoli of Perugia. In fact it seems that for a long time the preachers of the Franciscan Order had considered the problem of applying an effectual remedy to the evils of usury (cf. Holzapfel, 32 sq.).

The assistance and the influence of the Apostolic delegate to Perugia, Ernolori Barbaro, Bishop of Verona, greatly facilitated the work at the former town, and it was soon repeated at Orvieto (1483) through the action of the Franciscan Bartolommeo da Colle, and also at Gubbio and at other towns of Umbria. In the Marches the first mons was established at Monterubbiano, in 1465, through the efforts of the Franciscan Antonuzio and the Dominici Cristoforo; the first city of the Papal States that established a mons pietais was Viterbo (1469); in Tuscany, Siena (1472); in Liguria, Savona, and Genoa (1480), and in the Milanese territory, Milan (1483); everywhere it was the Franciscan Observants who took the initiative. But the greatest development was given to this work by Blessed Bernardino da Feltre, whose secondaries of monopoly of the credit business to the Jews, were accorded great privileges, and who were often accorded great privileges by the towns, on condition of the establishment of pawn banks. They lent money at excessive rates of interest as much as 60 per cent—or, when that was prohibited, as at Florence, where they were not allowed to charge more than 20 per cent, they resorted to subterfuges that made it possible for them to obtain as high rates as elsewhere. And in this way, they soon became rich and hated. Not less hated, however, were the so-called coaraini (named not after the city of Cahors in France, but after the Jews, who were a kind of travelling bankers, and whose exactions were often even greater than those of the Jews, their usual rate of interest being 43½ per cent, and frequently as high as 80 per cent. It was often a question, during the Middle Ages, of finding a remedy for the misfortune of others. As they were all not true Jews, Padua founded a mons pietais. The celebrated Doctor Durand de Saint Pourçain, Bishop of Mende, proposed that the magistrates of cities be compelled to lend money at low rates of interest. It is not known whether this proposition was accepted or not, but, in either event, it did not suggest the idea of the mons, for there lacked the condition of objects pawned, which was the case, also, in the institution of the "Mont de Salins", established later than 1350. The first true mons pietais was founded in London, where Bishop Michael Nothburg, in 1361, left 1000 marks of silver for the establishment of a bank that should lend money on pawned objects, without interest, for the period of one year. As the first of the institutions of this kind was founded, however, was not realized. Finally (1462), the first mons pietais was established at Perugia, and in a few years there were similar institutions throughout Italy. The establishment and dissemination of montes pietais is one of the brightest glories of the followers of the "Poverello" of Assisi, for the mons pietais of Perugia was founded in consequence of the preaching at that city of the Franciscan Michele Carcano of Milan, who inveighed against the usury of the Jews (1461). The fund for that charitable establishment was made up in part by voluntary contributions and in part by money lent by the Jews themselves. But the idea of the mons pietais was developed in the region of Tuscania, and of Teramo, and of the Genoese of Favorino Coppoli of Perugia. In fact it seems that for a long time the preachers of the Franciscan Order had considered the problem of applying an effectual remedy to the evils of usury (cf. Holzapfel, 32 sq.).

The assistance and the influence of the Apostolic delegate to Perugia, Ernolori Barbaro, Bishop of
but merely against the condition of requiring interest. It was not admitted that the use of the interest to maintain the charity justified the usury, since a good end could not justify evil means, and it was held that lending money on interest was incompatible with being unfruitful by its nature, and since Christ expressly forbids the practice (Luke, vi, 33). The term interest was not readily admitted by the friends of the montes, who replied that there were in reality two contracts between the montes and the borrower: one that of the loan, which should be gratuitous, the other implying the custody of the object pawned, therefore, the use of space and personal responsibility, which should not be gratuitous; and it was precisely on account of these two conditions that interest was charged. The loan, therefore, was regarded merely as a conditio sine qua non, and not as a direct cause of the interest. On the other hand, even the adversaries of the montes admitted that the damnum emergens or the lucrum cessans were legitimate titles upon which to require interest; and these two principles may be applied to the mons pietatis. Many other objections to which it was easy to reply were adduced, and in these disputations the friends of the montes were victorious. Only at Fænza, in 1494, where the use of the montes was opposed to the objections of the Augustinian Bariano, who is the author of a work entitled "De Monte Impietatis." It was among the Dominicanis, however, that the montes found a greater number of antagonists, notably the young Tommaso de Vio, who became Cardinal Cajeto. It cannot be said that the order as a whole was as opposed to the montes as several of its members favoured the establishment of the montes as has been seen in the case of Monte­rubiano, and as was the case at Florence, where Savonarola (1495) reopened the montes which had been established in 1494. Meanwhile other Dominicans, e. g. Amico da Viterbo and Domenico da Imola, were venturing to profess the dangers of the montes, but the writer who most exercised himself in their defence was the Franciscan Bernardino de Bustis (Defensorium Montis Pietatis). The legal and theological faculties of the universities, as well as individual jurists, gave opinions favourable to the montes. The papacy had approved of several of these institutions in the Holy See, either for its sanction, in general, or for special concessions; Holzapfel (10 sq.) refers to sixteen of these acts, anterior to the Bull "Inter multiplicis" of Leo X (4 May, 1515). By this Bull the pope and the Lateran Council, which took up the case of the montes in its tenth session, declared the institutions in question in no way illicit or sinful, but on the contrary meritorious, and that whosoever preached or wrote against them in the future, incurred excommunication. This Bull also provided that montes established thereafter should obtain the Apostolic approbation. The Bishop of Trani was the only member of the council who spoke against the montes, and Cardinal Cajeto, general of the order, was absent during the session, subsequently abandoned his position on the subject of these establishments.

The question of moral right having been determined in their favour, the montes pietatis spread rapidly, especially in Italy, where, in 1596 there were 556 of them, with a combined capital of nearly 79,000,000. In a month of Italy the best known and most successful pietatis were at Ypres in Belgium, (1534) but the institution did not develop in that country until 1618, when the Lombards were forbidden to receive objects in pawn; since 1848 the law has transformed the montes into municipal establishments. In France the first mont e pietatis appeared at Avignon, then a papal possession (1577); the next at Beaucar (1583); and in 1626, an ordinance prescribed the creation of montes pietatis in all the cities that might need them. However, they were not merely charitable institutions, because they were bound to lend money to all applicants, whether rich or poor, not, while not infrequently the rate of interest was not high. The law of 1551, with the special feature that their directors be appointed by the Government. In Germany and in Austria the montes pietatis were introduced at the end of the fifteenth century. At present they are municipal establishments—although some of them belong to the Government—and their net profits are applied to the account of public charities. The first mons pietatis in Spain was created in 1702 at Madrid. In England this form of charity never obtained a foothold, on the contrary it was held in aversion on account of its connexion with the papacy; an attempt to establish such an institution at London in 1797 failed in less than twenty years, through default on the part of its managers.

The aversion in which montes pietatis are held by many, even in our own day, leads to the question of the advantages and of the defects of these institutions; it is held that they promote carelessness in contracting debts, that they destroy love for labour, incite idleness, are for the most part fatal, and, lastly, that they are contrary to the principle of free competition. On the other hand, they are a necessity; for without them the needy would be exposed either to the extortions of private lenders or to ruin, into which they might be plunged by some misfortune from which a momentary loan might save them. Nevertheless their disadvantages are undeniable, but disadvantages are common to all human contrivances. For the rest the montes pietatis, besides the relief that they brought to the poor, exerted great influence upon the ideas concerning interest on loans; for the rigid views of the theologians of the Middle Ages in that connexion underwent a first modification, which prepared the way for a generalization of the principle that moderate interest might justly be charged, and also the mere existence of the montes pietatis compelled private speculators to reduce their rates of interest from the usurious rates that had hitherto prevailed.

U. BENIGNI.

Montesquieu, CHARLES-LOUIS DE SECONDAIGNE, BARON DE, French writer and publicist, b. in the Château de la Brède near Bordeaux, 18 January, 1689; d. at Paris, 10 February, 1755. His family was of noble rank; his grandfather, President of the Bordeaux Parliament, his father, a member of the royal bodyguard, and his mother, Marie de Penel, who died when he was eleven, traced her ancestry to an old English family. Young Charles de la Brède, as he was known, was sent to the Oratorian College at Juilly (1700–11), where he received a wholly literary and classical education in which religion held but a minor place. When, at twenty-five years of age he returned home, after having been called to the bar, he received from his paternal uncle the style and title of Baron de Montesquieu, by which he was known, and became councillor of the Bordeaux Parliament. He married a Protestant, Jeanne Cartigre,
"and they had three children; but neither his profession nor his family seem to have claimed much of his attention. At the age of nineteen, he left his book-office, and gave himself up entirely to study which henceforth became his life's one and only passion. "Study", he wrote afterwards, "has been my sovereign remedy against the worries of life. I have never had a care that an hour's reading could not dispel". As a matter of fact the story of his life is but the chronicle of that preparation, which was the composition of his book-office. His earliest productions were read before the Academy of Bordeaux, of which he became a member (1716). They deal with a variety of subjects, but mainly with scientific topics, history, and politics. For a time he thought of writing a "physical history of the Earth" for which he began collecting material (1719), but abandoned this plan in 1720. His interest in different orders of his book-office, publishing the "Lettres persanes" (Amsterdam, 1721), so named because it pretended to be a correspondence between two Persian gentlemen travelling in Europe, and their friends in Asia, who sent them the gossip of their seraglio.

Under this fictitious guise the writer goes on to describe, or rather satires, French and especially Parisian manners between 1710 and 1720. The king, the absolute monarchy, the Parliament, the Academy, the University, are all very transparently ridiculed, but it was the Catholic religion, its dogmas, its practices, its ministers from pope to monks that came in for his bitterest raillery. Because of its ideal of celibacy, the Catholic Church is accused of being a cause of depopulation, and because of its teaching concerning this world's goods, it is charged with weakening the prosperity of the nation, while its intolerant proselytism is a source of disturbance to the state. On the other hand Protestantism is held up as more favourable to material progress. Coming ostensibly from those two sources, the deformities then seemed less shocking to thoughtful minds, but they were none the less one of the first and rudest attacks directed against the Church during the eighteenth century. In them, he showed himself as incapable of understanding the Church's dogmas as he was of appreciating her services to society. Though in later years he was to find a juster point of view, his witty criticisms in their lively setting of romance and sensuality, quite to the taste of that age, assured a great success for the "Lettres persanes". Eight editions were published within a year. Montesquieu had not signed his name to them, but the author was quickly discovered, and the public nominated him for the Academy. His election is in 1726. Knowing to the scandal the "Lettres persanes" had caused, the king did not approve and an excuse was given that the author did not live in Paris, as the rules of the Academy required. Whereupon Montesquieu took up his residence in Paris, and was elected once more, and admitted in 1728.

Side by side with their frivolity the "Lettres persanes" contain some profound observations on history and politics. They show even then Montesquieu's meditation on the laws and customs of mankind, from which was to result his later work, "L'Esprit des lois". As a preparation for this work he set out (1726) on a long series of travels through Europe, and visited Vienna, and Hungary, spent some time in Venice, Florence, Naples, Geneva, and Rome, where he was received by Cardinal de Polignac and Benedict XIII. In the suite of Lord Chesterfield he went to England where he remained eighteen months, and was the guest of Prime Minister Walpole, of Swift, and Pope. Wherever he went he made the acquaintance of various illustrious persons of his own time, and heard, and read with avidity. After an absence of three years he returned to his family, his business, his vineyards and the farming of his estates at Château de la Brède. As a relaxation he paid occasional visits to Paris, and mixed with literary men and their friends in the salons of Madame de Tencin, Madame Geoffrin, and Madame du Deffand. Yet he studiously avoided over familiarity with what was known as the philosophical set. Though his religious convictions were not deep, his serious and moderate turn of mind had nothing in common with the noisy and aggressive impiety of Voltaire and his friends.

Henceforth his great aim in life was to write the "Esprit des lois" and all his spare time in the studious seclusion at La Brède was devoted to it. To begin with, ancient Rome gave him ample material for thought, but took up so much space in his work that in order not to mar the proportions of his book he published all that concerned it as a distinct work, "Les Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur et de la décadence des Romains" (Amsterdam, 1734). In this book he shows successively the glorious progress and slow decay which the Empire experienced from the foundation of Rome to the capture of Constantinople by the Turks. He devotes several pages to the narrative of events, but supposing that they are already known, he seeks to discover the links in the chain of events, and to point out the sources from which they sprang, choosing preferably those political causes, that is, institutions. By exhibiting them in their natural relationships he throws unexpected light on certain events of ancient history and those of more recent date. Boswell had already devoted two chapters of his "Histoire Universelle" to explaining the "sequence of events at Rome". Montesquieu treats the same subject in a larger way and with closer correlation of facts. His point of view is that of the statesman rather than of the moralist, and every religious precept is left aside. Such indeed is his indifference that he has not a word about religion. This concession to the prejudices of his age was a mistake, as modern criticism has shown, especially in the works of Fustel de Coulanges, that religion played a greater part in the political conduct of the Romans than Montesquieu credited it with.

"Les Considérations" was but an advance chapter of "L'Esprit des lois" which Montesquieu published after twenty years of labour (2 vols., Geneva, 1748). In this second work the author studies human laws in their relationships with the government, climate, and general character of the country, its customs, and its religion. He undertakes, not to examine various laws and discover their meaning, but to point out their underlying principles and to lay down the conditions which must be verified if such laws are to work for the happiness of man in society. In his judgments and conclusions Montesquieu is careful to take into account experience and tradition. He believes that laws can be enacted only for men in definitely known conditions of time and place. In so far he differs from the theorists and utopians of his day and of a later age, who had no hesitation in drafting laws for man in the abstract or for a humanity freed from all spatial and temporal determinations, and who took as the basis
of their deductions either the idea of a social contract in primitive times, or of a state of nature which had to be developed or restored. He thus avoids the errors of Hobbes, Locke, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. His personal sympathies went rather with the liberal ideas which have triumphed almost everywhere in the civilized world of to-day, but which were novelities then. He declared himself in favour of separating the executive, legislative, and judiciary powers (XI, vi), condemned slavery and torture, and advocated gentler treatment of criminals, toleration in religious belief, and freedom of worship. But in this work he treats the religious issue with more gravity than he had done in the "Lettres persanes". True, he passes over the truth of its teaching and the sanctity of its moral precepts, and treats of it "only as regards its advantages for civic life". But far from thinking that there can be a conflict between religion and society, he insists that the one is useful to the other. "Something", he says, "must be fixed and permanent, and religion is that something." He says again, more clearly: "What a wonderful thing is the Christian religion! It seems to aim only at happiness in a future life, and yet secures our happiness in this life also!" He does not dream of separating Church and State, nor of subjecting the former to the latter. "I have never claimed that the interests of religion should give way to those of the State, but that they should go hand in hand." Nevertheless on various points he seriously misunderstood Catholic teaching: "Les Nouvelles Eclesiastiques" (Oct., 1749) called attention to some of his statements of this sort, and the Sorbonne drew up a list of passages from his writings which seemed to call for censure (August, 1752). Before this (March, 1752), "L'Esprit des lois" had been placed on the Roman Index. But these measures created no great stir. The success of the book was enormous, its political influence world-wide. The early statesmen were very familiar with "L'Esprit des lois" and from it (XI, vi) derived much of their idea of federal government. Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, Hamilton, Madison, and Jay who wrote in the "Federalist" in defence of the new Constitution, were all enthusiastic readers of Montesquieu. Montesquieu's reputation became so widespread and he was so often able to enjoy peacefully the homage it brought him until his death, for which he prepared himself by receiving the sacraments of the Church, and showing every outward mark of perfect obedience to her laws. The influence of his ideas was to be felt long afterwards both in France and elsewhere.

Besides the works which we have mentioned, and which are the most important, Montesquieu left a few papers which he read before the Academy of Bordeaux, and a few incomplete writings. "Le temple de Gndie", a short novel of a sensuous turn written for the licentious society of the Regency epoch, does him little credit. He wrote an "Essai sur le goét", a "Dissertation sur l'Académie", a "Article et Isémonie", an uninteresting novel, and a few letters. These have all been collected in the "Oeuvres complètes de Montesquieu", edited by Edward Laboulaye (7 vols., Paris, 1875-79); "Mélanges inédits de Montesquieu published by Barven de Montesquieu (Bordeaux, 1892); "Voyages de Montesquieu", published by the same (Bordeaux, 1854-96); "Penseés et fragments inédits de Montesquieu", published by the same (Bordeaux, 1899-1901: two volumes have appeared; others are in course of preparation).

ANTOINE DEGERT.

Montesquieu, Claudius, distinguished musician, b. at Cremona, May, 1567; d. at Venice, 29 Nov. 1643. He studied under Ingegneri (composer of the "Responsoria", that until recently were regarded as by Palestrina), and at the age of sixteen he published a book of canzonets, followed by four volumes of madrigals. Although the majority of his early works show little trace of the inventive genius which afterwards distinguished the productions of his madrigals, printed in 1592, is remarkable for its many suspensions of the dominant seventh, and its inversion, as also suspended ninths. He was appointed Maestro di Cappella to the Duke of Mantua in 1602, and in 1613, was elected Maestro at Venice in succession to Martinengo, at a salary of three hundred ducats a year. So highly was he appreciated at St. Mark's that in 1616, the Procuratori increased his salary to five hundred ducats. From that date until his death he produced numerous choral compositions, as also operas, cantatas, ballets, most of which cannot now be traced. Fortunately, the score of his opera "Orfeo", printed in 1609, has come down to us, and it is sufficient to indicate the powers of a musician who broke away from the trammels of the older school and created a school of his own.

Montesquieu not only showed his genius in his dramatic writing but in the employment of new instrumental effects, and the combination of instruments in the theatre band. In his interlude written for the festival at the palace of Grand-Logis, he employed the device of an instrumental trombone till then unknown. Another novel effect was his employment of trombones to accompany the "Gloria" and "Credo" of a Mass, in 1631. At this date he was studying for the priesthood, and he was ordained in 1633. Six years later he composed an opera "Atone" for the opera house of San Cassiano, followed by two others, and a ballet for the carnival at Piaenza, in 1641. His enduring fame consists in his use of unprepared disords, his improvement of recitative, his development of orchestral resources and his revolution of instrumentation. He may justly be claimed as the founder of dramatic music, as we now understand it, and he anticipated Wagner in the employment of leitmotiv.

EDWARD, Hist. of the Opera (London, 1862); ETHER, Quellen Lexicon (Leipzig, 1900-04); LEE, Story of Opera (London, 1900).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

Monte Vergine (Montis Virginis), an abbey in the province of Naples, Italy, near the town of Avelino, commanding a magnificent view of the Mediterranean along the Bays of Naples, Salerno, and Gaeta, and inland as far as the Abruzzi Mountains. Monte Vergine was one of the three principal foundations of a temple sacred to Cybele that stood there; also as Mona Virgiliana, from the legend that Virgil retired thither to study the Sibylline books. St. Felix of Nola is said to have taken refuge there, and in the seventh century St. Vitalian of Capua erected on the hill a chapel to the Blessed Virgin Mary, called "Sancta Maria Magdalenae de Monte Vergine". According to Castellani, St. Felix was canonized by this pope, and his feast is kept on 25 June. As early as 1191 the abbey is spoken of as be-
longing "ad Dominum Papam specialiter". It received throughout the Middle Ages many marks of consideration from the kings of the Two Sicilies, within whose domains there were at one time no less than one hundred monasteries of this branch of the Benedictine order. Between many vicissitudes, laxity of rule threatened ruin to the abbey, and in the sixteenth century Clement VIII charged Blessed John Leonard, founder of the Clerks Regular of the Mother of God, as rector, and his abbots. The new constitutions were approved by Paul V in 1611, and included among other things a regulation that the monks of Monte Vergine should use the Camaldolese Breviary. The habit of the monks was to be white, and they were to wear a white scapular.

From the beginning the abbey seems to have been frequented, as was its abbey, by the bishops of the See of Benevento. The abbey had the faculty of conferring the four minor orders and confirmation. Between 1440 and 1515 it was held in commendam by five cardinals, and in that year was united with the Hospital of the Nunziata at Naples. The governors of the hospital sent as their representative to Monte Vergine a sacristan who interfered with the daily life of the monks. Among the independent monks were freed by St. Pius V in 1557. In 1579 Gregory XIII gave them charge of St. Agatha's in Subura, Rome; Paul V made it a privileged abbey, and it remained in their care until Gregory XVII gave it to the Irish students (see Irish College, Rome).

The monastery chapel contains an ancient Byzantine mosaic of the Virgin and Child, and a number of other mosaics have been discovered. The front of the Blessed Virgin standing out from a background of bright gold have won for it from peasants and pilgrims the name of "Schiovan." The story runs, that the head of the picture was cut from its frame by Baldwin, the Latin Emperor of Jerusalem, to save it from the Saracens, who had massacred the monks by his grand-niece Catherine of Valois (who lies buried in the chapel), and that she gave it to Monte Vergine. The lower portion of the picture as it exists in the shrine was added at a later date by the brush of Montana di Aresso. The church is also said to contain relics of the bodies of the young men, Sir drach, Mischach, Abdenago, who were saved from the fiery furnace. These relics were brought from Jerusalemy by Frederick II. Pentecost and the eighth of September are the two great days of pilgrimage and rejoicing at Monte Vergine. The nearest town is Mercogliano and on these days its population is more than doubled. The present abbot is Mgr. Victor Cor vesto, born in Rome on 18 January, 1884. The chapter consists of 15 canons. The abbots' jurisdiction extends over 7 parishes forming part of four communes in the border provinces of Avellino and Benevento. There are 27 churches within the privacy, and the population of 8070 souls is ministered to by 31 secular priests and 18 regulars.

Montevideo, Archdiocese of (Montevideo), in Uruguay, comprises the whole of the republic. This territory was under the jurisdiction of the Paraguayan Church till 1620, when it became subject to Buenos Aires. In 1828 the Holy See erected it into a vicariate Apostolic. On 15 July, 1878, it was raised to episcopal rank. Mgr. Hyacinth Vers being first bishop; on 19 April, 1897, it was made an archdiocese. It was decreed at that time to erect two archdiocesan parishes, Salt6, but no appointments have yet been made (1910).

Since colonial days ended, the Church has been persecuted at times, especially between 1880 and 1890 under Santos, who forbade religious under forty to make vows, instituted civil marriage and made it a crime to baptize a child before its birth was registered civilly. To-day however, the Church is flourishing, and the archdiocese contains many congregations of men (Jesuits, Capuchins, Redemptorists, Salesians, etc.), and over 300 nuns engaged in teaching and charitable work. The diocese contains 72,210 square miles, and about 1,103,000 inhabitants (in 1906), almost all Catholics, of whom 308,000 were in the Department of Montevideo. 7 parishes, 7 basilicas, 27 churches, 122 priories, and about 100 chapels and churches. The present occupant of the see is Mgr. Mariano Soler, b. at San Carlo, Uruguay, 25 March, 1846; elected bishop, 29 June, 1891; consecrated archbishop, 19 April, 1897; he has two auxiliary bishops: Mgr. Ricardo Isaacs (titular Bishop of Amemurium), b. at Montevideo, 7 February, 1876; elected, 13 December, 1897; and Mgr. Pio Gasquetto Secondo Stella (titular Bishop of Amizana), b. at Paso del Molino, Uruguay, 7 August, 1857; elected, 22 December, 1893. Almost all the inhabitants are Catholics, there is, however, a small Piedmontese Waldensian agricultural colony in the East of Colonia.

Noteworthy buildings of the City of Montevideo may be mentioned the cathedral, begun in 1803, completed and restored in 1905; and the Jesuit, Redemptorist, and Franciscan churches. Within recent years conferences of St. Vincent de Paul have been established in all the city parishes; likewise an excellent Catholic club; and an institute for Catholic working-men. The growth of Montevideo is of the seventeenth century; a small fort, San José, was built there in 1724; in January, 1728, the town was founded by Bruno de Zabala with the name San Felice y Santiago; in 1807 it was captured by the British; in 1828 it became the capital of the republic; from 1842 to 1851 it withstood the nine years' siege by Orie and his troops. The city has grown to be one of the seven greatest seaports in the world (see URUGUAY). San José de Mayo (9000) contains a magnificent church, more massive than the cathedral; and also the college of the Sisters of Nuestra Señora del Huerto, which has a very pretty chapel attached. (For the early Uruguayan missions among the Indians see REDUCTIONS OF PARAGUAY.)

Montfacon, Bernard de, French scholar, b. in 1555, at the château de Soulage, Department of Lot, and of noble parentage. For six years, he was an inmate of the Abbey of St-Germain-des-Prés, in 1741. He was the son of Timoléon de Montfacon and of Flore de Maigain. His family, originally of Gascony, had settled in Languedoc after the Albigensian Crusade of the thirteenth century; its principal seat was the château of Roquetailleade (arrondissement of Albi). He was instructed by Pavillon, Bishop of Alth, his father's friend, and in 1762, at the age of thirteen, he entered the Académie des Cadets at Perpignan, to prepare for a military career. After his father's death, he left home with his relative, the Marquis d'Hautpoul, a captain of grenadiers in the Regiment of Languedoc, and served as a volunteer under Turenne. He went through the campaign of Alsace, was at the battle of Marienthal, and fell dangerously ill at Saverne. In pursuance of a vow made to the Blessed Virgin, he then returned to his own country, resolved upon entering religion. On 13 May, 1676, he made his profession in the Benedictine monastery of La Coudre, at Besançon, Melun and Salté, but no appointments have yet been made (1910). Since colonial days ended, the Church has been persecuted at times, especially between 1880 and 1890 under Santos, who forbade religious under forty to make vows, instituted civil marriage and made it a crime to baptize a child before its birth was registered civilly. To-day however, the Church is flourishing, and the archdiocese contains many congregations of men (Jesuits, Capuchins, Redemptorists, Salesians, etc.), and over 300 nuns engaged in teaching and charitable work. The diocese contains 72,210 square miles, and about 1,103,000 inhabitants (in 1906), almost all Catholics, of whom 308,000 were in the Department of Montevideo. 7 parishes, 7 basilicas, 27 churches, 122 priories, and about 100 chapels and churches. The present occupant of the see is Mgr. Mariano Soler, b. at San Carlo, Uruguay, 25 March, 1846; elected bishop, 29 June, 1891; consecrated archbishop, 19 April, 1897; he has two auxiliary bishops: Mgr. Ricardo Isaacs (titular Bishop of Amemurium), b. at Montevideo, 7 February, 1876; elected, 13 December, 1897; and Mgr. Pio Gasquetto Secondo Stella (titular Bishop of Amizana), b. at Paso del Molino, Uruguay, 7 August, 1857; elected, 22 December, 1893. Almost all the inhabitants are Catholics, there is, however, a small Piedmontese Waldensian agricultural colony in the East of Colonia.

Noteworthy buildings of the City of Montevideo may be mentioned the cathedral, begun in 1803, completed and restored in 1905; and the Jesuit, Redemptorist, and Franciscan churches. Within recent years conferences of St. Vincent de Paul have been established in all the city parishes; likewise an excellent Catholic club; and an institute for Catholic working-men. The growth of Montevideo is of the seventeenth century; a small fort, San José, was built there in 1724; in January, 1728, the town was founded by Bruno de Zabala with the name San Felipe y Santiago; in 1807 it was captured by the British; in 1828 it became the capital of the republic; from 1842 to 1851 it withstood the nine years' siege by Orie and his troops. The city has grown to be one of the seven greatest seaports in the world (see URUGUAY). San José de Mayo (9000) contains a magnificent church, more massive than the cathedral; and also the college of the Sisters of Nuestra Señora del Huerto, which has a very pretty chapel attached. (For the early Uruguayan missions among the Indians see REDUCTIONS OF PARAGUAY.)

Montfacon, Bernard de, French scholar, b. in 1555, at the château de Soulage, Department of Lot, and of noble parentage. For six years, he was an inmate of the Abbey of St-Germain-des-Prés, in 1741. He was the son of Timoléon de Montfacon and of Flore de Maigain. His family, originally of Gascony, had settled in Languedoc after the Albigensian Crusade of the thirteenth century; its principal seat was the château of Roquetailleade (arrondissement of Albi). He was instructed by Pavillon, Bishop of Alth, his father's friend, and in 1762, at the age of thirteen, he entered the Académie des Cadets at Perpignan, to prepare for a military career. After his father's death, he left home with his relative, the Marquis d'Hautpoul, a captain of grenadiers in the Regiment of Languedoc, and served as a volunteer under Turenne. He went through the campaign of Alsace, was at the battle of Marienthal, and fell dangerously ill at Saverne. In pursuance of a vow made to the Blessed Virgin, he then returned to his own country, resolved upon entering religion. On 13 May, 1676, he made his profession in the Benedictine monastery of La Coudre, at Besançon, Melun and Salté, but no appointments have yet been made (1910).
caused him to be sent to the Abbey of Sainte-Croix at Bordeaux. Finally, in 1687, he was transferred to Paris, to the Abbey of St-Germain-des-Prés, which, under the rule of Mabillon, had become one of the chief centres of French erudition. He was then chosen to assist in preparing the edition of the Greek Fathers which the Benedictines had undertaken. To this end, he made the acquaintance of the study of Hebrew, Chaldean, Syriac, and Coptic, as well as that of numismatics, and in 1694 was appointed curator of the numismatic collection at St-Germain-des-Prés.

In 1690 Montfaucon had published a treatise on "La vérité de l'histoire de Judith". The monastery of St-Aubin, in which he laboured with Dom Pouget and Dom Lopin, appeared in 1698 and was well received (3 vols., folio, Paris; reprinted in P.G., XXV–XXVIII). Before undertaking new patristic labours, he resolved to study the manuscripts in the libraries of Italy. Obtaining permission in 1698, he set out with Dom Paul Briois, P. Millas; he made the acquaintance of Muratori; at Venice he was received very coldly, and was not even allowed to see the manuscripts in the Benedictine monasteries of San Giorgio Maggiore and San Marco. On the other hand, he was welcomed at Mantua, Ravenna, and especially at Rome by Innocent XII. Having been named procurator general at Rome of the Order of St. Benedict, he encountered difficulties with the Jesuits led to his resignation of that office which brought with it so many distractions from his chief work, and in 1701 he secured his recall to France. The scientific results of his journey were embodied in the quarto volume of his "Diarium Italicum" (Paris, 1702); he also collected a number of his companions. Dom Paul Briois, who had died on the journey (edited by Omont, "Revue des Bibliothèques", XIV, 1904).

In the full maturity of his powers, at liberty to satisfy his passion for work, with a large experience of life and an immense fund of general information, Montfaucon now took up his abode at the Abbey of St-Germain-des-Prés, where he spent the last forty years of his life. Here a choice body of scholars gathered around him, his avowed disciples, whose affection for their master prompted them to take the name of "Bardemins". Among these were Claude de Vio and Joseph Vaissette, authors of the "Vocabulaire de l'ancien Langage"; the heliast Charles de la Rue (his favorite disciple), Dom Lombez, the historian of Brittany, and even the Abbé Prévost, who was then a collaborator on the "Gallia Christiana". Montfaucon, moreover, corresponded with scholars all over Europe, and, in spite of the heavy tasks he took upon himself, he succeeded, thanks to his abstemious and regular life, in working almost to his last day. During this productive period, he supplemented the former edition of the Greek Fathers with a "Collectio nova patrum et scriptorum grecorum" (2 vols., folio, Paris, 1706). In 1709 he translated into French the "De vita contemplativa" of Philo Judeus, and essayed to prove that the Therapeutae there mentioned were Christians. Next he prepared the edition of Origen (2 vols., f.d., Paris, 1713) and that of St. John Chrysostom (13 vols., folio, Paris, 1718), prepared with the assistance of François Faverolles, treasurer of St-Denis, and four Benedictines, who spent thirteen years in collating 300 manuscripts.

The scientific bent of Montfaucon's mind led him to elaborate a new auxiliary science out of the studies he had made for the verification of his Greek texts. As Mabillon had created the science of diplomacy, so Montfaucon was the father of Greek paleography, the principles of which he established by the rigour of his method in grouping his personal observations. His great "Palaepgraphia Graeca" (folios, Paris, 1708) inaugurated the scientific study of Greek texts. Another auxiliary science of history, that of bibliography, owes to him a work still of considerable value, the "Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova" (2 vols., folio, Paris, 1739), a catalogue of the Greek manuscripts of the chief libraries of Europe. He also considered what benefit might accrue to history from the study of figured monuments, and, if he was not the creator of archeology, he was at least the first to show what advantages might be derived from it. Two of his works show him to be an originator. In 1719 he published "L'Antiquité expliquée et représentée en figures", a treatise on ancient art, which he reproduces, methodically grouped. All the ancient monuments that might be of use in the study of the religion, domestic customs, material life, military institutions, and funeral rites of the ancients. Of this work, which contains 1120 plates, the whole edition of 1800 copies was exhausted in two months, in spite of its enormous size. The regent, Philippe d'Orléans, desired that the author should become a member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, and he was elected to replace Père Letellier (1719). Montfaucon then conceived a more daring idea, and worked, similar to "l'Antiquité expliquée", which should embrace the whole history of France. The work, entitled "L'histoire de la monarchie française", was dedicated to Louis XV, appeared from 1729 to 1733 (5 vols., folio, Paris). In it Montfaucon studies the history, as it is shown in the monuments, of each successive reign down to that of Henry IV. His reproductions are inexact, and the work remained incomplete. On 19 December, 1741, he read before the Académie des Inscriptions a plan for continuing this work; two days later he died tranquilly, without any premonitory symptoms of illness. An indefatigable scholar, a bold thinker, an originator of scientific methods, he left after him a mighty generation of disciples to form the connecting link between the old Benedictine learning and modern scholarship.

LOUIS NICHEUR.

Montfort, Simon de, Earl of Leicester, date of birth unknown, d. at Toulouse, 25 June, 1218. Simon (IV) de Montfort was descended from the lords of Montfort l'Amaury in Normandy, being the second son of Simon (III), and Amicia, daughter of Robert de Beaumont, third Earl of Leicester. Having succeeded his father as Baron de Montfort in 1181, in 1190 he joined Alix de Montfort and Simon of Bouchard (III) de Bouchaner. In 1199 while taking part in a tournament at Écry-sur-Aisne in the province of Champagne he heard Fulk de Neueil preaching the crusade, and in company with Count Thibaud de Champagne and many other nobles and knights he took the cross. Unfortunately, the crusade ended in disaster, and the French knights, instead of co-operating with the pope, decided on a campaign in Egypt, and on their arrival at Venice entered on a contract for transport across the Mediterranean. Being unable to fulfil the terms of the contract, they compounded by assisting the Venetians to capture Zara in Dalmatia. In vain the pope urged them to seek for the Holy Land. They then proceeded to Constantinople, though Simon de Montfort offered energetic opposition to this proposal. Notwithstanding his efforts, the expedition was undertaken and the pope's plans were defeated.

In 1204 or 1205 Simon succeeded to the Earldom of
Leicester and large estates in England, for on the death of the fourth Earl of Leicester in that year, his honour of Leicester devolved on his sister Alicia, Simon's mother; and as her husband, Simon (III), and her eldest son were already dead, the barony devolved on Simon himself. But though he was recognized by King John as Earl of Leicester, he was never formally invested with the earldom, and in February, 1207, the king seized all his English estates on pretext of a debt due from him. Shortly afterwards they were restored, only to be confiscated again before the end of the year. Simon, content with the Norman estates he had inherited from the de Montforts and the de Beaumonts, remained in France, where in 1208 he was made captain-general of the French forces in the Crusade against the Albigeenses. At first he declined this honour, but the pope's legate, Arnold, Abbot of Citeaux, ordered him in the pope's name to accept it, and he obeyed.

Simon thus received control over the territory conquered from Raymond (VI) of Toulouse and by his land was shown by his efforts to dissuade Louis of France from invading England in July, 1216, in which matter he was seconded, though fruitlessly, by the legate Gualo. Having at this time raised more troops in Paris, Simon returned to the south of France, where he occupied himself in waging war at Nimes, until in 1217 a rebellion broke out in Provence, where Count Raymond's son re-entered Toulouse. Simon hastened to besiege the city, but was hampered by lack of troops. On 25 June, 1218, while he was at Mass he learned that the besieged had made a sortie. Refusing to leave the church he ordered the sortie to be protected, and the scene of action only to be wounded mortally. He expired, commending his soul to God, and was buried in the Monastery of Haute-Bruyère. He left three sons, of whom Almeric the eldest ultimately inherited his French estates; the youngest was Simon de Montfort, who succeeded him as Earl of Leicester, and who was to play so great a part in English history.

EDWIN BURTON.

Montgolfier, JOSEPH-MICHEL, inventor; b. at Vidalon-lez-Annony, Department of Ardèche, France, 26 August, 1740; d. at Balaruc-les-Bains, Department of Hérault, France, 26 June, 1810. His father was a prosperous paper-manufacturer, who brought up nine children, presenting to them an example of high virtue, honesty, economy, and piety. Joseph was educated at the local college in a very unsatisfactory manner. When he returned home he found in the manufacture of paper subjects of study more to his liking. He set up an independent establishment with his brother Augustine in order to exercise the inventive faculties that were held in check by his economical father. His numerous ideas and projects and his simplicity of character exposed him to financial losses, and eventually brought upon him an unjust temporary imprisonment.

He improved the manufacture of paper, invented a method of stereotyping, and constructed an air-pump for supplying the air in the moulds. Numerous objects of everyday life occupied his inventive faculties. His most important work, however, was in connexion with hydraulics and aeronautics. He interested his brother Etienne in these so-called chimerical projects. They invented the hydraulic ram, which uses the energy from a copious flow of water under a small head in order to force a small portion of that water to a considerable height. Observations on the behaviour of a sheet hung over a fire led them to attempt a number of experiments with balloons made of taffetas and filled with heated air. On 5 June, 1783, a successful exhibition took place before the États of Vivarais, assembled at Annony. A globe, 110 feet in circumference and weighing about 500 pounds, was filled with air heated at 160°. This balloon rose to a height of 6600 feet and came down very gently at a distance of a mile and a half. This attempt naturally excited enormous interest throughout the civilized world. Joseph left to his brother the honour and duty of reporting to the Academy of Sciences at Paris and of repeating experiments at the expense of the state. Balloons were constructed that carried with them a furnace for the purpose of keeping the air heated and therefore light, and two courageous physicists, Biot and Gay-Lussac made a successful ascent. At Lyons, Joseph and six others went up in a balloon 126 feet feet 6 inches in diameter. On 20 August, 1783, the brothers were placed by acclamation on the list of correspondents of the Academy, "as scientists to
whom we are indebted for a new art that will make an epoch in the history of human science". Etienne received the decoration of Saint-Michel for himself, and letters of nobility for his father. Joseph obtained a pension, and 40,000 livres for the construction of an experimental dirigible balloon. This he was unable to realize.

He was noted for extraordinary bodily strength and for courageous philanthropy. During the stormy days of the Revolution he offered and ensured protection and asylum to many proscribed persons, who were often not known to him even by name. "With no faction, he submitted to the political laws unless they were in opposition to the laws of humanity, and awaited with confidence the return of order". His business having been ruined, he went to Paris, where the new Government rewarded him. He was called to the consulting bureau of arts and manufactures, was rewarded and recompensed. He was the successor of Coulomb, and was made a Knight of the Legion of Honour.

Apart from a few memoirs in "Journal des Mines" and "Journal de l'Ecole polytechnique", he published very little, viz.: "Discours sur l'aérostat" (with his brother Etienne), Paris, 1783; "Voyageurs aériens" (with Etienne), Paris, 1784; "Mémoires sur la machine aérostatique", Paris, 1784; "Notes sur le bélier hydraulique", Paris, 1803.


William Fox.

Months, Special Devotions for.—During the Middle Ages the public functions of the Church and the popular devotions of the people were intimately connected. The laity assisted at the daily psalmody, the sacrifice of the Mass, the numerous processions, and were quite familiar with the liturgy. Those few religious exercises outside of official services, e.g. the Rosary (a substitute for the 150 Psalms) originated in the liturgy. Later, however, especially since the sixteenth century, popular devotion followed its own channels; liturgical practices like the Stations of the Cross, the Quarrant’Ore, various litanies and rosaries (corones), prevailed everywhere; novenas and series of Sundays and week-days in honour of particular saints or mysteries were instituted. Entire months of the year were given over to special devotions. Following is a list of the more common devotions with the indulgences attached: (1) January, the Holy Name of Jesus (feast of the Holy Name, second Sunday after Epiphany); indulgences, one hundred days each day if the devotion is made publicly, three hundred days each day if the devotion be in a public church or chapel, plenary indulgence for daily assistance at the public functions, under the usual conditions (Leo XIII, "Brief", 21 Dec., 1901; "Acta S. Sedis", XXXIV, 425). (2) March, St. Joseph (feast, 19 March); indulgences, three hundred days for those privately or publicly perform some pious practice in honour of St. Joseph, during the month, a plenary indulgence on any day of the month under the usual conditions (Pius IX, "Rescript Congr. Indulg.", 27 April, 1865). This month of devotions may commence in February and be concluded 19 March (Pius IX, 19 March, 1877). March of every month in case of legitimate impediment (Raccolta, 404). The practice of a triduum before the feast of St. Joseph has been recommended by Leo XIII (Enecyl. "Quamquam pluries", 15 August, 1889). (3) May, the Blessed Virgin Mary. The May devotion in its present form originated at Rome where Father Latomus in the Roman College of the Jesuits, roused the fidelity and immorality among the students, made a vow at the end of the eighteenth century to devote the month of May to Mary. From Rome the practice spread to the other Jesuit colleges and thence to nearly every Catholic church of the Latin rite (Alber, "Blüthenkränzle", IV, 531 sq.). This practice is the oldest instance of a devotion extending over an entire month. Indulgences, three hundred days each day by assisting at a public function or performing the devotion publicly in private, plenary indulgence on any day of the month or on one of the first eight days of June under the usual conditions (Pius VII, 21 March, 1824; Pius X, 19 March, 1912; ten years; 18 June, 1822 in perpetuum).

In June, the Sacred Heart, consecrated last of all in Rome, was publicly practised, was approved by Pius IX, 8 May, 1873 (Reser. auth., n. 409), and urgently recommended by Leo XIII in a letter addressed by the Cardinal Prefect S.R.C. to all the bishops, 21 July, 1909. Indulgences: (a) seven years and seven quarantines each day for performing the devotion publicly or privately; (b) plenary indulgence for the devotion practised daily in private, or if a person assist at least ten times at a public function, a plenary indulgence on any day in June or from 1-8 July (Deer. Urbis et orbis, 30 May, 1902); (c) the indulgence toties quoties on the thirtieth of June or the last Sunday of June (25 Jan., 1908) in those churches where the month of June is celebrated solemnly. Pius X (8 Aug., 1906) urged a daily sermon, or at least for eight days in the form of a mission (26 Jan., 1908); (d) to those priests, who preach the sermons at the solemn functions in June in honour of the Sacred Heart and to the rectors of the churches where these functions are held, the privilege of the Gregorian Altar on the thirtieth of June (Pius X, 8 Aug., 1906); (e) plenary indulgence for the devotion in private for the public devotion: seven years and seven quarantines each day; plenary indulgence on any day in July or 1-8 August, after having assisted eight times at a public function under the usual conditions; if the devotion be held privately three hundred days each day with plenary indulgence on 31 July, or 1-8 of August (Pius IX, 4 June, 1859). For this practice any other month or any period of thirty days during the year may be chosen (Raccolta, 178). (6) September, the Seven Dolours of the Blessed Virgin Mary (feast of the Seven Dolours, third Sunday in September); indulgences, three hundred days each day and the devotions may be performed in public or private; plenary indulgence on the first Sunday of September under the usual conditions (Leo XIII, "Raccolta", 27 Jan., 1888, 232).

(7) October, the Holy Rosary (feast of the Holy Rosary, first Sunday in October). Leo XIII personally instituted this practice in an Encyclical (1 Sept., 1893) in which he admonished the faithful to
dedicate the month of October to the Queen of the Holy Rosary in order to obtain through her intercession the grace that all men might come to defend His Church in her sufferings, and for nineteen years he published an encyclical on this subject. By the decree of the Congregation of Rites (20 Aug., 1885; 26 Aug., 1886; 2 Sept., 1887) he ordained that every year during the entire month of October, including the first and second of November, in every cathedral and parochial church in all the churches and chapels which are dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary, five decades of the Rosary and the Litany of Loreto are to be recited, in the morning during Mass or in the afternoon whilst the Blessed Sacrament is exposed; and by the encyclical letter of 15 August, 1889, a prayer in honour of St. Joseph was added. Indulgences (S. C. F. M. C. 1889; 1890; 1891) were granted every day for the public or private recitation of five decades; (b) plenary indulgence on the feast of the Holy Rosary or during the octave for those who during the entire octave recite daily five decades and fulfil the other usual conditions; (c) plenary indulgence on any other day of the month for the recitation of five decades in any of the churches and chapels of the city; (d) remission of at least ten years the five decades ("Raccolta", 354; Alber, "Blutenkenrzte", III, 730 sq.). Also in October there are devotions in honour of St. Francis of Assisi (Teast, 4 Oct.); indulgences, three hundred days each day by assisting at the public devotions in honour of St. Francis in a church or public oratory; plenary indulgence for those who receive the Holy Sacrament and the Holy Eucharist during the octave of the feast; see for other devotions (Leo XIII, 17 Jan., 1888). Popular devotion has also selected other mysteries and has dedicated January to the Holy Childhood and the hidden life of Jesus according to the Gospel of the first Sunday after Epiphany; March, to the Holy Family, on account of the feast of St. Joseph and the Annunciation (25 March); August, to the Maternal Heart of Mary (feast on the Sunday after twenty-second of August); October, to the Holy Angels (feast, 2 Oct.); December, to the Immaculate Conception (feast, 8 Dec.) or to the Holy Child in the stable at Bethlehem (25 Dec.). These practices, however, are not formally approved by the Church, nor enriched with indulgences.

These devotions, of course, vary with conditions in different countries. Though there is a wide variety, constantly changing, the prayers more commonly used are the litanies of the Holy Name, Sacred Heart, St. Joseph, the Blessed Virgin, the indulgenced prayers of the Raccolta, the rosary of the Dominicans. For the May and June devotions, a short sermon or instruction usually follows, with Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament concluding the services.

BENIGNO, Die Abhlas (13th ed., Paderborn, 1906); SCHWROHOFER, Abenteuer (Munich, 1900).

FREDERICK G. HOLWECK.

Monti di Pieta. See Montes Pietatis.

MONTMAGNY, Charles Huault de, second French Governor of Canada, b. in France towards the end of the sixteenth century, of Charles Huault and Antoinette du Drac; d. in the Antilles after 1651. Educated by the Jesuits, he joined the Order of Malta in 1622, and fought against the Moslems and the corsairs of Africa. Appointed to replace Chaplain before the announcement of the latter's death, he reached Quebec on 15 June, 1636. He rebuilt Fort St-Louis, and traced the plan of the city, giving to its four primitive streets the names they still bear in honour of King Louis, of the queen-mother, and of the patron saints of Paris, and of his order. With him had come several noble families destined to contribute to the country's development and renown. During his administration were built the Jesuit College (founded 1635), the Ursuline monastery, and Hôtel-Dieu (1639). Isle Jésus, lying parallel to Montreal, was first called by the Jesuit Lejeune Isle Montmagny in his honour. From the outset, he was ardent for the conversion of the natives and priests in the country. The Jesuits went to Sillery, where Montmagny strove to have the Indians instructed. When Maisonneuve, in the autumn of 1641, came with forty colonists to find Montreal, Montmagny kept them for the winter, and in the spring personally escorted them to their destination. He built Fort Richelieu (now Sorel) at the mouth of the Saint Lawrence, and here he received on the 20th of July a band of fifty Iroquois. The English then occupied the fortress at Queenston and Montmagny, in 1643, while the Iroquois were repulsed, the onslaught of 700 Iroquois. At the expiration of a third term of office, he was replaced by Daillebrot (1648), and departed sincerely regretted by all and leaving behind him an undying reputation for prudence and wisdom. He had efficaciously aided in the progress of the colony by the concession of twenty large domains to the enterprising hands of many noble families. Shortly after his return to France, he was sent to St. Christopher in the Antilles, a possession of his order, where he died. He lies buried in the church of Bassetterre. Parkman accuses him of being a tool in the hands of the Jesuits, but his refusal to develop actively their missions in the region of the Great Lakes, to the benefit of the French in Canada, gives ample proof of his independent government. Awdy by his imposing stature and dignity, the aborigines called him Onomutho or "High Mountain" (a translation of his name, Montmagny, Mons magnum). I was withal mild, courteous, and affectionate, winning the attachment of both Indians and whites. He was called the "second father" of New France.

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Montmirail (Monte-Mirabilis), John de, son of Andrew, Lord of Montmirail and Ferté-Gaucher, and Hildiade d'Olay, b. in 1165; d. 29 Sept., 1217. He was trained in piety by his mother, and well instructed in the secular sciences. Whilst young he embraced a military career, and was presented at the Royal Court, where he formed a lasting friendship with Philip Augustus, later King of France. The discipline of court life led him to neglect the training of his youth; even his marriage with a most estimable lady, Helvide de Dampierre, failed to effect a change for the better. However, in his thirtieth year he met Jober, Prior of St-Etienne de Montmirail, whose words of counsel proved sufficient to cause his conversion; and he turned to God with generosity and fidelity. He built an hospital for the sick of all kinds, but the objects of his predilection were the lepers, and those hopelessly afflicted. He loved the poor as brothers, and provided for them. He was severe on himself, wearing a coarse hair-shirt, passing frequently entire nights in prayer. Not satisfied with a life of holiness in the world, nor with that of a recluse, which he tried for a while, he entered the Cistercian monastery of Longpont, after having distributed amongst the poor all his possessions not needed by his wife and family; and he gave himself wholly to prayer and penance, so much so that he had to be reprimanded for going to extreme mortification. He had to cast off all his former friends; even members of his own family abused him for having abandoned honour and wealth for poverty and subjection. But none of these things could weaken the fervour with which he sought perfection. Innumerable miracles were wrought at his
tomb, and attract pilgrims even to the present day. Leo XIII granted a special office in his honour for the Diocese of Soissons.

Monarchy, Anne, First Duke of, b. at Chantilly, 15 March, 1492; d. at Paris, 12 November, 1567. He belonged to that family of Montmorency whose members from 1327 held the title of first Barons of France. Educated with the future Francis I, appointed marshal in 1522 as a reward for his services in the capture of Novara, his successful efforts to obtain the freedom of Francis I, taken prisoner at Pavia (1525), assured him of his favour. He immediately became grand master of the royal house and Governor of Languedoc. To his cleverness was due the treaty of Cambrai (1529), by which the two sons of Francis I, retained as hostages by Charles V since 1526, were released; in 1530 his power became unlimited. He inaugurated a new policy; his foremost aim was that France should retain her strength and live at peace with the emperor and the pope. He arranged the interview at Marseilles (1533) between Francis I and Clement VII in which the marriage of Catherine de Médicis with Prince Henry, the second son of the king, was arranged. The continued friendship of Francis I with certain German princes and his ambitions in Italy which were opposed to those of the emperor, made an understanding with Charles V very difficult. With the outbreak of war in 1536, Montmorency adopted the tactics of never giving battle; he laid waste Provence so that when the imperial forces invasiously entered his province they were obliged by famine to retreat. The articles of agreement which Charles V and Francis I signed (July, 1538), were the work of Montmorency, who declared afterwards that "the interests of both might be considered identical". The journey of Charles V to France (January, 1540) led Francis I to believe that the emperor was about to cede Milan to him; but he was soon undeceived. Montmorency, constable since 1538, was disgraced (June, 1541) through the influence of the favourite, Mme. d'Etampes. In 1547 Henry II, hardly became king, recalled Montmorency and made him really his favourite: Charles V made advances to the constable who in 1551 became a duke and a peer. He soon found himself opposed to the Guises. In spite of the military glory of occupying Metz (April, 1552), his one desire was to secure peace between France and the Empire, and in 1555 he made a vain effort to bring this about through the mediation of Mary Tudor. The war was prolonged; at Saint-Quentin (August, 1557) Montmorency, defeated, was taken prisoner; it was in 1558 that he commenced the negotiations which terminated in the treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (April, 1559) by which France obtained Metz, Toul, Verdun, and Colmar but renounced all claim to Italy, Savoy, Brescia, and Bugey. Montmorency, in retirement during the reign of Francis II, under the regency of Catherine de Médicis found his position very complicated. The uncle of Coligny and an enemy of the Guises, it seemed as if he ought to have sustained that policy of toleration towards the Protestants at first inaugurated by the queen-regent; but his Catholic convictions led him with the Duke of Guise and the Marchéal de Saint-André to form a triumvirate (6 August, 1561) to save Catholicism. Wounded mortally at the Huguenot battle of Dreux (19 December, 1562) after the peace, he joined with the Protestant Condé in the effort to take Havre from the English (30 July, 1563). In the second war of religion he again opposed Condé; and it was a follower of Condé who mortally wounded him at the battle of Saint-Denis (10 November, 1567).

Of indomitable courage, his cruelty towards conquered soldiers was shocking. He preferred defensive to offensive warfare. Although definitively the first of the great French lords, he worked towards the development of royal absolutism; under Francis I and Henry II he showed himself a faithful defender of the royal authority and suspected the Guises of being its enemies. A conservative in religion, he could not understand the intrigues of Catherine de Médicis and throughout the religious wars he fought vigorously for Catholicism under the same banner as the Guises whom he detested. An enlightened and generous protector of the writers and artists of the Renaissance, in 1549 he entrusted to his counselor and confidant together a numismatic collection which later, after the condemnation of the Duke of Montmorency, the descendant of Anne, Louis XIII gave to his brother, Gaston d'Orléans, and which was the beginning of the Cabinet des Médailles of the national library of Paris. The library of Chantilly as formed by Anne contained a beautiful collection of French and English translations of Latin authors. The Institut de France in 1900 bought "Les Heures du contétable" to add them again to this library from which they had been taken; they form one of the most admirable illuminated manuscripts of the sixteenth century, and we find in them a very beautiful prayer to Saint Christopher, composed by Anne himself during his years of disgrace; this manuscript was completed in 1549. During his disgrace Anne built the chateau of Ecouen where Jean Goujon, Rosso, and Bernard Palissy worked, and where were to be found two slaves in marble of Michael Angelo.

Montmorency, Anne, First Duke of. La triomphe et les gestes de Mgr. Anne de Montmorency, ed. Delisle (Paris, 1904); Delville, Les heures du contétable Anne de Montmorency ou Messe Condé (Chantilly, 1903); La tribu des Lartetrie. Un conte de la vie du contétable de Montmorency (Paris, 1879); Deville, Anne de Montmorency, grand maire et constable de France de la Tour, aux armes, a combattu d'un comte (Paris, 1886); Deville, Anne de Montmorency, contétable et pair de France sous les rois Henri II, Francois II et Charles IX (Paris, 1889). See also bibliography under Guise and Catherine de Médicis. — Georges Goyau.

Montor, Alexis-François Artaud de, diplomat and historian, b. at Paris, 31 July, 1772; d. at Paris, 12 Nov., 1849. An émigré during the Revolution, he was, however, entrusted by the royal princes with missions to the Holy See and served during the campaign of Champagne. In 1805 he wrote for the government a satisfactory report on the French legation at Rome; Artaud occupied this post under Cacault, left Rome for a short time when Cardinal Fesch, Cacault's successor, brought Chateaubriand with him, and returned to Rome in the same capacity after Chateaubriand had resigned. Appointed chargé d'affaires of France to Florence in 1835 he was busy with diplomatic business and was successfully suspected of having employed his power in behalf of the Queen of Etruria whose possessions Napoleon wished to give to Elisa Bonaparte. Made censor during the last years of the empire, he became under the Restoration secretary of the embassy at Vienna, then again at Rome. In 1830 he retired upon a pension to devote himself exclusively to literary works. — Besides
his translation of Dante's "Divina Commedia" (1811-1813) which was rated very highly, Artaud de Montor left important historical works: "Machiavel, son génie et ses erreurs" (Paris, 1833); the volume on the history of Italy in the collection of the "Université populaire" (Paris, 1833); "Lettres à un ami" (Paris, 1836); "Histoire de Dante Alighieri" (Paris, 1841); "Histoire des souverains pontifes romains" (8 vols., Paris, 1842); "Histoire de Léon XII" (Paris, 1843); "Histoire de Pie VIII" (Paris, 1843). Shortly before his death, he published in 1849 when Pius IX was banished to Gaeta, a work entitled "La papauté et les révoltes" in which he rejected his earlier views on the merits of the Pope's observations as a diplomat form the valuable feature of Artaud de Montor's historical works. He was a member of the Académie des Inscriptions et belles lettres from 17 Dec., 1830.

MONTPELLIER. DIOCÈSE OF (MONTIS PESSULANI), comprises the department of Hérault, and is a suffragan of Avignon. When the Concordat of 1802 re-established this diocese, it accorded to it also the department of Tarn, which was detached from it in 1822 by the creation of the Archdiocese of Albi; and from 1802 to 1822, Montpellier was a suffragan of Toulouse. A Brief of 18 June, 1877, authorized the bishops of Montpellier to call themselves bishops of Montpellier, Béziers, Agde, Lodève, and Saint-Pons, in memory of the different dioceses united in the present Diocese of Montpellier.

(A) Diocese of Montpellier.—Maguelonne was the original diocese. Local traditions, recorded in 1853 by Abbe Maret in his "Histoire des évêques de Maguelonne", affirm that St. Simon the Leper, having landed at the mouth of the Rhône with St. Lazarus and his sisters, was the earliest apostle of Maguelonne. Gareiél invokes in favour of this tradition a certain manuscript brought from Byzantium. But the chronicler, Bishop Arnaud de Verdela (1339-1352) was ignorant of this alleged Apostolic origin of Maguelonne. It is certain that the tombstone of a Christian woman named Vera was found at Maguelonne; Le Blant assigns it to the fourth century. The first historically known Bishop of Maguelonne was Bontius, who assisted at the Council of Narbonne in 589. Maguelonne was completely destroyed in the course of the wars of the counts of Carcassonne and the Saracens. The diocese was then transferred to Subastian, but Bishop Arnaud (1030-1060) brought it back to Maguelonne which he rebuilt. Near Maguelonne had grown up by degrees the two villages of Montpellier and Montpelleret. According to legend, they were in the tenth century the property of the two sisters of St. Fulcan, Bishop of Lodève. About 975 they gave them to Ricius, Bishop of Maguelonne. It is certain that about 990 Ricius possessed these two villages; he kept Montpellier and gave Montpelleret in feoff to the family of the Guillemaus. In 1065 Pierre, Count of Subastian and Melgueil, became a vassal of the Holy See for this countship, and relinquished the right of nomination to the Diocese of Maguelonne. Urban II charged the Bishop of Maguelonne to proclaim the papal suzerainty, and he spent five days in this town when he came to France to preach the Crusade. In 1215 Innocent III gave the countship of Melgueil in feoff to the Bishop of Maguelonne, who thus became a temporal lord.

From the time the Bishop of Maguelonne had the right of cocainage. Clement IV reproached (1266) Bishop Bérenger de Fréol with causing to be struck in his diocese a coin called "Miliarensis", on which was read the name of Mahomet; in fact at that date the bishop, as well as the King of Aragon and the Count of Toulouse, authorized the coinage of Arabic money, not intended for circulation in Maguelonne, but to be sold for exportation to the merchants of the Mediterranean.

In July, 1204, Montpellier passed into the hands of Peter of Aragon, son-in-law of the last of the Guillemes; Jaime I, son of Peter II, united the city to the Kingdom of Majorca. In 1282 the King of Majorca paid homage to the King of France for Maguelonne. Bérenger de Frédol, Bishop of Maguelonne, ceded Montpellier to Philip IV (1292). Jaime III of Majorca sold Montpellier to Philip VI (1349); and the city, save for the period from 1365 to 1382, was henceforth French. Urban V (Guillaume de Grimoard) had studied theology and canon law at Montpellier and was crowned pope by Cardinal Ardoni Aubert, nephew of Innocent VI, and Bishop of Maguelonne from 1352 to 1354; hence the attachment of Pope Urban for this diocese which he favoured greatly. In

Cathedrale, Montpellier
1364 he caused the foundation at Montpellier, of a Benedictine monastery under the patronage of St. Germain, and came himself to Montpellier to see the new church (9 Jan.-5 March, 1367). He caused the city to be surrounded by ramparts, in order that scholars might work there in safety; and finally he caused a large canal to be begun by which Montpellier might communicate with the sea. At the request of King Francis I, who pleaded the epidemics and the ravages of the pirates which constantly threatened Maguelonne, Paul III transferred the see to Montpellier (27 March, 1539). The new diocese was introduced in Feb., 1560, by the pastor, Guillaume Mauguet, was much troubled by the wars of religion. Under Henry III a sort of Calvinistic parish was installed there. The city was reconquered by Louis XIII (October, 1622).

Among the 54 bishops of Maguelonne, and the 18 bishops of Montpellier, may be mentioned: Blessed Louis Aleman (1418-23), later Bishop of Arles; Guillaume Pellier (1527-68), whom Francis I sent as an ambassador to Venice, and whose learning as a humanist and naturalist made him after Soévole de Sainte-Marthe, "the most learned man of his century"; the preacher Pierre Penouillet (1608-62); François de Boquet (1657-76), whose historical labours were
very useful to the celebrated Baluze; the bibliophile Colbert de Croisy (1696–1738), who induced the Oratorian Pouget to compose in 1702 the famous "Catechism of Montpellier," condemned by the Holy See in 1712 and 1721 for Jansenistic tendencies; Fournier (1808–94), who in 1891 was confined for a time in the house of Dr. Dechante at the demand of the bishop for a sermon against the Revolution. Among the numerous councils and synods held at Montpellier, the following merit mention: the council of 1162 in which Alexander III excommunicated the antipope, Victor; the provincial synod of 1195, which was occupied with the Saracens of Spain and the Albigensian crisis; the council of 1215, in which was presented over by Peter of Benevento,legate of the Holy See and passed important canons concerning discipline, and declared also that subject to the approval of the pope, Toulouse and all the other towns taken from the Albigenses should be given to Simon de Montfort; the council of 1224, which rejected the request of the magnates of Languedoc to be allowed to take part in the Synod of Toulouse; the council of 1258, which by permitting the seneschal of Beaucaire to arrest ecclesiastics taken in the act of crime, in order to hand them over to the bishop, made way for royal magistrates to exercise power within the ecclesiastical jurisdiction and thus inaugurated the movement as a result of which, under the name of "privileged cases," a certain number of offenses committed by ecclesiastics became amenable to lay justice.

(B) Diocese of Agde.—Local traditions designate as the first Bishop of Agde, St. Venustus, said to have suffered and died during the legendary invasion of the barbarian, Chroesus, about 407 or 408. The first historically known Bishop of Agde is Sophronius who assisted at the Council of Agde in 506.

(C) Diocese of Béziers.—Local traditions assign as the first Bishop of Béziers the Egyptian saint, Aphrodias, said to have sheltered the Holy Family at Hierapolis and to have become a disciple of Christ, also to have accompanied Sergius Paulus to Gaul when the latter went thither to found the Church of Narbonne, and to have died a martyr at Béziers. The first historically known bishop is Paulinus mentioned in 418; St. Guiraud was Bishop of Béziers from 1121 to 1123; St. Dominic refused the See of Béziers to devote himself to the运动. Among the fifteen synods held at Béziers must be mentioned that of 356 held by Saturninus of Arles, Arian archbishop, against St. Hilary; those of 1233, 1246, and 1255 against the Albigenses.

Local traditions made St. Aphrodiasius arrive at Béziers mounted on a camel. Hence the custom of leading a camel at the beginning of each Mass at Béziers on the feast of the saint; this lasted until the Revolution.

(D) Diocese of Lodève.—Since the fourteenth century local tradition has made St. Florus first bishop of Lodève, and relates that as a disciple of St. Peter, he afterwards evangelized Haute-Auvérargue and died in the present village of St.-Flour. It is historically certain that the bishops of Lodève mentioned since 421, the first historically known bishop is Maternus, who was present at the Council of Agde in 506. Among the bishops of Lodève are: St. George (863–884), previously a Benedictine monk; St. Fulcran (949–1006), who in 975 dedicated the cathedral of St. Genès and founded the Abbey of St. Sauveur; the Deacon Baudoin (1124–1130); Count of Carcassonne, Guillaume d’Estouteville (1450–1453), who played an important part as papal legate, also in the rehabilitation of Joan of Arc; the brothers Guillaume Briçonnet (1489–1516) and Denis Briçonnet (1516–1520).

(E) Diocese of Saint-Pons-de-Thomières.—The Abbey of St-Pons was founded in 936 by Raymond, Count of Toulouse, who brought thither the monks of St. Géraud d’Aurillac. By a Bull of 18 Feb., 1318, John XXII raised the abbey to a see.

Special honour is paid in the present Diocese of Montpellier to St. Pons (Pontius) de Cimiez, martyr under Valerian, patron of St.-Pons-de-Thomières; St. Tiberius and Modestus and St. Florence, martyrs at Carcassonne; St. Martin, born at Canet; St. André, at Agde (d. about 500); St. Maxence, a native of Agde and founder of the Abbey of St.-Maxence, in Poitou (447–515); St. Benedict of Aniane, and his disciple and first historian, Saint Ardo Smargus (d. in 843); St. Guillaume, Duke of Aquitaine, who in 894, founded near Lodève, on the advice of St. Benoît de Saint-Denis, the Monastery of Gellone (later St-Guillaume du Désert), died there in 812, and under the name of "Guillaume au Court Nœ" became the hero of a celebrated epic chanson; St. Etienne, Bishop of Apt (975–1046), born at Agde; Blessed Guillaume VI, Lord of Montpellier from 1121 to 1149 and who died a Cistercian at Grandesle; Bl. Peter of Castelnau, Archdeacon of Maguelonne, inquisitor (d. in 1208); St. Gérard (or Géri), Lord of Lunel (end of thirteenth century); the celebrated pilgrim, St. Roch, who was born at Montpellier about the end of the thirteenth century, saved several cities of Italy from the pest, and returned to Montpellier to live as a hermit, where he died in 1225. The Benedictine Abbey of Lodève, at the limits of the diocese, in the thirteenth century a centre of monastic reform. The Benedictine Abbey of Valmagne was founded in 1138 by Raymon of Trouvel, Viscount of Béziers. As early as 1180 the Hospital of the Holy Ghost at Montpellier received exposed or abandoned children.

The chief pilgrimages of the diocese are: Notre Dame de Grâce at Gignac, on the site of a sanctuary built by St. Flur, first Bishop of Lodève; Notre Dame de Grau near Agde, on the site of an oratory built in 1146 by St. Severus; Notre Dame de Mougerous at Mougerous (fifteenth century); Notre Dame de Montaigu at Ceyras, a pilgrimage founded by the Franciscans in the first half of the sixteenth century; Notre Dame de Roubiac (dating from the tenth century); Notre Dame du Sac at Brissac, established by the Benedictines; Notre Dame de Trédos, a pilgrimage already in existence in 1162; Notre Dame des Tables at Montpellier, dating from the ninth century, and particularly developed under the Franciscans in the thirteenth century; Notre Dame des Tables disappeared after the Revolution; but the cult transferred to the chapel of the Jesuits is still in vogue, and in 1889, Mgr. de Cabrières crowned the statue in the name of the pope. Before the application of the Law of 1901 there were in the diocese, Carthusians, Jesuits, Franciscans, Lazarists, Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, Redemptorists, Congregations of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, 8 houses of mercy, 15 establishments for nursing the sick in their homes, 1 hospital for the insane, 6 hospitals or infirmaries.

In 1908 the diocese numbered 482,779 inhabitants, 43 parishes, 310 chapels, 27 vicariates.
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University of Montreal.—It is not known exactly at what date the schools of literature were founded which developed into the Montpellier faculty of arts; it may be that they were a direct continuation of the Gallican Roman schools. The school of law was founded c. 1089 by Placide, archbishop of Narbonne, and Bonnet, who came to Montpellier in 1160, taught there during two different periods, and died there in 1192. The school of medicine was founded perhaps by a graduate of the Spanish medical schools; it is certain that, as early as 1137, there were excellent physicians at Montpellier. The statutes given in 1220 by Cardinal Constantin were confirmed by Pope Honorius III in 1240 by Pierre de Conques, placed this school under the direction of the Bishop of Maguelonne. Nicholas IV issued a Bull in 1289, combining all the schools into a university, which was placed under the direction of the bishop, but which in fact enjoyed a large measure of autonomy. Theology was at first a part of the Department of the Arts in the Universities of Padua, Raymond Lullus, and the Dominican Bernard de la Treille lectured. Two letters of King John prove that a faculty of theology existed at Montpellier independently of the convents, in January, 1390. By a Bull of 17 December, 1421, Martin V granted canonical institution to this faculty and united it closely with the faculty of law.

In the sixteenth century the faculty of theology disappeared for a time, when Calvinism, in the reign of Henry II, held complete possession of the city. It resumed its functions after Louis XIII had re-established the royal power at Montpellier in 1622; but the rivalries of Dominicans and Jesuits interfered seriously with the progress of the faculty. After the Revolution the faculty numbered among its illustrious pupils of law Petrarch, who spent four years at Montpellier, and among its lecturers Guillaume de Nogaret, chancellor to Philip the Fair, Gaillarde de Grimoard, afterwards pope under the name of Urban V, and Pedro de Luna, afterwards pope under the name of Benedict XIII. But after the sixteenth century this faculty fell into decay, as did also the faculty of arts, although for a time, under Henry IV, the latter faculty had among its lecturers Casaubon. The Montpellier school of medicine owed its success to the ruling of the Guilhems, lords of the town, by which any licensed physician might lecture there; there was no fixed limit to the number of teachers, lectures were multiplied, and there was a great wealth of teaching. Rabelais took his medical degrees at Montpellier. It was in this school that the biological theory of vitalism, elaborated by Barthez (1734-1806), had its origin. The French Revolution did not interrupt the existence of the faculty, although the number of members and the number of letters were re-established in 1810; that of law in 1880. It was on the occasion of the sixteenth centenary of the university, celebrated in 1889, that the Government of France announced its intention—which has since been realized—of reorganizing the provincial universities in France.

Montreal, Archdiocese of, Metropolitan of the ecclesiastical Province of Montreal. Suffragans: the Dioceses of Saint-Hyacinthe, Sherbrooke, Valleyfield, and Joliette. Catholic population, 470,000; clergy, 720, of whom 395 are secular priests. Protestant population, 80,000, composed of different sects. The diocese, separated from Quebec by Grand River XVI (1836), was a maximum length of sixty and breadth of fifty-two miles. (See the official reports of His Grace the Archbishop to the Holy See, in the Archives of Montreal.)

The present article will be continued in: I. History; II. Present Conditions. Division I will be subdivided by periods: A. Before the Cession (1763); B. From the Cession to the Formation of the Diocese (1836); C. From 1836 to the present time (1910), in the last subdivision including an account of the Eucharistic Congress of 1910.

I. History.—A. Before the Cession.—On his second voyage (1535), Jacques Cartier, the discoverer of Canada, stopped at Stadacona (Quebec). He went up the St. Lawrence to the savage village of Hochelaga, now Montreal, which afterwards bestowed the beautiful and well deserved name of Mont Royal on the mountain that overhangs the present city. In 1608 Quebec was founded by Samuel de Champlain. While, in Canada, the youthful colony was endeavouring to live under the rather weak, but too selfish and mercantile, government of the Compagnie de la Nouvelle-France, the Compagnie de Notre-Dame-de-Montreal was being formed in France. Two men of God, M. Olier, of Saint-Sulpice, and M. de la Dauversière, were the life of this Compagnie de Montréal. They offered themselves without imposing any burden on the king, the clergy, or the people, having as their sole aim, the glory of God and the establishment of religion in New France. This association having addressed itself to M. Chomodey de Maisonneuve, found in him one who would carry out its wishes faithfully. The island of Montreal was purchased from the Compagnie des Cent-Associés, for purposes of colonization (7 August, 1640). On 18 May, 1642, M. de Maisonneuve arrived with a company of thirty from the Seigneurie of Saint-Sulpice, landed with Mlle Jeanne Mance, the future foundress of the Hôtel-Dieu. Ville-Marie, as he first named Montreal, was then founded. (See Canada.) For thirty years an heroic struggle had to be carried on against the Iroquois. In 1636 there arrived Marguerite Bourgeoys, who a little later established the Sisters of Charity. In 1648 the first French Fueliess were forcibly sent by M. Olier on his death-bed, settled under the direction of M. de Queyless. From that time the spiritual wants of Montreal have been entrusted mainly to the Fathers of Saint-Sulpice (see Saint-Sulpice, Congregation of). It was at Montreal that Dollard formed his famous battalion in 1650. There also, Lemoine and, before him, Lambert Close, after Maisonneuve, had won great distinction. M. de Queyless, the Sulpician, had come to Canada as Vicar-General of Rouen (1557). Rightly or wrongly, the Archbishop of Rouen believed that Canada was subject to him in spiritual matters, as the missionaries had gone thither from his diocese; near the pope nor the bishop. In 1657 Mgr de Laval arrived at Quebec in 1659. M. de Queyless, not having been informed directly, either by the Court or by the Holy See, of the nomination of Laval by Alexander VII, hesitated a moment before
yielding up the spiritual rights which he believed to be his (see Laval, Saint-Sulpice). On 26 October, 1873, Mgr de Laval erected canonically the parish of Notre-Dame at Montreal, which was naturally confided to the Sulpicians. From that time to the cession, the successive curés were MM. François Dollier de Casson (30 Oct., 1678); François Vauchon de Bellefont (29 Sept., 1701); Louis Normant (25 May, 1732); Etienne Montgolfier (21 June, 1759). The third successor of Mgr de Laval, Mgr Desquet, from 1725 till 1739 Coadjutor, and later Bishop, of Quebec, was an old Sulpician from Montreal. In 1832, the Recollects were called to Montreal. From the time of their arrival at Quebec in 1615, these religious had been travelling through the country, and one of their number, Father Viel, had paused, with his disciple Abraham, in the Saint-Sulpice. Thanks to the influence of Mgr. Plessis (b. at Montreal in 1763) was consecrated at Quebec. This was the great bishop (1801-1815) who fought so ably and so resolutely for religious liberty. The clergy of Montreal supported him. Mgr Plessis, having asked for auxiliaries, obtained, among others, Mgr Provencher for the West and Mgr Larigle, a time plan, for Montreal. The last Bishop of Telmessus in 1820. In 1809 the College of St. Hyacinthe was founded by M. Giroud; in 1825 the College of Saint-Thérèse, by M. Ducharme; in 1832, the College of the Assumption, by M. François Labelle. This was the answer given to the English Protestants, who, with their Institution Reformed, wished to make the French their branches. In 1824 the fabriques (administrative councils in charge of church revenues) were authorized to acquire and hold property for the support of the schools. In 1838 normal schools were established by the help of the clergy. In 1832, and again in 1834, a cholera epidemic afforded opportunities for the display of heroic zeal. In 1836 the Société de la Propagation of the Faith was established at Montreal, on the model of the society founded at Lyons in 1822, with which it became affiliated in 1843, but from which it separated in 1876. Mgr Plessis was succeeded in the See of Quebec by Mgr Panet, in 1825, and Mgr Signay (Sainia) followed in 1832. Finally, on 13 February, 1836, a diocese was erected into a diocese by Pope Gregory XVI.

C. From 1836 to the Present Time (1910).—This was a disturbed, but very fruitful and prosperous period. After the unfortunate events of 1837-38 (when several Montreal villages, on the Richelieu and at Deux Montagnes, inspired by a noble-hearted generosity rather than by prudence, rose up in arms against the encroachments of British burghers) there followed the period called the Union of the Two Canada (1840-67). Parliamentary institutions dependent on the people were established by the efforts of Lafontaine and Cartier. The Confederation was established in 1867. (See CANADA). During this period the diocese of Montreal grew. Mgr Larigle, consecrated in 1821, titular in 1836, d. 1840; Mgr Bouret, coadjutor in 1837, titular in 1840, resigned in 1876, d. 1885; Mgr Fabre, coadjutor in 1873, titular bishop in 1876, archbishop in 1886, d. 1896; Mgr Bruchési, archbishop from 1897 to the present time. The superiors of Saint-Sulpice, after Mgr Labelle, Mgr Guitard, were Mgr M. B. Bouchard (1856), Bayle (1866), Colin (1881), and Lecocq (1902).

The foundation of the Grand Séminaire at Montreal took place in 1840; of the Canadian College at Rome, in 1848; of the Séminaire de Philosophie, near the Grand Séminaire, at Montreal, in charge of the Sulpicians, in 1854. The Brothers of the Christian Schools arrived in 1837; the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, in 1841. The Jesuits returned in 1842, their novitiate was opened in 1843, and the Collège Sainte-Marie, in 1848. The Viateurs and the Fathers of the Holy Cross arrived in 1847. Of the communities of women, the Religious of the Society of the Sacred Heart arrived from France in 1842; the Sisters of the Holy Cross from Angers, for teaching and establishing homes for penitents. The same year the Sisters of Providence were founded by Madame Gamelin, for teaching and works of charity. Two were the teaching Sisters of the Holy Names of
Jesus and Mary; the Sisters of the Holy Cross, also a teaching institute from France, arrived in 1847; in 1848 the institute of Sœurs de la Miséricorde was founded for the care of Magdalenes and in 1850 the Sisters of St. Anne, for teaching. Colleges were founded at Joliette and Bourget, by the Clerics of Saint-Viateur, in 1846 and 1850; at Saint-Laurent, by the Fathers of the Holy Cross, in 1847. (For the Laval University, chartered in 1852, and its successor at Montreal, see LAVAL University.) In 1850 the Diocese of St. Hyacinthe was erected, and in 1874 that of Sherbrooke; both of these became suffragans of Montreal in 1886, when Montreal became a metropolitan see. The other two suffragans, Valleyfield and Joliette, were erected in 1892 and 1904 respectively. Other notable events were: in 1840, the missions of Mgr. Laberge, parish priest of St. Jérôme, to counteract the emigration movement towards the United States; in 1866, division of the parish of Notre-Dame (then divided further into more than 50 parishes); in 1868, the condemnation by Bishop Bourget, confirmed by the Holy See, of the “Institut Canadien,” a club which by means of its books and its lectures had become a centre of Voltaireanism and irreligion; also “the Guibord affair,” a famous lawsuit in reference to the burial in consecrated ground of a member of the same club. About 1884, began at Montreal the Lenten lectures in Notre Dame, then those in the Gesù, and lastly those in the cathedral (in 1889) under Mgr. Bruchési. In 1896 Loyola College was founded by the Jesuits for English-speaking Catholics; in 1905, Mgr. Racicot was appointed auxiliary bishop to the Archbishop of Montreal.

The Eucharistic Congress of 1910.—The Twenty-first International Eucharistic Congress was held at Montreal, 7–11 September, 1910. (For the origin and object of these congresses, see CONGRESSES, CATHOLIC: International Congresses.) At the Eucharistic Congress of London, in 1908, the Committee offered Mgr. Bruchési the opportunity to hold the Congress of 1910 in his archiepiscopal city. For a year the various committees at Montreal worked energetically in preparation for the event. Pius X sent as legate a latera His Eminence Vincenzo Vannutelli, Cardinal-Bishop of Palestrina. All the bishops of Canada and the United States and a large number from Europe were present in person or sent representatives. There were three hundred priests and twenty archbishops and bishops, between three and four thousand priests, and more than a half million lay visitors came to Montreal. The literary reunions of the French-speaking section were held at the house of the Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament, Laval University, and the National Monument, while those of the English-speaking and of the Jesuits were held at the Convent of the Sacred Heart, Windsor Hall, and Stanley Hall. More than a hundred studies on the Blessed Eucharist—in relation to dogma, moral history, discipline, pious practices, devotion, and associations—were read and discussed. Each session was presided over by a bishop. Special reunions for priests, men and women, and for the young were held with great success.

A splendid gathering of twenty thousand young men received the papal legate with enthusiasm; thirty thousand school-children passed in review before him. It is estimated that a hundred thousand men marched in procession on the occasion of the solemn Mass in the Cathedral. Sunday, 11 September, in the presence of 700,000 spectators. The streets of the city were magnificently decorated for the occasion with triumphal arches, draperies, and flags, under the direction of the committee of archi-

pecters. On the side of Mont Royal, in the Parc Maneu, an immense park in the form of an amphitheatre, a monumental altar had been erected; there Mass was celebrated in the open air on 10 September, and there on the following day, the great procession terminated, when nearly 800,000 Christians assembled to welcome Jesus in the Eucharist held in the hands of the cardinal legate, blessing Montreal, Canada, America, and the whole world. Besides the literary reunions already mentioned, two great meetings were held on Friday and Saturday evenings at Notre-Dame, where speeches in honour of the Christian Faith and the Blessed Sacrament were delivered by: Cardinal Vannutelli, Cardinal Logue, Archbishops Bruchési, Bourne, and Ireland. Bishops Touchet and Rumeau, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Lomer Gouin, Hon. Thomas Chapais, Judge Doherty, Deputy Tellier, Judge O'Sullivan, Deputy Henri Bourassa, M. Gerlier, and many other distinguished ecclesiastics and laymen of the Old and New World. These memorable displays of eloquence made a deep impression in the souls of the twelve to fifteen thousand auditors. Also in the church of Notre-Dame, at the first hour of Thursday, 8 September, as a religious prelude to the literary sèances, an imposing midnight Mass was celebrated, at which thousands of men received Holy Communion, the Mass having been preceded by an hour’s solemn adoration under the direction of members of the Association Adoration Nocturne of Montreal. The ceremony of the official reception of the papal legate, the special Mass on Thursday, 8 September, in favour of the numerous religious communities of Montreal, and also the high Mass on Sunday, 11 September, sung by the cardinal legate, at which Cardinal Gibbons and Mgr. Touchet preached, all took place in the cathedral of St. James. At the open-air Mass on Saturday, 10 Sept., sung by Mgr. Farley, the preachers were Mgr. O’Connell and the Rev. Father Hage.

What specially distinguished the Congress of Montreal from any previous Eucharistic Congress was the official participation of the civil, federal, provincial, and municipal authorities. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company had sent a representative to meet the legate in Rome, and His Eminence
crossed the ocean on board one of the Empress liners of the same company. At Quebec the Federal Government yacht met the cardinal and his suite, and conveyed them thence to Montreal. All along the route, the population on the banks of the river greeted the legate as he passed. At Montreal, despite most inconstant weather, an immense crowd gave him an enthusiastic reception. Mayor Guérin presented addressed a welcome in French and English. During the congress, the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, and the City of Montreal each held a reception for the legate and other official personages.

Under the immediate direction of Archbishop Bruchési and the more remote direction of the Permanent Committee of the Eucharistic Congress, presiding over Mgr Henry, Bishop of Namur, four great committees laboured to organize the Congress of Montreal: Committee of Works: president, Canon Gauthier; vice-presidents, M.M. Lecocq, M.-Shane, Perrier, and Auclair. Committee of Finance: president, Canon Martin; vice-president, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and Hon. L. J. Forget. Committee of Reception: presidents, Canon Danth and Father Donnelly; vice-presidents, Canon Roy and Father Troie. Committee of Decorations and Procession: president, Canon Le Pailleur; vice-presidents, Fathers Belanger, Laforce, Piètre, Rusconi, O'Reilly, Martin, Deschamps, Heffernan. To these committees there had been added for press purposes a special committee composed by Father Elie J. Auclair.

Present Conditions.—The Diocese of Montreal, at the present time (1910) is under the direction of Mgr Paul Bruchési, with an auxiliary bishop (present the Rt. Rev. Mgr Zoétique Racicot, titular Bishop of Pogla), and a cathedral chapter. The Catholic population is about 470,000, served by 72 priests, 112 Catholic clergy, 150 parishes or missions, 66 of which are in the city and suburbs. Besides Laval University (see above), the seminaries and colleges are: the Grand Séminaire, with 350 students; the Seminary of Philosophy, 120; the Montreal College, 300; and Sacré-Cœur College, recently founded and under the direction of the Sulpicians; St. Mary's and Loyola College, under the direction of the Jesuits; those of Ste Thérèse and L'Assomption, under secular priests, and of Saint Laurent, under the Fathers of the Holy Cross. In all, some 2000 boys and young men are trained in these colleges. In addition to these, 64,000 children are taught in the schools or convents of religious orders, and 8,000 by lay Catholic teachers, mostly women. Some 1500 Brothers, and more than 3700 Sisters devote themselves, in the diocese, to works of teaching or of charity. There are nearly 60 hospices, asylums, or orphanages, where some 45,000 old people, orphans, sick, and infirm are charitably cared for. Moreover, according to the latest official diocesan report, from which the above statistics are gathered, more than 200 secular priests from this diocese and more than 4000 Sisters minister or teach in other parts of Canada or in the United States.

In 1909, there were some 390 secular priests in the diocese, 80 Sulpicians, 150 Jesuits, 20 Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 30 Franciscans (in Montreal since 1890), 30 Trappists, 50 Redemptorists (in Montreal since 1884), 30 Fathers of the Holy Cross, 20 of the Holy Sacrament (1890), 8 of St. Viator, 5 of the Company of Mary, 10 Dominicans (1901), 2 Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul (1908). It would be impossible to give all the details of this useful and fruitful religious life. The Carmelites (1875) and the Sisters of the Precious Blood (1874) have 50 houses and the community is increasing. To these communities have been added the Little Sisters of the Poor (1887), the Sœurs de l'Espérance (1901), the Sisters of the Immaculate Conception (1904), the Daughters of Wisdom (1910), and the Brothers of the Presentation (1910). The parishes, in town and country, are in a flourishing condition. Mgr Bruchési has devised a plan of giving poor church help and protection by making certain rich, older parishes act as their sponsors. Every year, on one of the Sundays of September, all Montreal visits the cemetery, near the top of Mount Royal, where, in the presence of 50,000 Catholics, a service for the dead takes place, possibly the only one of its kind in the world. On the eve of the civic Labour Holiday, the archbishop has, for some years past, invited the workmen of his diocese to be present at a religious service.

Archives of the Archbishops of Montreal: La Sain. Religieuse (Montreal, 1845); De Charleroi, De Bruxelles, De Bourbourg, De Douai, De Flandres, De Gand, De Lille, De Lutèce, De Paris, De Saint-Omer, De Soignies, De Tourcoing, De Valenciennes, De Ypres (Bruxelles, 1885); Les Reminiscences de Mgr Plessis (Paris, 1867); Mgr Michel de Brou (Paris, 1870); Mgr Naud (Philadelphia, 1874); Mgr La Véine (Montreal, 1875); Mgr Léger (Montreal, 1876); Mgr Lebrecq (Montreal, 1877); Mgr Desaillens (Montreal, 1878); Mgr le Vaillant (Montreal, 1878); Mgr Sahuc (Montreal, 1879); Mgr Léger (Montreal, 1880); Mgr Saillant (Montreal, 1881); Mgr La Véine (Montreal, 1882); Mgr Desaillens (Montreal, 1883); Mgr Léger (Montreal, 1884); Mgr Lebrecq (Montreal, 1885); Mgr La Véine (Montreal, 1886); Mgr Desaillens (Montreal, 1887); Mgr Léger (Montreal, 1888); Mgr Lebrecq (Montreal, 1889); Mgr La Véine (Montreal, 1890); Mgr Desaillens (Montreal, 1891); Mgr Léger (Montreal, 1892); Mgr Lebrecq (Montreal, 1893); Mgr La Véine (Montreal, 1894); Mgr Desaillens (Montreal, 1895); Mgr Léger (Montreal, 1896); Mgr Lebrecq (Montreal, 1897); Mgr La Véine (Montreal, 1898); Mgr Desaillens (Montreal, 1899); Mgr Léger (Montreal, 1900); Mgr Lebrecq (Montreal, 1901); Mgr La Véine (Montreal, 1902); Mgr Desaillens (Montreal, 1903); Mgr Léger (Montreal, 1904); Mgr Lebrecq (Montreal, 1905); Mgr La Véine (Montreal, 1906); Mgr Desaillens (Montreal, 1907); Mgr Léger (Montreal, 1908); Mgr Lebrecq (Montreal, 1909); Mgr La Véine (Montreal, 1910); Mgr Desaillens (Montreal, 1911).

ELIE J. AUCLAIR.

Montreuil, Charterhouse of Notre-Dame-des-Prés, at Montreuil, in the Diocese of Arras, Department of Pas-de-Calais, France, founded by Robert, Count of Boulogne and Auvergne. The charter of foundation is dated from the château d'Hardelet on 15 July, 1324; the church was consecrated in 1338. The foundation, being close to Calais, was liable to disturbance in time of war. Thus it was often sacked by the English during the wars in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and was for a time abandoned. The religious returned when peace was restored. In 1542 the monastery was again wrecked by the Imperial troops and in the wars of religion fresh troubles attended the community. The house was rebuilt by Dom Bernard Bruyant in the latter part of the seventeenth century and remained undisturbed until the Revolution. In 1790 the monastery was suppressed and its property sold by auction the following year. Eighty-two years later the Carthusians repurchased a portion of their old estate and the first stone of the new monastery was laid on 15 May 1878. The work was pushed forward with such energy by the Prior, Dom Eusèbe Berger, that the whole was finished in three years. The monastery contains twenty-four cells in its cloister. Montreuil has taken a special position among Carthusian houses, owing to the establishment there of a printing press from which has been issued a number of works connected with the order. Dom le Couteulx's "Annales" (in eight vols.) and the edition of Denys the Carthusian may be quoted as examples of the fine printing done by the monks. By the recent "Association Laws" the community of Montreuil has been once more ejected. The monks are now lodged in the Charterhouse of Paul, minister, England; but printing works have been transferred to Tournai in Belgium.

TROMBY, Stoia ... dall' ordine Cartusiano (Naples, 1773); LE COUTEULX, Annales ordinis Cartusiani (Montreuil, 1901); LEPEYRE, S. Bruno e l'ordine dei Chartes (Paris, 1866); G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Montreuil Abbey, a former convent of Cistercian nuns in the Diocese of Laon, now Soissons, France. Some incorrectly claim that it was the first convent of Cistercians in the country. It is situated in the town of Montreuil, a few kilometers northeast of Soissons, near the city of Laon. The abbey was established in the 12th century by Saint Barolomeus, Bishop of Laon, and within a few years it numbered nearly three hundred. In early days the community busied themselves not merely in weaving and embroidery, but also in tilling the fields, clearing the forest, and weeding the soil.
Mont-St-Michel, a Benedictine Abbey, in the Diocese of Avranches, Normandy, France. It is unquestionably the finest example both of French medieval architecture and of a fortified abbey. The buildings of the monastery are piled round a conical mound which rises abruptly out of the waters of the Atlantic to the height of 300 feet, on the summit of which stands the great church. This rock is nearly a mile from the shore, but in 1880 a causeway was built across the dangerous quicksand that occupies this space and is exposed at low water, so that there is now no danger in approaching the abbey. The monastery was founded about the year 708 by St. Aubert, Bishop of Avranches, and according to the legend, by direct command of the Archangel Michael himself, who appeared to the bishop in a dream on three separate occasions. About 966, Richard the Fearless, third Duke of Normandy, finding the community in a relaxed condition, installed Benedictines from Cerezo of Mont-St-Michel. A few years later, in 1017, Abbot Hildebert II began the colossal scheme of buildings all round the rock which should form a huge platform level with the summit, on which the abbey church might stand. In spite of the enormous difficulties involved in the design, difficulties increased by fire and the collapse of portions of the church, the scheme was persevered in until 1522, five centuries and crowned by the completion of the flamboyant choir in 1520. Even among religious communities, such an instance of steadfast purpose and continuity of plan stands unrivalled; but the completion was only just in time. In 1223 the abbey was granted in commendam to Cardinal Le Veneur and the series of commendatory abbots continued until 1622 when the abbey, its community reduced almost to the vanishing point, was united to the famous Congregation of St-Maur. At the French Revolution the Maurist monks were ejected and the splendid buildings became a prison for political offenders while, with unconscious irony, the name of the place was changed from Mont-St-Michel to Mont Libert. In 1794 the prison was closed and for a few years the abbey was leased to the Bishop of Avranches, but in 1872 the French Government took it over as a national monument and undertook, none too soon, the task of restoration. The work has gone on almost continually ever since, and the restorers must be praised for the skill with which the great pile has been saved from ruin, and the good taste with which the whole has been done.

This vast group of buildings has been the subject of several important monographs. Speaking generally, the monastic buildings consist of three main stories. Of these, the two lower take the form of vast irregular rings completely enclosing the natural rock, while the upper forms a core to the whole edifice. The third story rests partly on the two lower stories and partly on the apex of the rock which is found immediately beneath the pavement of the church. The most remarkable part of all is the mass of buildings known as "la mervelle" (the marvel) on the north side of the rock facing the ocean. This vast structure, half military,
he was empowered to bestow favours on the nobles of the province, who bound themselves in return to guard the abbey in time of war. In 1489 King Louis XI founded the Order of St. Michael, and held the first chapter of its knights in the “salle des chevaliers.” It is said that the cockle shell, horn, and staff, which became the recognised insignia of a pilgrim from the thirteenth century onwards, take their origin from Montyon. The staff was used by the pilgrim across the treacherous quicksand, the horn served to summon aid should tide or fog surprise the pilgrim; while the cockle shell was fixed in the hat as a souvenir to show that the pilgrim had accomplished his journey in safety. The abbey bore as its arms a cockle shell and fleurs-de-lis with the significant motto “Tremor immersus Oceanis.”

MONTYON

Montyon, Antoine-Jean-Baptiste-Robert Auguste, Baron de, famous French philanthropist; b. at Penthievre, January 29, 1735; d. December 29, 1820. He was the son of a wealthy official of the Exchequer. As soon as he had completed his education, young Montyon was made king’s advocate at the court of Le Châtelet (Paris) where his inflexible integrity won for him the surname of “Grenadier of the Bar.” In 1758 he entered the Great Council and in 1764 was made a member of the petitioners. In 1767 he became intendant of Auvergne, where his liberality to the poor endeared him to the people. It is said that he yearly spent as much as twenty thousand francs of his private income to give work and help to needy families. On his refusal to install the new magistrates appointed by Maupou after the suppression of the Parlements, he was transferred to the Intendance of Provence and then to La Rochelle. In 1775, through the influence of the duc de Penthièvre, he was recalled to Paris and appointed councillor of State. Amidst the cares of public life, he had found time for the study of economics and belles-lettres. The French Academy awarded a distinction to his “Essai de Fiscalité” (Paris 1774). The following year he published “Recherches et considérations sur la population de la France.” Montyon’s great concern, however, was philanthropy, which he delighted to practice in an anonymous way. In order to foster emulation for the good among his countrymen, he founded a number of prizes to be awarded by the Academy of Science, the Academy of Medicine. At the beginning of the French Revolution, he thought it was his duty to share the fortunes of the princes of the House of Bourbon, and he left the country. He travelled in Switzerland and Germany, but spent the greater part of his exile in London; during his stay in that city, he gave each year ten thousand francs to relieve the French refugees, and the French soldiers who were prisoners in England; the same amount was sent to the poor of Auvergne. Montyon returned to France in 1815 at the time of the second restoration and henceforth devoted all his time to the work that had made his name famous. He re-established the prizes which he had founded before the Revolution and which had been abolished by the National Convention. The best known of these prizes are “le prix de vertu,” to reward a virtuous act done by a poor Frenchman, and the prize to be bestowed on the author of the work most useful to morals. These prizes are to be awarded by the French Academy. Montyon also distributed large sums of money among the bureaus of charities in Paris. His will, in which are expressed sentiments of the deepest piety, besought the bulk of his property to the hospitals and homes of his native city.

PATRIE MARQUE.

MOORE, Hugh, Venerable. See MOYTON, ROBERT, VENERABLE.

Moore, Arthur, Count, b. at Liverpool, 1849; d. at Mooresfort, Tipperary, Ireland, 1904, was the son of Charles Moore, M.P. for Tipperary. Educated at Ushaw, he afterwards travelled in Spain and in 1874 was elected M.P. for the Borough of Clonmel. In Parliament he was a follower of Mr. Butt, and strongly advocated land reform, better treatment of children in workhouses, university education for Irish Catholics, and Home Rule; and he specially interested himself in providing Catholic chaplains for the navy. In 1877 he married a daughter of an English baronet, Sir Charles Edward, who was created a peer and received the title of Count from the pope. During the Gladstone Parliament of 1880–85 Count Moore was usually on the side of Parnell. He favoured land purchase as the best settlement of the Irish land question; he advocated the providing of suitable cottages for Irish labourers, and better treatment of Irish emigrants on board ship; he always voted for Home Rule, and vehemently denounced coercion. But he had no faith in violent agitation, and did not favour the full programme of the Land League or that of the National League; and he voted for the second reading of Gladstone’s Land Bill though Parnell and his friends abstained from voting. Count Moore would only follow the party, and he was too independent to be blindly obedient to Mr. Parnell; when the Redistribution Act of 1885 disfranchised Clonmel, he was left without a seat in Parliament. He had therefore no share in the stirring scenes which followed the general election of 1885. But he was not content to lead a life of ease and inactivity, believing that “a Catholic layman should be up and doing and not merely telling his beads in a corner.” Blessed with ample wealth he was a generous contributor to schools, churches, convents, and hospitals; a militant but not an aggressive Catholic he was always ready to do battle for Catholic truth, and in speeches, lectures, and newspaper articles often did splendid service for the Church and her interests. He spared no effort to secure that Catholic sailors should not be left without religious instruction during life, or without a priest at the hour of death; and so valuable was his work in this matter that the Irish Bishops, at their meeting at Maynooth in 1865, thanked him and invited him to join the Catholic Truth Society and attend its meetings; he desired to have a branch of the Benedic- tine Order in Ireland, and would have helped to es- tablish it. He established and generously endowed the Cistercian Abbey at Roeceosa. Always ready to help others he did not forget his own personal sanctity. He attended Mass every day, spent hours before the tabernacle in his own chapel, fasted rigorously, made frequent retreats; and he went, year after year, to Lourdes and to the Holy Land, not as a mere sight-seeing traveller but as a pilgrim and a penitent. At home he was the kindest and the most indulgent of landlords, and no beggar went unrelieved from his door. When he died, his body, enclosed in the Fran- ciscan habit, was interred at a high altar in the church of the Cistercians at Roeceosa.

CHARLES, Life of Count Arthur Moore (Dublin, 1895).

E. A. D’ALTON.
Moore (or Moore), Michael, priest, preacher, and professor, b. at Dublin, Ireland, 1640; d. at Paris, 22 Aug., 1726. Educated at Nantes and Paris, he taught philosophy and rhetoric at the Collège des Grasins. Returning to Ireland, he was ordained priest in 1664, and appointed Vicar-General of the Diocese of Dublin by Archbishop Russell. When the Revolution of 1688 drove James II from his British dominions, Ireland was held for him by Richard Talbot, Earl (afterwards Duke) of Tyrconnell. The provost of Trinity College, Dublin, Dr. Huntingdon, fled to England when James landed in Ireland. The college was seized by the Jacobites, the chapel was made a powder magazine, one portion of the building was turned into a barrack, and another into a gaol for persons suspected of disaffection to the royal cause. Moore was chaplain and confessor to Tyrconnell through whose influence and on the recommendation of the Irish Catholic bishops, he was appointed (1689) by James, provost of Trinity College—the only Catholic who ever held that position. He upheld the rights of the college, secured it from further pillage, and endeavored to mitigate the treatment of the prisoners. With the librarian, Father McCarthy, he prevented the soldiery from burning the library, and by preserving its precious collections rendered an incalculable service to letters. A sermon with a dedicatory address to Charles, Prince of Wales, was inscribed on the Within the king so deeply that he was obliged to resign (1690), and retired to Paris. When James, after the battle of the Boyne (1690), fled to Paris, Moore, removed to Rome, became Censor of Books, and won the favour of Innocent XII and Clement XI. When Cardinal Barbarigo established his college at Montefiascone, Moore was appointed Master of the University of the Papacy (1701–2), and received from Innocent XII an annual grant of two thousand crowns. After the death of James II (1701), Moore returned to France, where, through Cardinal de Noailles, he was appointed Rector of the University of Paris (17 Oct., 1701 to 9 Oct., 1702). He was also made principal of the Colleges of Navarre, and professor of philosophy, Greek, and Hebrew in the Collège de France. In 1702 he was selected to deliver the annual panegyric on Louis XIV, founded by the City of Paris. Moore joined Dr. Farrelly (Fealy) in purchasing a house near the Irish College for poor Irish students. Blind for some years, he died in 1726. After four years, his widow, as an act of his master's affection to steal and sell many hundreds of volumes of his choice library. What remained Moore bequeathed to the Irish College. He died in the Collège de Navarre, and was buried in the vault under the chapel of the Irish College. His published works include: "De Existentia Dei, et Humane Mentis Immortali, etc."; "Doctrinae Aristotelicae Compendium" (Paris, 1692); "Horatio ad Studium Linguarum Graecarum et Hebraicarum" (Montefiascone, 1700); "Vera Scientiæ Methodus" (Paris, 1718).

P. J. Lennox.

Moore, Thomas, poet and biographer, b. 25 May, 1779, at Dublin, Ireland; d. 26 February, 1832, at Devizes, England. His father was a grocer till 1806 when, he, in common with Lord Byron, moved to London. His mother, a woman of varied accomplishments, did much to train him for his remarkable success in society. Thomas early manifested a remarkable power of rhyming, singing, and acting. When fifteen he was entered at Trinity College, Dublin, which the Catholic Relief Act of 1793 had opened its doors to Catholics, who were, however, hardly more than tolerated. Denied all incentive because of his religious belief, Moore gave little or no heed to academic honors. A curious point noted by a recent biographer is that Moore was entered as a Protestant, possibly by his school-master, Mr. Whyte, who himself was a Protestant, wished to qualify his favorite pupil for all the good things that the college offered to non-Catholics. Moore probably was not aware of this; at any rate he never availed himself of it. Though his education and associations were mostly Protestant, and though he himself was in fact after his first year in college scarcely more than a nominal Catholic, he never changed his creed. Among his intimate friends was Robert Emmet, whose tragic death made on him a lasting impression. Moore shows this in his writings, as in the beautiful lyric, "O breathe not his name," and also in the veiled allusions in "The Fire Worshipers," one of the four long poems of "Lalla Rookh." After graduating in 1798 he set out in the following spring for London to study law. He was never admitted to the Bar, as legal studies had for him no attraction. Literature was more to his liking. When scarcely fifteen, some verses of his appeared in a Dublin magazine "The Anthologia Hibernica." While in college he wrote a metrical translation of the "Odes of Anacreon" which he published in London in 1800, with a dedication "by permission" to the Prince of Wales. He published also a volume of original poems under the title of "The Poetical Works of the late Thomas Little," which met with severe criticism on the grounds of indecency. Later editions were expurgated; but Moore showed his fondness for amorous poetry by recurring to it in "The Loves of the Angels." Again criticized, he went on, in his metrical version of Washington Irving's "Life of Washington." Moore's success almost from the day he set foot in England was extraordinary. It was no doubt his personal charm and the masterly singing of his own songs that gave him the start in his successful career. Like the ancient bard he sang his own verses to his own accompaniment, and was welcomed everywhere. Early in 1803 the Government proposed to establish an Irish laureateship and offered Moore the position with the same salary and emoluments as the English office of similar title; but Moore declined the honour. Another offer later in the year, that of Registrar of the Admiralty Court of Bermuda, he accepted and left England in September for his post of considerable importance. After four years, when he returned to his liking he appointed a deputy and sailed for New York. He visited the principal cities of the States, and then went to Canada. He was delighted with his Canadian tour, but was far differently impressed by "the land of the free" and its people. Judging everything from his pro-English viewpoint, he could find scarcely anything to admire in the young republic which had so lately gained its independence from England. After an absence of fourteen months he returned to London "with a volume of poetic travels in his pocket" which with later additions he published in 1806 under the title of "Epistles, Odes and other Poems." In addition to his animadversions on America it contained several splendid sonnets. The famous critic, Jeffrey, in an article in the "Edinburgh Review" attacked the book severely and called its author "the most licentious of modern versifiers." This brought on the famous "lead pencil duel," and paved the way for the lifelong friendship between the poet and the critic. Another challenge from Moore, this time to Lord Byron, was given the "lead pencil" used in the meeting with Jeffrey, resulted in another close friendship between "hostile forces".

In 1807 Moore published the first numbers of his "Irish Melodies." Were all his other works lost, these would give him the right to the title of a much more "The Poet of the people of Ireland." The importance and the difficulty of this undertaking—to
fit words to the old national airs of Ireland—Moore fully realized. But the task of marrying words to these airs was no easy one. "The Poet", as Moore himself wrote, "who would follow the various sentiments which they involved, and bring the rapid fluctuation of spirits, that unaccountable mixture of gloom and levity which composes the character of my countrymen and has deeply tinged their Music". Almost all contemporary writers, among them Shelley and Landor, spoke enthusiastically of the melodies, saying that they were lyrics of the highest merit. His friend and biographer, Lord John Russell, wrote in 1853 that "of all lyrical poets, Moore is surely the greatest". Moore continued to write these at intervals for twenty-seven years, receiving $500 for each, which gave him an annual income of $2500. Six of the ten numbers of his melodies were published, when he tried his hand with like success at "Sacred Songs" and "National Airs".

The lyrics, however, did not take up all his time. In 1808 he published poems on "Corruption" and on "Intolerance" and in the following year "The Sceptic". These attempts at serious satire, in which he used the heroic couplet of Pope, did not meet with success. On the contrary, they strained and directed against the prince his former patron, who on becoming regent through the insanity of his father had changed front and broken with the Whigs, with whom Moore had previously allied himself. These pieces, together with those he wrote against several members of the Ministry, were gathered together and published in 1813 with the title "Intercepted Letters or The Two-penny Postbag". In this sort of light-hearted satire Moore had struck a rich vein which he worked for more than twenty years with his "Fudge Family in Paris", "The Fudges in England", and "Fable of the Holy Alliance". Moore's reputation in the literary world of his time derived from the distinguished arrangements made for the copyright of "Lalla Rookh" (1817). Longmans, the publishers, agreed to give the highest price ever paid for a poem, $15,000, and that, too, without seeing a line of the work. And twenty years later they still called it the "cream of the copyrights". After considerable reading and studying of the history and the manners of Persia and of the Persians up to the time of Baber, foundering a story on the long and fierce struggle between the Persian fire-worshippers and their haughty Moesian masters—a theme that had much to recommend it to an Irishman familiar with the long struggle between his countrymen and their rulers. Men who had lived long in the East marvelled at his skill in reproducing faithfully life in the Orient with its barbaric splendours.

Scarce was this off his hands when the news arrived that he must make good the loss of $30,000 caused by his agent in Bermuda. Moore had not saved anything out of his large income. His friends would have come to his assistance; but he would not ask for help, nor for refuge, and preferred to suffer on the continent. More than three years he had of rather enjoyable exile, most of which was spent in Paris where his family joined him in 1820. He had in 1811 married a young actress, Miss Beasy Dyke. Towards the close of 1822, after settling the Bermuda claim, which had been reduced to $5,000, he took up his residence again in England. Heretofore he had been almost exclusive of verse, or prose; from this time he is primarily a writer of prose—he becomes a biographer, a controversialist, an historian. During the summer of 1823, he accompanied Lord Lansdowne on a visit to the south of Ireland. While there he learned much of the discontent among the peasants, of their secret organizations, and of their mysterious leader, Captain Rock. On his return he read history, and as a result of his reading and his sight-seeing, he wrote a "History of Captain Rock and his Ancestors" in which he gives the history of agrarian crimes and denounces, not the Shanavestes of "Foggy Boggie Tipperary" whom eight years before he called murderous savages deserving death, but the bad laws of England that generated all sorts of crime. The book made its way everywhere. In England, perhaps for the first time, the cause of Ireland received a hearing. Naturally it became popular in Ireland where even Catholics, notwithstanding (in the words of Moore) "some infidelities to their religion which break out now and then in it", expressed their gratitude for his defence of their country.

This favourable reception delighted Moore; only now he began to know Ireland and her people. He came back at times to his own and endeavoured to make amends for his former lack of sympathy, as may be seen in some of his later writings, as the "Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald" (1831). This, which is probably his best prose work, was a labour of love; for in writing a sympathetic account of a young Irish patriot who suffered for his country in the uprising of 1798, Moore could hardly hope for encouragement from an English reading public. In the meantime he had published the "Life of Sheridan" (1835), a work which he had engaged upon during his exile of seven years. So successful was it financially that the publishers added $1500 to the original price of the copyright. Its chief value lay, as the critic Jeffrey said, in the historical view it gave of public transactions for the past fifty years. The next prose work, "The Epicurean" (1827), has some merit as a story, but as a life of 1815 of Stendhal, it marks a transition in the Epicurean philosophy. Moore was to be Byron's editor; he became, instead, his biographer. His "Life of Byron" (1830) is one of the most popular biographies ever written, though the picture given is not wholly true to life.

After finishing the life of Fitzgerald he wrote a theological treatise from which he departed "to the poetry of Ireland in defence of their Ancient National Faith", and called it "The Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion" (1834). The Irish Gentleman wishes to become a Protestant, studies hard at home and abroad, but fails to find anything either in Scripture or the Church Fathers to justify a change. This very conviction as found in the work is the more touching as it was written as it was by one who had married a Protestant, and was glad to have his children brought up as Protestants. In his fifty-fifth year Moore doubtless took a different view of life, and saw the folly of mere worldly advantages when these involved a sacrifice of religious truth. Similar motives likely influenced him in his next and last work, "The History of Ireland" (1839—46). During much of his life he had been more of an English Whig than an Irish Nationalist. But the last of it he gave generously to his country by calling the attention of the English people to their misgovernment of Ireland. The task which he undertook was, however, too much for him; the one volume intended lengthened out into four, and then stopped at the reign of Queen Elisabeth.

Moore was now broken down. Financial troubles had constantly harassed him, notwithstanding his large income. He had expected, and with good reason, great things from the Government when his friends the Whigs got in power. A recognition came in 1833 when he received a literary pension of $1500, to which was added, a few years before his death, another pension of $500. He was not spared domestic troubles. Two daughters died in infancy; the third lived only to be a girl of sixteen. Of his two sons one died from consumption in 1841; the other, Thomas, wild and extravagant, died in Africa in 1845. At this time Moore wrote in his letter, "Out of five children is now gone and we are left desolate and alone. Not a single relative have I now left in the world."
He had previously lost his parents and his sisters, his favourite Ellen dying suddenly at about the same time as his son Thomas. His life was now practically over, and he died in his seventy-third year, being buried at Brayham Deane near Wilsborrow. Moore’s biographer, Lord John Russell, declared: “When these two great men” (Scott and Byron) “have been enumerated, I know not any writer of his time who can be put in comparison with Moore”; and yet when Moore wrote, England was rich in great writers. Such praise as this may appear exaggerated to-day when criticism operates with a swing to the opposite extreme, especially among younger writers. The truth, as usual, seems to lie between two extremes. Much of Moore’s work is ephemeral, but there remains a group of lyrics that are as perfect of their kind as anything in the world of literature. In 1841 Moore collected and arranged his poems, to which he wrote interesting prefaces.

Moore, Memoirs, Journals, and correspondence, edited by LORD JOHN RUSSELL (London, 1853–6); GWYN, Thomas Moore (London, 1905); GILDER, Moore, Past and Patriot (Dublin, 1900); Memoirs of the author prefixed to the poems collected by Moore himself (1841); VALLET, Études sur la vie et les œuvres de Thomas Moore (Paris, 1889).

M. J. FLAHERTY.

Mopsuestia, a titular see of Cilicia Secunda in Asia Minor and suffragan of Anazarbus. The founding of this city is attributed to the soothsayer, Mopsus, who lived before the Trojan war, although it is scarcely mentioned before the Christian era. Pline calls it the free city of Mopsos (Hist. nat., V, 22), but the ordinary name of Mopsia or better Mopsuesta, as found in all the Christian geographers and chroniclers. At one time the city took the name of Seleucia, but gave it up at the time of the Roman conquest; under Hadrian it was called Hadriana, under Decius Deica, etc., as we know from the inscriptions and the coins of the city. Constantius built there a magnificent bridge over the river Araxes, called “Chromonas,” (XII, P. G., XCIV, 488) afterwards restored by Justinian (Procopius, De Edificiis, V, 5) and still to be seen in a very bad state of preservation. Christianity seems to have been introduced very early into Mopsuesta and during the third century there is mention of a bishop, Theodorus, the adversary of Paul of Samosata. Worthy of mention are Saint Auxentius, who lived in the fourth century and whose feast is kept on 18 December, and Theodore, the teacher of Nestorius. The Greek diocese which depended on the Patriarch of Antioch, still existed at the beginning of the fourteenth century (Le Quen, “Oriens christianus”, II, 1002). At first a suffragan of Anazarbus, Mopsuesta was an autocephalous archbishopric (1137, Mansi, Consil. Collectio, XVII, XVIII, 472, 476–480, etc.) and perhaps it was already so in 714 (Le Quen, II, 1000). The city was taken by the Arabs at the very beginning of Islam; in 686 we find all the surrounding forts occupied by them and in 700 they fortified the city itself (Theophanes, a. m. 678, 6193). Nevertheless, because of its position on the frontier, the city fell naturally from time to time into the hands of the Byzantines; about 772 its inhabitants killed a great number of Arabs (op. cit., a. m. 6284). Being besieged in vain by the Byzantine troops of John Tzimisce in 964, Mopsuesta was taken the following year after a long and difficult siege by Nicephorus Phocas. The city then numbered 200,000 inhabitants, some of whom were killed, some transported elsewhere and replaced by a Christian population. Its river, the Pyramus, formed a great harbour extending twelve miles to the sea.

In 1097 the Crusaders took possession of the city and engaged in a fratricidal war over its walls; it remained under the possession of Tancred who annexed it to the Principality of Antioch. It suffered very much from Crusaders, Armenians, and Greeks who lost it and reconstructed it alternately, notably in 1106, in 1152, and in 1171. The Greeks finally abandoned it to the Armenians. Set on fire in 1206, Mamissas, as it was called in the Middle Ages, became two years afterwards the capital of the Kingdom of Lesser Armenia, at the time that a council was held there. Although it was by this time in a state of decline it still possessed at least four Armenian churches. In 1322, the Armenians suffered a great defeat under its walls; in 1432 the Frenchman, Bertrand, found the city occupied by the Musulmans and largely destroyed. Since then it has steadily declined and to-day, under the name of Misis, is a little village of about 800 inhabitants, partly Armenians, partly Musulmans; it is situated in the sanjak and the vilayet of Adana. The list of its Latin bishops may be found in Le Quen, III, 1197–200; in Ducange, “Les familles d’outre-mer”, 770; in Eubel, “Hierarchia catholica medii aevi” I, 588; and of the Armenian bishops in Alishan, “Siissoun”, 290.


S. VALLEH.

Mopsuestia, Theodore of. See Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Mor (Moor), Antonis Van DASHERST, commonly called ANTONIO MORO, or ANTHONIS MORE, a Dutch painter, b. at Utrecht, in 1519; d. at Antwerp, between 1576 and 1578. Of his early life we only know that his artistic education was commenced under Jan van der Soorel, and that his earliest work is probably the portrait at Stockholm, dated 1533. Recent investigations would indicate that the group of knights of St. John, at Utrecht, supposed to have been painted about 1541, and a picture of two pilgrims at Berlin, dated 1544, together with the portrait of a woman unknown, in the Berlin gallery, were probably among his earliest works, although their authenticity has not been questioned. In 1547, he was received as a member of the Venerable Guild of St. Luke at Antwerp, and shortly afterwards (about 1548) he attracted the attention of Cardinal Granvelle, Bishop of Arras, who became his steady patron, and presented him to the Emperor Charles V. The portraits executed during the commencement of his Granvelle career, two are especially valuable, one of the bishop himself in the Imperial gallery at Vienna, and of the Duke of Alba, which now belongs to the Hispanic Society of New York. He probably visited Italy first in 1550, for we hear of him in Rome, where he copied some works by Titian, notably the “Danae”. A copy was sent by Queen Elizabeth to the Earl of Salisbury. In 1552 it has been gravely suggested, but on insufficient evidence, that one of the masterpieces of the Prado gallery, the portrait of the unknown young Cardinal, hitherto attributed to Rafael, and regarded as one of his noblest works, should be credited to Mor. From Rome, he went to Genoa, and thence to Madrid. In 1553 he was sent to England, where he painted the portrait of Mary Tudor, perhaps one of his very noblest works; and in all probability the portraits of Sir Henry Sidney, and of Ambassador Simon Renard. That of Renard's wife was not painted until three years later. To this period should be attributed the miniature of Mary Tudor in the Duke of Buccleuch's collection, two portraits of Elizabeth, and the portrait of twenty-one, one of which once belonged to Dr. Prept, and another even more notable, of Roger Ascham, now in the collection of Mr. Pierpont Morgan. This
was at one time the property of Ascham's college, and later, of the Marquess of Hastings. At about this time Mor married, but we know little of his wife, save that her name was Metgen, and she is supposed to have been a widow. He became a man of large means, acquired property, and was known as Mor van Dashorst when residing in Utrecht. He had one son, Philip, afterwards a canon, and two daughters. At the end of 1554, he was back in Holland, where he painted a portrait of William of Orange, and other notable works. A little later he executed his own portrait, now in the Uffizi Gallery, one of his wife, now in the Prado, a portrait of a knight of St. James at Budapest, one of Alexander Farnese at Parma, the portrait of an unknown man in Verona, and a very extraordinary religious picture of the Resurrection, now at Nimwegen in a private collection. His portrait of Jean Le Coq (Galatius), one of his wife, and that called Don Carlos, in the gallery at Cassel, is the of the Duchess de Feria (?), and of a widow, in the Prado, of himself in Lord Spencer's collection, and of Campaña, the Brussels painter, in the Basle gallery, are of a subsequent period. Several very important works, executed towards the close of his life are, Elizabeth Queen of Spain, in the Bischofsmuseum, London, Jacopo da Torello and three other fine portraits, in the Stueters gallery (Paris), and the famous portrait of his own master, Jan van Scorel, belonging to the Society of Antiquaries (London). Other noted works are those representing a Professor of the University of Oxford in the Brunswick Gallery, and the very famous portraits of Sir Thomas and Lady Gresham, at one time at Strawberry Hill, now in the Hermitage collection (St. Petersburg). After the disgrace of Cardinal Granvelle, Mor remained in Spain for a while, and the following portraits belong to this period of his life: The Jeweller, in the gallery of The Hague, Sir Henry Lee, in the Duke of Alba's collection, Antonio del Rio, his sons, and his wife, in the Louvre, the Duke of Alba, at Brussels, Ferdinand of Toledo, at Vienna, and several others of unknown people. His last portrait appears to be that of "Goltzius", in the Brussels Gallery. The last document that refers to him was one issued at Antwerp, in 1573, and we obtain the date of his death from certain documents still extant in the church of Notre Dame in that city. The many references to him and the numerous essays on his career, have been summed up by Henri Hyman in his memoir of Mor (Brussels, 1910), and to this invaluable work all students must now be referred.

Hymans, Antonino Moro, son œuvre et son temps (Brussels, 1910).

George Charles Williamson.

Morales, Ambrosio, Spanish historian, b. at Cordova, 1513; d. in 1591. After his studies at the University of Salamanca and Alcalá, he took Holy orders. Soon he was elected to the chair of Belles-Lettres at Alcalá. In 1574 he was appointed chronicler of Castile and commissioned to continue Florían de Ocampo’s "Crónica General de España". This he brought down, after ten years of labour on it, to the date of the union of Castile and Leon under Ferdinand I. His pupil Sandoval continued it down to 1079. While he exhibits more talent and a better training than his predecessor Ocampo, Morales still proves to be on the whole a dull chronicler, and manifests little tendency to react upon his facts, correlate cause and effect, or philosophize in any way. His style is rather wearisome. See the "Crónica general de España", prosiguiendo adelante los cinco libros que el Maestro Florían Doccampo, Coronista del Emperador D. Carlos V diez escribió" (Alcalá, 1574); and see also the ed. of Madrid, 1791-92. Other writings of Morales are "De las antigiedades de las ciudades de España", and the "Viaje por orden del Rey D. Felipe II etc.

Memorias de la Academia Española, VIII, 285 sqq.

J. D. M. Ford.

Morales, Juan Bautista, missionary, b. about 1597 at Ecija in Andalusia, Spain; d. at Fu-ning, China, 17 Sept., 1684. He entered the Order of St. Dominick at a very early age, and, after devoting some years to missionary work in the Philippine Islands, accompanied in 1633 a band of Dominican missionaries to China, taking up their work in the province of Fu-kien. Here he took an active part in the controversy between the Jesuits and the Dominicans and Franciscans on the other, regarding Chinese customs (see CHINA). The latter maintained that the Jesuits, to win over more easily the people to the religion of Christ, tolerated to a certain extent the cult of Confucius and of ancestors; and, seeing in this alleged condescension to heathen customs, a prejudice to the purity of the faith, they despised Morales to Rome in 1644, and on 12 Sept., 1645, obtained from Innocent
X a decision condemning the methods of the Jesuits. The latter also appealed to Rome, and obtained from Alexander VII a favorable answer. In 1661 Morales visited Madrid, which caused the attention of the Habsburgs to turn from Flanders to this country. In 1672 he returned to Flanders, where he died in 1683. His works, however, have not been forgotten, and in 1868, five years after the death of Morales, Clement IX issued a new decree deciding against the Jesuits. About the same time the Dominicans discovered an enemy in their own ranks in the person of the Chinese friar, Gregory Lopes, Bishop of Basiles, who sent to the Holy See a memorandum favourable to the Jesuits. Among the works of Morales the following are the most important: (1) "Questo xvii a Fr. J. B. de Morales, missionum sina-
rum procuratore, proposita Rome 1643 S. Congreg.
de Prop. Fide" (Rome, 1645); (2) "Tractatus ad explicandas et elucidandas opiniones et controversias inter Patres Societatis Jesu et religiosos S. Ord.
Prav."; (3) "Commentarius explicatitianis libri V. Vin-
ginis lingua sinica"; and (4) "Tractatus ad Dei amorem
in voluntate excitandum, lingua sinica."}

QUÉTÉC-BICHARD, Script. Ord. Pred., II, 811; TROYON, Hommes
civilisés, de l'ordre J. Dominiæque, V, 627, 628, 630; BUC, Le Christo-

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

MORALIES

MORALITIES

Morales, Luis de, Spanish painter, b. at Badajos in Extremadura about 1509; d. at Badajos, 1586. His life was spent in painting devotional subjects for churches and oratories. Painting was for him not merely a means of charming the sense of vision: he strove by his brush to express the religious enthusiasm which characterized his age. Critics have detected two different periods in the artistic career of Morales. In his earlier style, the influence of the Florentine school is more marked: he executed various studies and exercises after works of Michangelio; notably, he copied at Evora a picture representing Christ on the Cross, with the Blessed Virgin and St. John. To this, not easily definable, period is referred a "Circumci-
sion" at the Museum at Madrid, which he may have painted for the high altar of the church of La Higuera of Fregenal. In his second style Morales lessens the number of figures in his compositions, which seldom contain more than two or three, often in bust or in half-length. His favourite themes, frequently re-
produced without any change, are "Ecce Homo," "Christ at the Column," and "The Blessed Virgin holding the Dead Christ." The drawing is clean and firm, the anatomy correct, the figures, which recall primitive German and Flemish work by their slender-
ness, are not wanting in grace, and at times are char-
acterized by a certain air of melancholy. The colour-
ing is delicate and as brilliant as enamel. Morales excelled in the faculty of making his modelling stand out by the skill and the rapidity of his handling. Like the early Northern painters, he exercises minute care in the reproduction of the beard and hair, and makes a point of rendering faithfully the drops of blood falling from the thorn-crowned brow of Christ, and the tears flowing from the eyes of the afflicted Mater Dolorosa.

No artist of his time knew better than he how to appeal to the ardent faith of his countrymen, because no one else in that day knew so well how to impart to his sacred characters so intense and infectious emotion. As an example of this we may take the "Christ at the Column" in the Church of San Isidro el Real at Madrid; here the painter pathetically places the dying Saviour between the columns of the Divine Master at the flagellation. The resignation of Jesus, His loving look directed towards Peter and fraught with forgiveness, the deep penitence of the Apostle, are so vividly rendered that one shares the enthusiasm of Morales's countrymen, and can under-
stand why they called him El Dueño. Natural to his mind is the rendering of Philip II, however, whose preference was for the Italian painters, does not seem to have shared the general

enthusiasm: he gave Morales but one commission, for the "Christ going up to Calvary," which he pre-
sented to the Jeronymite church at Madrid. The king had ordered the abbots in 1577 to give Morales those who had become destitute in his old age. Many imitators of Morales exaggerated his style into manne-
rierism and caricature. His son Cristóbal accomplished little beyond mediocre reproductions of his works, but one of his pupils, Juan Labrador, became distinguished as a painter of still life. To the works of Morales already mentioned we may add: at Badaj-


GASTON SORTAIS.

Moralities (or Moral Plays) are a development or an offshoot of the Miracle Plays and together with these form the greater part of Medieval drama. They were very popular in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries and existed side by side with the Miracle Plays of that date. A Morality has been defined by Dr. Ward as "a play enforcing a moral truth or lesson by means of the speech and action of characters which are personified abstractions—figures representing virtues and vices, qualities of the human mind, or conditions in general life. In whole, that defi-

Gaston Sortais.
yet that does not seem to have been contemporary opinion, for the multitude of extant printed editions of Moralties is stated by Mantsius to exceed by far that of the Miracles and farces. Mr. Pollard is, moreover, of the opinion that in its earlier days the Morality was not wholly unworthy to be ranked with the Miracle Play. It is, of course, clear that the substitution of the moralities' abstract ideas (Love, Friendship, etc.) in place of the human or supernatural characteristics of the Bible or legendary narrative, would tend to produce a less real effect if acted carelessly, or if the audience did not thoroughly comprehend, or was out of sympathy with, the meaning of the play (and this is practically the position of the modern reader, especially if non-Catholic). But the abstract ideas, after all, are more fully authenticated on the stage, and if we put ourselves even slightly into the Catholic, religious, and moral atmosphere of the medieval audience (to which the ethical bearing of the play was not naturally dull but vivid, because of the tremendous human issues it was concerned with), we should be able to understand why the Moralities were popular not only in the Middle Ages but on into the time of the Renaissance. Besides this, in many Moralities the characters were not all abstract qualities—there were angels and devils, priests, doctors, and, especially in English plays, the fool, under various names, chiefly that of the "Vice". The verisimilitude of the Morality was very much on the whole, more varied than that of the Miracle Plays. One of the latest and most thorough of English writers upon this stage of the drama points out that four main plots can be distinguished in the earlier Moralities, sometimes occurring alone and sometimes in combination: the Debate of the Heavenly Graces; the Coming of Death and the Conflict of Virtue and Vice; and the Debate of the Soul and the Body.

In England, however, we have not extant examples of all the four, though the Morality Play is well represented in our literature. The earliest English Morality of which we have a play of the "Lord's Prayer" of the latter half of the fourteenth century "in which all manner of vices and sins were held up to scorn and the virtues held up to praise": this play is lost, but it must have been much thought of, for a Guild was formed in York (where it was played) with the special object of maintaining it. Also lost is another early and highly interesting Morality of the "Creed". The earliest complete Moral play extant, leaving out the "Dance of Death and the Confession of Life" (ed. Waterhouse, see below), is the "Castell of Perseverance", 3560 lines long, written perhaps in the early fifteenth century. This "traces (to quote Mr. Pollard's skilful summary) the spiritual history of Humanum Genus [Mankind or the typical man] from the day of his birth to his appearance at the Judgment Seat of God, personified by the way whom his pathway is beset, the Guardian Angel by whose help he resists them, and the ordinances of Confession and Penance by which he is strengthened in his conflict". Dramatic power is shown in this Morality; the plot forms a unity, and is developed in logical sequence. It must have been a thrilling moment for the audience when Humanum Genus after hearing the persuasive arguments of his Good and his Bad Angel, beseeches which to follow:—

"Whom to folowe, wetyen I ne may; I stonde in stodye, and gyinne to rave: I wolde be ryche in gret aray, And fayn I wolde my soyle save I my schame. Thou (to Bad Angel) woldest to the world I me toke; And he wolde that I it forsake. Now so God me helpe, and the holy boke I not (knowe not) wyche I may have."

Other early Moralities approaching the same type are

"Mind, Will, and Understanding"; "Mankind" (these, with the "Castell of Perseverance", included in one MS. and named in modern times after a former owner, the "Macro Moralties", ed. Pollard and Furnivall, see below); "Everyman" (London, 1902), a translation from a Dutch original; the "World and the Child" (Mundus et Infans; ed. Manly, see below). All these plays are lengthy and belong, almost certainly to the fifteenth century. About the same date we may place two plays which though not pure Moralities are yet much influenced by the Moralphies, "St. Mary Magdalen" (ed. Furnivall, see below), and what is known as the Croxton Play of the "Sacrament" (ed. Waterhouse, see below).

At least by the end of the fifteenth century a kind of Morality play appears in English Morality, of which we have been speaking, time was not an object, nor was there need to limit the number of actors, but little by little, as performances began to take place indoors, in the hall of a king or a noble, and as they passed into the halls of professional actors, compression began to be necessary both in time and in the number of personages introduced. The aim of the play, also, became gradually more secular. The result was a modified and shortened Morality known as an Interlude. The meaning of this term is not yet clearly defined. Its primary meaning according to Mr. Chambers is that of a play in dialogue between actions, and as such that of a stage play. The secondary meaning, that of a dramatic diversion in the pause or interlude between the parts of a banquet or other entertainment, which has been generally given to the term, may still stand. The nature of the Moral Interlude and its close connexion with the earlier Morality proper is, however, clear. It deals with portions of the man's life; in the ethical drama, in some Interludes, is mainly limited to warnings against the certain sins (especially those of youth) and in others to exhortations to learning and study. "Hick Scornor" (ed. Manly, see below) and the Interlude of the "Four Elements" (Hazlitt, "Dodson's Old Plays", London, 1874) are early examples. This type of play was often used as a means of asserting Protestantism against Catholicism. Among the writers of this later type of Morality we find John Skelton in his "Magnyficyence" (ed. Ramsay, see below), and John Heywood, the dramatist, who was especially noted for his Interludes, some of which, however, are more like plays proper having a satirical rather than a definite moral aim, and leading life of the man's life; to the 15th-century, in some Interludes, are lively enough, but in others there appears something of the dramatic lifelessness which has been, perhaps rashly, attributed to Moralities in general. When we find an Interlude on the subject of Love, in which the characters are named "Loving not Loved" and "Loved not Loving", "Both Loving and Loved", "Neither loved nor Loving", it is plain that this type of work is reaching its end, or if it is to continue must take on a more living character. John Heywood's work, however, on the whole, brings us in Interludes such as "The Four P's" and "The Pardner and the Frere" (both plays to be found in Hazlitt's "Dodson's"), to the threshold of real drama. Allegory has passed away, together with the recognized moral plot, and the characters are drawn from contemporary life. This "transformed morality takes its place as one of the threads which went to make up the wondrous web of the Elizabethan drama".

MORALITY

Art. 15. Gomel, II (London, 1903); Gatley, Representative English comedies (New York, 1903); Idem, Plays of Our Forefathers (London and New York, 1908); Manly, Specimens of Pre-Shakespearean Drama (Boston and London, 1897).


MORALITY.

It is necessary at the outset of this article to distinguish between morality and ethics, terms not seldom employed synonymously. Morality is an antecedent to ethics: it denotes those concrete activities of which ethics is the science. It may be defined as human conduct in so far as it is freely subordinated to the ideal of what is right and fitting. This ideal governing our free actions is common to the race. Though there is wide divergence as to theories of ethics, there is a fundamental agreement among men respecting essential lines of conduct in public and private life. Thus Mr. Hobhouse has well said: "The comparative study of ethics, which is apt in its earlier stages to impress the student with a bewildering sense of the diversity of moral judgments, ends rather by impressing them with a more fundamental and far-reaching uniformity. Through the greatest extent of time and space over which we have records, we find a recurrence of the common features of ordinary morality, whi...o my mind at least is not less impressive than the varia:ions which also appear" (Morals in Evolution, I, 1, n. 11). Plainly this uniformity regards principles rather than their application. The actual rules of conduct differ widely. We may acknowledge as obligatory, certain savage tribes believe that filial piety requires them to despacht their parents when the infirmities of old age appear. Yet making allowance for all such diversities, it may be said that the common voice of the race proclaims it to be right for a man to reverence his parents; to care for his own body, to feed his soul, to control his appetites; to be honest and just in his dealings, even to his own damage; to show benevolence to his fellows in time of distress; to bear pain and misfortune with fortitude. And only within comparatively recent years has anyone been found to deny that beyond this man is bound to honour God and to prefer his country's interests to his own. Thus, indeed, the advance of morality lies not so much in the discovery of new principles as in the better application of those already accepted, in the recognition of their true basis and their ultimate sanction, in the widening of the area within which they are held to bind, and in the removal of obstructions inconsistent with their observance.

The study of ethics, then, is a subject of keen debate during the past century. In much recent ethical philosophy it is strenuously maintained that right moral action is altogether independent of religion. Such is the teaching alike of the Evolutionary, Positivist, and Idealist schools. And an active propaganda is being carried on with a view to the general substitution of secular for religious morality based on the beliefs of Theism. On the other hand, the Church has ever affirmed that the two are essentially connected, and that apart from religion the observance of the moral law is impossible. This, indeed, follows as a necessary consequence from the Church's teaching as to the nature of morality. She admits that the moral law is knowable to reason: for the due regulation of our free actions, in which morality consists, is simply their right ordering with a view to the perfecting of our rational nature. But she insists that the law has its ultimate obligation in the will of the Creator by whom our nature was fashioned, and who has given us his right ordering as a duty, and that its ultimate sanction is the judgment of God which its violation must entail. Further, among the duties which the moral law prescribes are some which are directly concerned with God Himself, and as such are of supreme importance. Where morality is divorced from religion, reason will, it is true, enable a man to recognize to a large extent the ideal to which his nature points. But much will be wanting. He will disregard some of his most essential duties. He will, further, be destitute of the strong motives for obedience to the law afforded by the sense of obligation to God and the knowledge of the tremendous sanction attached to its neglect—motives which experience has proved to be necessary as a safeguard against the influence of the passions. And, finally, his actions, if in accordance with the moral law, will be based not on the obligation imposed by the Divine will, but on considerations of human dignity and on the good of human society. Such motives, however, cannot present themselves as strictly speaking, obligatory. But where the motive of obligation is wanting, action lacks an true moral force. They can be substituted for this connexion the Church insists upon the doctrine of original sin. She teaches that in our present state there is a certain obscurity in reason's vision of the moral law, together with a morbid craving for independence impelling us to transgress it, and a lack of complete control over the passions; and that by reason of this inherited taint, man, unless supported by Divine aid, is unable to observe the moral law for any length of time. Newman has admirably described from the psychological point of view this weakness in our grasp of the moral law: "The sense of right and wrong ... is so delicate, so fitful, so easily puzzled, obscured, perverted, so subtle in its argumentative process, so invulnerable by evidence, so impervious by pride and passion, so unsteady in its course, that in the struggle for existence amid the various exercises and triumphs of the human intellect, the sense is at once the highest of all teachers yet the least luminous" (Newman, "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk", in section on conscience).

Dealing with this subject, however, it is further necessary to take account of the historical argument. Various facts are adduced, which, it is alleged, show that morality is, in point of fact, capable of dissociation from religion. It is urged (1) that the most primitive peoples do not connect their religious beliefs with such moral code as they possess; and (2) that even where the moral consciousness and the religious system have reached a high degree of development, the spheres of religion and morality are sometimes regarded as separate. Thus the Greeks of classical time were in moral questions influenced by non-religious conceptions such as that of aibds (natural fate) by fear of the gods; while one great religious system, namely Christianity, has in the entire independence of the moral code any belief in God. To these arguments we reply, first: that the savages of to-day are not primitives, but degenerates. It is the merest superstition to suppose that these degraded races can enlighten us as to what were the beliefs of man in his primitive state. It is among civilized races, where degeneration has not proceeded so far, that we must seek for knowledge as to what is natural to man. The evidence gathered from them is overwhelmingly in favour of the contention that human reason proclaims the essential dependence of morality on religious belief. In regard to the contrary instances alleged, it must be denied that the morality of the Greeks was disconnected with religion. Though they may not have realized that the laws prescribed by natural law were derived from a divine command, they most certainly believed that their violation would be punished by the gods. As to Buddhist belief, a distinction must be drawn between the metaphysical teaching of the Buddha himself, and the practical interpretation of that teaching as expressed in the lives of the great mass of the adherents of the creed. It is only the Buddhist monks who have really followed the speculative teaching of their masters on this point and have dissociated the moral law from belief in God. The mass of adherents never did.
so. Yet even the monks, while denying the existence of a personal God, regarded as a heretic any who disputed the existence of heaven and hell. Thus they too help to bear witness to the universal consensus that the moral law is based on supernatural sanctions. We may, however, readily admit that where the religious convictions and the moral code were still intact, while ancestral precept and civic obligation were viewed as the preponderating motives. A broad distinction must be made between such cases and that of those nations which having once accepted the Christian faith with its clear profession of the connexion between moral obligation and a Divine law, have subsequently repudiated this belief in favour of a purely natural morality. There is no parity between “Fore-Christians” and “After-Christians”. The evidence on our command seems to establish as certain that it is impossible for these latter to return to the inadequate grounds of obligation which may sometimes suffice for nations still in the immaturity of their knowledge; and that the rejection of those motives necessarily followed by a moral decay, leading rapidly to the corruptions of the most degraded periods of our history. We may see this wherever the great revolt from Christianity, which began in the eighteenth century, and which is so potent a factor to-day, has spread. It is naturally in France, where the revolt began, that the movement has made most headway. There its effects are not disputed. The birth-rate has shrunk until the population, were it not for the immigration of Flemings and Italians, would be a diminishing quantity; Christian family life is disappearing; the number of divorces and of suicides multiplies annually; while one of the most ominous of all symptoms is the alarming increase of juvenile crime. But these effects are not peculiar to France. The movement away from Christianity has spread to certain sections of the population in the United States, in England, in Germany, in Australia, countries providing in other respects a wide variety of circumstances. Wherever it is found, there in varying degrees, the movement has a similar development. There its effects are not disputed. The birth-rate has shrunk until the population, were it not for the immigration of Flemings and Italians, would be a diminishing quantity; Christian family life is disappearing; the number of divorces and of suicides multiplies annually; while one of the most ominous of all symptoms is the alarming increase of juvenile crime. But these effects are not peculiar to France. The movement away from Christianity has spread to certain sections of the population in the United States, in England, in Germany, in Australia, countries providing in other respects a wide variety of circumstances. Wherever it is found, there in varying degrees, the movement has a similar development. There its effects are not disputed.

Grating religion to be the essential basis of moral action, we may further inquire what are the chief conditions requisite for the growth and development of morality in the individual and in the community. Three such may be singled out as of primary moment, namely: (1) a right education of the young, (2) a healthy public opinion, (3) sound legislation. It will bring us in due course than to discuss in the briefest manner on these points. (1) Under education, we include the early training of the home as well as the subsequent years of school life. The family is the true school of morality, a school which nothing can replace. There the child is taught obedience, truthfulness, self-restraint, and the other primary virtues. The obligation to practise them is impressed upon him by those whose claim on him he at once recognizes, whose word he does not dream of doubting; while the observance of the precept is made easy by the affection which unites him with those who impose it. It is, therefore, with reason that the Church has ever declared divorce to be fatal to the true interests of a nation. Where divorce is frequent, family life in its higher form disappears, and with it perishes the foundation of a nation's morality. Similarly the Church maintains, that during the years of school life, the moral and religious atmosphere is of vital importance, and that apart from this the possession of intellectual culture is a danger rather than a safeguard. (2) It is hardly necessary to do more than call attention to the necessity of a sound public opinion. The great mass of men have neither opportunity nor leisure to determine a standard of morals for themselves. They accept that which prevails around them. If it is high, they will not question it. If it is low, they will aim no higher. When the nations were Catholic, public opinion was predominantly swayed by the teaching of the Church but not always formed by the press; and since the press as a whole views morality apart from religion, the standard proposed is inevitably very different from what the Church would desiderate. Hence the immense importance of a Catholic press, which even in a non-Catholic environment will keep a true view before the minds of those who recognize the Church's authority. But public opinion is also largely influenced by voluntary associations of one form or another; and of recent years immense work has been done by Catholics in organizing associations with this purpose, the most notable instance being the German Volksvereine. (3) It may be said with truth that the greater part of a nation's legislation and its legal system arise in the Church. This is of course manifestly the case with all laws connected with the family or with education; and with those, which like the laws regarding the drink traffic and the restriction of bad literature, have the public morals for their immediate object. But it is also true of all legislation which deals with the circumstances of the lives of the people, e.g., Law for the Factory. By looking at the conditions of labour and protecting the poor from the hands of the usurer, promote morality, for they save men from that degradation and despair in which moral life is practically impossible. It is thus evident how necessary it is, that in all such questions the Church should in every country have a definitely formed opinion and should make her voice heard. (See ETHICS; LAW.)

CATHERIN, Religion und Moral (Freiburg, 1900); FOX, Religion and Morals (New York, 1930); DEVER, Key to the World’s Progress (London, 1900); IDEM, Studies of Family Life (London, 1888); BALFOUR, Foundations of Belief (London, 1895), Part I; Catholic Church Society’s Lectures on the History of Religion (London, 1910).”
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Moral Philosophy. See ETHICS.

Moral Theology. See THEOLOGY.

MORAZ, PATRICK FRANCIS. See SYDNEY, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

MORATIN, LEANDRO FERNANDEZ DE, Spanish poet and playwright, b. at Madrid, 10 March, 1760; d. at Paris, 21 June, 1828. He is usually known as the younger Moratín, and was the son of Nicolás Fernández de Moratín (1737–80), a lawyer and professor of poetry at the Imperial College, also a playwright. The elder Moratín had devoted himself to attempting to reform the Spanish drama and had written several plays after the style of Racine and Corneille. In 1762 he had published his “Desengaño al Teatro Español” in which he criticized the old drama and especially the “Auto Sacramental” which still flourished. So successful was this work, that three years later the exhibition of “Autos” was forbidden by royal edict. Among his works were “La Petimbre”, “La Manca”, etc., and probably the best known, “Herminando”, a tragedy. Knowing by his own experience how precarious was literature as a means of livelihood, the elder Moratín apprenticed his son to a jeweller, thinking in this way to develop his son’s artistic skill. While serving as apprentice, young Leandro won two prizes offered by the Academy, one in 1779 with an epic ballad entitled “La toma de Granada”, and the
other in 1782 with "La lección poética", a satire upon the popular poets of the day. These brought him to the notice of the statesman and author Jovellanos, through whose influence Moratín was appointed secretary to Count Rancón, and afterwards to Fray López de Villalpando, who was a chaplain in the Spanish Legation at Paris before returning to Spain in 1787.

During the year that he spent in Paris he improved the opportunity to study the French drama and formed friendships with men of letters, both of which circumstances aided materially in the artistic development of the young poet. Returning to Spain in 1789, Moratín set out to continue the work begun by his father in reforming the Spanish drama upon the French classical model. He secured the patronage of Manuel Godoy, prime minister and favourite of Charles IV, through whose influence he was able in 1790 to stage the first of his plays, "El Viejo y la Niña"; a comedy in three acts and in verse. This was followed in 1792 by "La Comedia nueva" or "El Café" in two acts and in prose. In the same year Godoy gave him the means for foreign travel and his journey through France, England, the Low Countries, Germany, and Italy completed his education. His next play "El Barón" was produced in 1803, followed in 1804 by "La Mojigata" (the female hypocrite), a weak imitation of Molière's "Tartuffe". An unsuccessful attempt to formulate religious grounds by means of the Inquisition. Moratín's crowning triumph came in 1806 when the second of his prose comedies and his best work "El Sí de las Niñas" was produced. Performed before crowded houses night after night, it ran through several editions in one year, and was translated into several languages, including English under the title of "The Fair Maid of Edinburgh".

friend Godoy, Moratín was compelled to flee from Spain, but returned shortly afterward to accept from Joseph Bonaparte the post of royal librarian, a lack of patriotism which lost him the friendship of loyal Spaniards, so that when the Spaniards returned to power, Moratín was compelled to pass the rest of his days in exile. He died in 1838 in Paris, where he had spent the greater part of his life following the Spanish revolution. Moratín's works have been translated into several languages and have had a considerable influence on Spanish literature.

In his work, Moratín shows originality, he skilfully describes the manners of his time and is clever in his dialogue. He adheres to the French unities, but introduces certain peculiarities of the Spanish stage, dividing his plays into three acts and using the slight romantic verse. He was unquestionably the best dramatic writer Spain had produced since the famous ones of the Siglo de oro. The "Biblioteca de Autores Españoles", Vol. II, contains the plays of both the elder and the younger Moratín.

TICERO, History of Spanish Literature (Boston, 1906); FITZ-MATRICEL-KELLY, A History of Spanish Literature (New York, 1906); FREDERICO, Historia de la literatura y del arte dramático en España, tr. from German of MEIER (Madrid, 1885-97).

VENTURA FUENTES.

MORAVIA (German MÄHREN), Austrian crown land east of Bohemia. In the century before the Christian era the Germanic Quadi (a tribe closely related to the Marcomanni, who had just driven the Celtic Boii from Bohemia) took possession of the modern Moravia. Of these two tribes Bohemia and Moravia we know nothing beyond their collisions with the Romans—e.g., their wars with Marcus Aurelius in A.D. 185 and 181 and with Valentinian I (364-75). The invasion of the Huns under Attila drove the majority of the Marcomanni and Quadi from their settlements. In the fifth century the desolated territory was overrun by the Franks and the Slavs. Of the sixth century, these were conquered by the Avars, who advanced as far as Thuringia. The Slavs were delivered from the Avar yoke temporarily (622-38) by Samo, who was perhaps of Frankish parentage, and finally by Charlemagne, whose defeat of the Avars in 796 enabled the Moravians to recover the territory extending from the Danube to the northern borders of the Gran. During this period a uniform principality had developed on Moravian soil, and received the name of the Kingdom of the Morimorites from the founder of the dynasty, Moimir. Moravia stood towards the Frankish Empire in relations of dependence; at least, the "Maharancers" brought presents to Emperor Louis at the Diet of Ratibor in 822. When Moimir sought to assert his independence of the empire, he was deposed by the Germans and his nephew Wratlawa appointed prince. The latter's struggle for complete freedom ended in his betrayal into the hands of Louis the German by his nephew Swatopluk, who then attained to power under German protection.

In the ecclesiastical domain Wratlawa had also desired independence of the German Empire. Christianity had already been preached in Moravia, but had failed to reach the great mass of the people, as the German and Italian missionaries were ignorant of the vernacular speech. In 863 Wratlawa asked the Greek emperor to send new apostles acquainted with the Slav tongue. This last effort failed, on religious grounds by means of the Inquisition. The translation of a portion of the Bible into the Slav language, for which purpose they invented special Slav characters. In 867 they set out for Rome to extend the Bishopric of Prague. The Bishop's Service in the vulgar tongue. Pope Adrian II, who consecrated both brothers bishops, is said to have acceded to their petition. While Constantine, having a premonition of his approaching end (869), remained in Rome, Methodius returned to Moravia and there resumed his work of evangelization, in opposition to the ecclesiastical clergy. In 870 Methodius was deposed by the German spiritual authorities, was confined for two and a half years in a German monastery, and was freed only at the strict command of the pope in 873. His activity was, however, even now narrowly restricted by the Bavarian bishops, although the use of the Slav Liturgy was expressly recognized by the popes.

The understanding between Swatopluk and the Frankish Empire was of short duration. From 882 Swatopluk was engaged in fierce conflict with Arnulf, who administered Carinthia and Pannonia. In 885, however, a complete reconciliation took place, and the Moravian prince lent Arnulf his zealous support until the latter successfully established Christianity to the German Crown. But the energetic Arnulf was not likely to tolerate any longer the growth of Swatopluk's power, so dangerous to his empire. In 892 war again broke out, and Swatopluk died in 895 before any decisive result had been reached. Subsequently the Moravian Kingdom was rent asunder by the struggle of various claimants for the Moravian crown. In the middle of the tenth century succumbed to the attack of Hungary at the battle of Presburg. The country remained in the hands of Hungary until the battle of Lechfeld in 955, when it was united with Bohemia by the Bohemian Duke Boleslaw of the Premysl family, the confederate of Emperor Otto I. Towards the end of the tenth century Moravia was conquered by the Polish duke, Boleslaw Chrobry (992-1025), but, when domestic disturbances broke out in Poland after his death, Duke Udalrich of Bohemia, with the assistance of his son Břetislav, recovered Moravia from the Poles. Břetislav administered the land as Duke of Moravia, and established his residence at Olmütz. After the death of the booty then in his hands of Swatopluk, he founded the first Moravian monastery, that of Raigern near Brunn (1048). The strife, caused by X.—36
the law establishing in Bohemia the right of succession by seniority (1054), extended also to Moravia (which would have been divided to provide petty principalities for the younger sons of the ducal house), especially to the principalities of Brunn, Olomitz, and Znaim. The suzerainty of the Bohemian duke was honored by granting his successor in contravention of the law regulating succession by seniority, long wars were waged against him by the rightful heir, Duke Udalrich of Brunn (1101, 1105, and 1107). These wars reached their climax in 1125, when Prince Otto of Olmütz rose against Duke Sobeslaw, the youngest son of Wratislav II, and was supported by Lothair of Supplinburg. Lothair led an army in person for his confederate Otto, but he was defeated in a decisive battle near Kulm (1126). Sobeslaw (1125–40) and his nephew and successor, Wladislaw II, energetically maintained the Bohemian supremacy over Moravia; during the reign of the latter the Moravian branch of the Přemysl family became extinct, whereupon Prince Conrad Otto of Znaim, who probably belonged to the collateral line of the Bohemian Přemysls, united the three divisions of the Moravian kingdom (1174). On his attempting also to annex Bohemia (from which, on the death of Wladislaw, his son Frederick had been expelled by his barons), Barbarossa, to whom Frederick had fled, joined with the Přemysl nobles to appear before his tribunal at Ratisbon, and decided (29 Sept., 1182) that Frederick should rule in Bohemia, but that thenceforth Conrad Otto should hold Moravia as an immediate margravate, independent of Bohemia. After Conrad Otto's death in Sicily (1191), a new war of succession broke out between the brothers Ottokar and Henry Wladislaw; to avoid bloodshed, the latter renounced in 1197 his claims to Bohemia, accepting Moravia as a margravate feudal to the Bohemian crown. Thenceforth, this was the political condition of Moravia.

The German colonization of Moravia, begun under Henry Wladislaw, greatly increased under his successors Henry Wladislaw II and Přemysl, as the invasions of the Mongols in 1241 and the Cumane in 1252 had swept away numbers of the inhabitants into captivity. This immigration of Germans led to the formation of German townships, the development of which was encouraged by the Přemysl family, especially by Ottakar II. The privileges, accorded to these towns, generally on those of Magdeburg and Nuremberg. After Ottakar had fallen in the battle of Marchfeld fighting against Rudolf of Hapsburg (1278), Moravia remained for five years as a pledge in Rudolf's hands, but was then under Ottakar's successor, Wenceslaus II, reunited with Bohemia, though its area was somewhat reduced. With Wenceslaus III, the ruling line of the Přemysls became extinct in 1306. Moravia at first fell with Bohemia to Albert I of Hapsburg; then on Albert's death in 1307 to Henry of Carinthia, and in 1309 to John of Luxembourg, son of Emperor Henry VII. In the Privilege of 1311 John granted the country important liberties, which formed the foundation of the subsequently augmented rights of the estates. Under the provostship of Lips and Margrave Charles (1333), later Emperor Charles IV, a new period of prosperity began. In 1349 Charles enfeoffed his brother John in the margraviate. In 1371 John divided the country among his three sons, Jobst (Jodocus) receiving the title of Ancient Margrave and Overlord; his two younger sons were also given the title of Margrave, but were only in their lands in fief from Jobst. This partition and the great Western Schism, which evoked two ecclesiastical parties in Moravia as elsewhere, gave rise to much discord and disturbances between 1380 and 1405. On the death of the childless Jobst, Moravia, as a vacant fief, reverted to the Bohemian Crown, and its administration was entrusted to certain district governors by Wenceslaus IV.

As in Bohemia, where similar political and ecclesiastical conditions prevailed, Hussitism maderapid and great progress in Moravia under the feeble rule of Wenceslaus V, especially among the nobility and peasantry; the Bishop of Olmütz and almost all the imperial cities inhabited by Germans, however, remained true to the Catholic cause. On Wenceslaus's death his brother, Emperor Sigismund, was recognized in Moravia as margrave, although the Bohemians refused to recognize him as king. Against the Hussites, who, under the leadership of two apostate priests, had established a fortified camp in the neighbourhood of Ungarisch-Hradisch (Neu Tabarz), were received vigorous support from Duke Albert of Austria. In 1423 Albert received for these services the Margraviate of Moravia in fief. After the chief power of the fanatical Hussites in Bohemia had been crushed in the battle near Lipau (1434), a treaty of peace was also arranged in Moravia, according to which the Hussites were allowed to receive Communion under both species; these Compacte, as they were called, being published at the Diet of Iglaú (1436). Under Albert's son, Wladislaw Posthumus (1449), began the first attempts to stem Utraquism and to restore to the Catholic Church its earlier dominant position. Especially efficacious towards this end was the missionary activity of St. John Capistran, whose influence, however, prevented him from attaining complete success. George of Podiebrad, who became King of Bohemia on Wladislaw's death in 1457, had to resort to arms to secure recognition in Moravia from the German and Catholic towns. In 1464 he promised the Moravian Estates that the margraviate should never be separated from those of Bohemia by sale, exchange, or mortgage. After his death, however, the strife between Matthias Corvinus and Władysław of Poland for the Bohemian Crown resulted in the peace of 1478, according to which Corvinus received Moravia for life and Władysław Bohemia. On the death of Corvinus, Moravia also fell under the sway of Władysław (1490). Thanks to the excellent
administration of the governor Cibor of Cymburg (1469–94), who, although a Utraquist, enjoyed the confidence of both princes, Władysław was able to leave to his son Louis II in 1516, considering the troubled era, a splendidly ordered land. Louis was slain in the Battle of Mohács in 1526. As he was childless, Ferdinand of Hapsburg, husband of Anna Jagellon, the sister of Louis, claimed Moravia with Bohemia and Hungary. His claim was submitted by the assembly of the Moravian Estates, who did homage to Ferdinand at Brünn and Olmütz in 1527.

Turning to ecclesiastical affairs, there was in Moravia in the fifteenth century, besides the Catholics and Utraquists, a third confession, the so-called "Brethren's Union". This body had spread widely, thanks mainly to the patronage of certain influential nobles, who could defy all decrees of banishment. Luther's teaching thus found a favourable soil in Moravia, and spread rapidly, especially in the cities of Olmütz, Znaim, and Iglau. From 1526 Moravia was also the refuge and new home of the Anabaptists, the adherents of Hübmaier, the Gabrielists, and the Moravian Brethren, who later emigrated to Russia and thence to the United States. The friendly attitude of Emperor Maximilian II (1564–76) towards Protestantism favoured the growth of all these non-Catholic movements, and the defection of the colleges of Brünn and Olmütz (1574) the Catholic Counter-Reformation set in, its direction being undertaken by Franz von Dietrichstein, Bishop of Olmütz (1599–1636). The Bohemian rising against the emperor in 1618 extended for a short time to Moravia, and on 19 August, 1619, the opposition party of the Moravian Estates was compelled to separate Gaarstein at Prague for the deposition of Ferdinand and the election of Frederick of the Palatinate as King of Bohemia. In Feb., 1620, the latter succeeded in making his entry into Brünn as Margrave of Moravia, but the Battle of the White Mountain gave victory to the cause of the emperor and Catholicism, and the imperial seventh contingent of some thousands of the inhabitants was meted out to the leaders of the rebellion and the revolting cities; in 1622 the Anabaptists were compelled to leave the land, and in 1623–8 the Brethren's Union.

An imperial edict of 9 March, 1628, ordered the return to the Catholic Church, and compelled all recusants to emigrate. The Protestant religion, however, continued to increase, and its priority being secured in all the townships. From 1642 Moravia was the theatre of the devastating wars between the imperial forces and the Swedes, who maintained a foothold in the land until the Peace of 1648 (in Olmütz until 1650). Sixty-three castles, twenty-two large towns, and three hundred and thirty villages were destroyed, and the plague swept away thousands of the inhabitants whom the war had spared. On the conclusion of the Thirty Years' War the Catholic restoration was actively resumed. From Olmütz, Brünn, Iglau, Znaim, and Hradisch outwards, the Jesuits displayed a fruitful activity by holding missions far and wide, while the Piarists performed invaluable service by establishing schools and colleges; the Jesuits and to a certain extent the clergy, however, continued for a long time an obstacle to complete Catholicization. Under Leopold I, Joseph I, and Charles VI, Moravia enjoyed as a rule peaceful conditions, although in 1633 the Turks and Tatars penetrated as far as Olmütz and Brünn, devastating the land. The wars begun by Frederick II of Prussia for the possession of Silesia reduced Moravia to a pious state, especially northern Moravia and Olmütz. Maria Theresa and Joseph II introduced extensive alterations in almost all branches of the administrative system. The administration was greatly centralized, the autonomy of the estates and the Diet was abolished, and in 1782 Moravia was united with Slavonia for administrative purposes. In favour of the Protestants a patent of tolerance was issued, while on the other hand thirteen monasteries for men and six for women were suppressed. The University of Olmütz, deserted after the suppression of the Jesuit Order, was transferred in 1778 to Brünn, where a bishopric had been founded in 1777, Olmütz and Znaim being simultaneously raised to an archdiocese. Emperor Leopold restored to the estates a certain independence.

The Napoleonic era did not pass by without leaving a landmark in Moravia, for at Austerlitz, in the centre of the land, was fought the decisive battle of the Third Coalition War, and the subsequent conflict between Austria and Napoleon took place partly in Moravia (Battle of Znaim). The Restoration was followed by many years of peace. The Austrian Revolution of 1848 gave Moravia and the other crown lands of Austria a constitution, substantially unaltered to-day, and admitted the co-operation of the people in the making of laws. In 1866 Moravia was the scene of the latest war between Austria and Prussia, which was decided at the Battle of Königgrätz, and a Moravian town, Nikolsburg, witnessed the preliminary negotiations which resulted in the Peace of Prague.

In the subsequent era of peace Moravia made great strides in cultural and economical development. The national quarrels between the Germans and Czechs, however, were by no means solved, and especially the portion of Bohemia bordering on Moravia, found a friendly settlement in Moravia in 1905. The electoral conditions were altered so as to include—in addition to the three electoral classes of the landed interests, the cities, and the rural districts—a fourth general electoral class consisting of every qualified male Bohemian and Czech, and districts where such election was not established according to the national land registers, and curiae of the separate nationalities were instituted to settle all disputes involving the question of nationality. The question of language in the case of the autonomous national and district authorities has been settled on a bilingual basis, and the division of the school board accords with the national proportion. Although, by the acceptance of this franchise reform, the Germans lost their previous majority in the Diet, they gave their consent to the change in the interests of public peace.

Politically speaking the Margraviate of Moravia is an Austrian crown land, the highest administrative authority being vested in the chief of state, the Diet consists of 149 deputies: 2 members with individual vote, the Archbishop of Olmütz and the Bishop of Brünn; 30 members of the landed interests (10 German, 20 Czech); 3 deputies from the Chamber of Commerce of Olmütz and from that of Brünn; 40 representatives of the towns (20 German, 20 Czech), 51 representatives of the rural communes (14 German); 2 representatives of the town electors, 1 deputy from the electoral curie (6 German). In the Imperial Diet of the Austrian Crownlands Moravia is represented by 49 deputies. Ecclesiastically, the land is divided into the dioceses of Olmütz and Brünn, which are treated in separate articles. The Protestant have 1 Superintendent, 14 Seniorate, and 46 preachers; the Jews have their rabbis; the Jewish community of Brünn is the largest in Moravia, and the Jewish community of Olmütz is the smallest. Moravia is 8573 square miles. According to the census of 1900 the population of Moravia was 2,437,706 inhabitants, including 2,325,574 Catholics, 185 Uniates, 66,365 Protestants, 44,255 Jews; and, according to nationality, 695,492 Germans and 1,727,270 Czechs. At the beginning of 1909 the population was estimated at 2,595,164.

Fyten, Monasticen historia. Diplomat. omnium Moraviae monasteriorum (11 vols., 1790); Codex diplomatic. et epist. Moraviae (15 vols., Olmütz and Brünn, 1835–90); EISTNER and EMLER, Regesta diplom. nemor epist. Bohemiae et Moraviae (9 vols., Olmütz, 1855); A. WOLNY, Die Markgrafschaft Mähren (6 vols., Brünn, 1853); G. WOLNY, Kirchl. Topographie von Mähren (8 vols., Brünn, 1855); DRUCK, Mélanges allemands. Gesch. (12 vols. and index, Brünn, 1850–88); WEINBRÜNNER, Mähr. u. das Bistum Brünn (Vieis, 1877); BRECHELMANN, Gesch. Mähr. (2 vols., Brünn, 1893–5); TRAUTENBERG, Chronik der Landeshauptstadt Brünn (6 vols.,
Some papers found after her death and arranged by Father Baker, were afterwards published in two separate works: one entitled "The Holy Practices of a Divine Lover, or the Saintly Ideot's Devotions" (Paris, 1657); the other, "Confessiones Amantis", or "Spiritual Exercises", in which was prefixed her "Apology" for herself and her spiritual guide (Paris, 1659), both recently republished.

Baker, Life and Death of Dame Gertrude More (ML, written soon after her death—very good)—see also Writings of D. Gertrude More (2 vols., London, 1910); Sweeney, Life and Spirit of Father Baker (London, 1861); Weldon, Personal and Spiritual Notes (Stammbach, 1881); Life of Father, introduced to his edition of The Holy Practices of a Divine Lover (Fort-Augustus, 1908).

E. B. WELD-BLUNDELL.

MORE, Henry, great-grandson of the martyred English chancellor; b., 1586; d. at Watton in 1661. Having studied at St. Omer and Valladolid, he entered the Society of Jesus, and after his profession, and fulfilling various subordinate posts in the colleges, he was sent on the English Mission where he was twice arrested and imprisoned (1621-1622), while acting as chaplain to John, the first Lord Petre. He became provincial in 1635, and in that capacity had a good deal to do with the negotiations of Pansani, Conn, and Rossetti, the papal agents at the court of Queen Henrietta Maria. He was rector of St. Omer in 1649-1652, and again in 1657-1660. During these years he wrote his important history of the English Jesuits: "Historia Missionis Anglicane, sub anno MDLXXX ad MDCXXXV" (St. Omer, 1860, fol.). Besides translating Jerome Platus's "Happiness of the Religious State" (1632), and the "Manual of Meditations" by Thomas de Villa Casini (1618), he wrote "Vita et Doctrina Christi" in meditations quotidianas per annum (2nd ed., 1649), followed by an English version, entitled, "Life and Doctrines of our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Ghent, 1565, in two parts; London, 1880).


J. H. POLLEN.

MORE, Sir Thomas. See Thomas More, Blessed.

MOREL, Gall, a poet, scholar, esthetic, and educationist, b. at St. Fiden, Switzerland, on 24 March, 1827; d. at the Abbey of Einsiedeln, 9 December, 1872. His parents' names were Benedict, but the monastery he took the name of Gall. In 1814, he entered the gymnasia at St. Gall. A pilgrimage to Einsiedeln in 1817 influenced him deeply, and soon afterwards he entered the monastery school as a novice. In 1820 he took the final vows, and after several years spent in theological and philosophical studies, was ordained priest in 1826, being appointed forthwith instructor in the monastery school. From this period his life presents a picture of extraordinary activity. From 1826 to 1832 he was professor of rhetoric, and until 1835 he lectured on philosophy. In this latter year he became librarian of the abbey, and retained this office until the end of his life, while fully engaged in the offices of chorister director (1834-40), prefect (1836), and rector (1848) of the abbey school, archivist of the abbey (1839-45), counsellor of education of the Canton Schwyz (1843-5), and subprior of the abbey (1846-52).

In spite of the many demands upon his time and strength, the industrious scholar exhibited a many-sided activity. He is best known as a poet, ten volumes of lyric, didactic, and dramatic verse testifying to his prolific poetical talent. Endowed by nature in so many directions, it has been said that in his poems, "he shows himself now as a childlike pious monk, now as a good-natured humorist, now as a man fully conversant with worldly affairs, and often as a keen satirist, forcible and epigrammatic in ex-
Mohed. Though Morel may not rank among the princes of verse, still his modest muse produced many a poem of enduring worth. But Morel also proved himself a scholar of great versatility. Under his care the library of Einsiedeln was enriched in thirty-seven years by more than 20,000 volumes; many of these are most valuable, especially the manuscripts, which include a tenth-century MS. of Horace, rescued by Morel from the bindings of books, and named after him "Codex Morellianus." Drawing on these literary treasures, Morel published the "Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters," "Offenbarungen der Schwester Mechtilde von Magdeburg," and other works. Another publication was the "Regesta der Archive der schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft"; and he also compiled the Regesta of the Benedictine Abbey of Einsiedeln. Morel's compilations and catalogues are models of accuracy and arrangement. He was associate founder of the Swiss Society for Historical Research (1840), and wrote many valuable contributions for its "Archiv." He likewise assisted in the formation of "Verein der fünf alten Orte," and was a contributor to its organ, the "Geschichtsfreund." 

In aesthetics, Morel became an authority by painstaking study and repeated art journeys to Munich, Vienna, Venice, Milan, Rome, and Paris. His concepts were clearly expressed in words that he considers it the prime object of aesthatics to reconstruct creation: the Divine ideas by the understanding in philosophy, the Divinely picturesque by our fancy in art, and God's creation by our will in our lives. An accomplished violinist, Morel critically treated music as an important branch of aesthetics. Morel's aesthetic views as an educator were nearly fifty years ago easier to estimate than to describe. His energy and his quickening influence over teachers and scholars raised the humble Klosterschule to a high rank among institutions of learning. In this connection special mention must be made of his efforts to foster school drama, including the publication of two volumes entitled "Jugend- und Schultheater." In the apt words of Bishop Greith of St. Gall, "Father Call Morel was a living vindication of the monastic and cloistered life against the attacks of misunderstanding and prejudice."


N. SCHEID.

Morel, Juliana, Dominican nun, b. at Barcelona, Spain, 16 February, 1594; d. at the convent of the Dominican nuns at Avignon, France, 26 June, 1653. The accounts of the learning of this celebrated Spanish lady seem to be on the miraculous. In a laudatory poem Lope de Vega speaks of her "as the fourth of the Graces and the tenth Muse," and says "that she was an angel who publicly taught all the sciences from the professorial chairs and in schools." The apparently extravagant praise of the poet is confirmed by the reports of contemporaries. Left motherless when very young, Juliana's first training was received from the Dominicans at Barcelona. At the age of four she began Latin, Greek, and Hebrew at home under competent teachers, and, when not yet seven years old, wrote a pretty Latin letter to her father who was away. Accused of taking part in a murder, the father fled to Lyons with his daughter, then eleven years old. At Lyons Juliana continued her studies and devoting nine hours daily to music, dialectics, ethics, and music. At the age of twelve she defended in public her theses in ethics and dialectics "summa cum laude." She then applied herself to physics, metaphysics, and canon and civil law. Her father, who had meanwhile settled at Avignon, wanted his daughter to obtain a doctorate in the last-named faculty. This was gained in 1608, when she publicly maintained her law theses at the papal palace of the vice-legate before a distinguished audience, among whom was the Princesse de Condé. Disregarding wealth and a desirable marriage, she entered during the same year the convent of Sainte-Praxede at Avignon. In 1609 she received the habit of a nun, and on 20 June, 1610, took the vows. Just as she had distinguished herself in secular life by her learning, so in the order she excelled all others in piety, humility, and faithful observance of the rules, being on three occasions, notwithstanding her reluctance, named prioress. In this manner the pious nun spent the remainder of her life in the convent, which she had been specially beloved by the sisters. For two years before her end she was in great bodily suffering and her death agony lasted five days. She left a number of religious writings: (1) a translation of the "Vita Spiritualis" of St. Vincent Ferrer, with comments and notes to the various chapters (Lyons, 1617; Paris, 1619); (2) "Exercices spirituels pour la contemplation" (Avignon, 1637); (3) French translation of the Rule of St. Augustine, with additional of various explanations and observations for the purpose of instruction (Avignon, 1680); (4) History of the reform of the convent of St. Praxedis, with lives of some pious sisters, in manuscript; (5) Latin and French poems, some printed and some in manuscript.

QuETIN ET EICHARD, Script. Ord. Prud., II (1721), 845 sqq.; BARONIUS, Apologeticus, V, 320; ANTONIO, Bibliotheca hispanica, II (1872), 544-5.

N. SCHEID.

Morelos, José María, Mexican patriot, b. at Valladolid (now called Morelia in his honour), Mexico, on 30 September, 1779; died at Guadalupe, on 22 December, 1815. His father died while he was still a youth, and, being left destitute, he worked for some time as a muleteer, until he succeeded in obtaining admission, as an extern, to the College of San Nicolás at Valladolid, the rector of which institution was at that time the reverend Don Miguel Hidalgo. Having been ordained priest, he was appointed parish priest of Carcáquez and Nuecepéarto in Michoacan. When Hidalgo left Valladolid for Mexico City, after uttering his Grito de Dolores, Morelos offered himself to him at Chareo, and Hidalgo commissioned him to raise troops for the cause of Independence on the southern coast, and to get possession of the port of Acapulco. Returning to his parish, he collected a small amount of money, and hastened towards Zacatula, and, following the coast, reached Acapulco with some 3000 men whom he had recruited on the way and supplied with arms taken from the royalists. After defeating Paris, who had come from Oaxaca with the object of relieving Acapulco, he left part of his forces to continue the siege and made for Chilpancingo. Forming a junction there with the brothers Galiana and Bravo, he marched to Chilapa and captured that town. As the viceroy, Venegas, was keeping all the colonial troops occupied with the siege of Zitacuaro, Morelos, who had been joined at Jante-leco by his fellow-priest Mariano Matamoros—thenceforward his right hand in almost every enterprise he organized four arms in support of the revolution in various parts of Mexico. But the easy surrender of Zitacuaro to Calleja, and the approach of that commander with all his forces, placed Morelos, with some 4000 men, in the situation of being besieged at Cuautla by 8000 of the best troops of the viceroyalty. With indomitable courage, fighting day after day, Morelos held out for fourteen-three days and succeeded in breaking away with all that remained of his army. He then passed over to Huajuapan, from whence to Ometepec and on to Oaxaca, capturing all those places, and defeating every body of troops that encountered him.

On 14 September, 1813, the independent
Congress assembled at Chilpancingo and there passed the decree: "That dependence upon the Spanish Throne has ceased forever and been dissolved. That the said Congress neither professes nor recognizes any religious, political, or social authority, public or private, of any other; that it will protect with all its power, and will watch over, the purity of the Faith and its dogmas and the maintenance of the regular bodies". From Chilpancingo he turned towards his native Valladolid, which was then held by the royalist leaders Iturbide and Llano; driven back before he moved on Churubusco. At Purbuey his brave companion Matamoros was captured, and was shot at Valladolid, 3 February, 1814. These reverses were followed by the recapture of Oaxaca by the royalist troops. The independent Congress of Chilpancingo had removed to Apatzzingan, where it promulgated the Constitution of 22 October, 1814. Then it determined to remove again from Apatzzingan to Tehuacán, Morelos accompanied it to protect it, and engaged in the Battle of Tresmalacas, where he was made prisoner.

Having been taken to Mexico City, on 22 November, 1815, proceedings were instituted against him by both the military and the ecclesiastical tribunal, and an accusation was lodged against him for rebellion. The principal charges against him were: (1) Having committed the crime of treason, failing in his fealty to the king, by promoting independence and causing it to be proclaimed in the Congress assembled at Chilpancingo. Morelos answered to this that, as there was no king in Spain (Ferdinand VII having been taken to France, a prisoner), he could not have been loyal to the king; and that, as to the declaration of independence, of the said Congress, he had concurred in it by his vote because he believed that the king would not return from France and that, even if he should return, he had rendered himself unworthy of fealty by handing over Spain and its colonies to France like a flock of sheep. (2) Having treated those who were prisoners to him as prisoners, he declared that he had done this in obedience to orders sent first by the Junta at Zitacauro and then by the Congress at Chilpancingo, by way of reprisals, moreover, because the viceregal Government had not accepted the exchange of prisoners proposed instead of General Matamoros. (3) Having ignored the excommunications pronounced and inflicted by the bishops and the Inquisition. He declared that he had not considered these excommunications valid, believing that they could not be imposed upon an independent nation, such as the insurgents must be considered to constitute, so long as they the sentences were not those of a pope or an eccumenical council. (4) Having celebrated Mass during the time of the Revolution. He denied this, since he had regarded himself as under irregularity from the time when blood began to be shed in the territory under his command.

The case having been concluded in the military tribunal that court requested of the ecclesiastical tribunal the action and support of a priest, in accordance with the formalities prescribed by the canons; the ecclesiastical tribunal granted both requests, and communicated its decision to the vicerey. It was at this point that the tribunal of the Inquisition intervened, requesting the vicerey, Callejas (who had succeeded Venegas) to delay execution of the sentence four days, and citing Morelos to a public auto de fe on 27 November. On that occasion, with all the formalities proper to such proceedings, twenty-three charges were preferred against him: the Inquisitors added to the charges brought at the former trial others which they believed themselves competent to try, as implying, according to them, suspicions of heresy. And in that (1) Having refused, deliberately, to give the lives of his associates in the Independent Government.
In 1654 twelve of his plays were published in one volume under the title of "First Part of the Comedies of Moreto". Among them may be mentioned "El lindo Don Diego", "Los jueces de Castilla" dealing with the life of Peter the Cruel, "San Franco de Sena", and "Trampa Adeinante".

A writer, Moreto lacked the creative genius of some of his contemporaries, but he excelled them all in knowledge of stagecraft, in the power of coming quickly to the point in evolving his plots. He also excelled in the variety of his characters and in depicting human passions, while at character drawing he was a master surpassed by none. He handles a humorous situation with great delicacy of touch, and is at his best in comedies of the lighter and gayer sort. His best play "El desden con el desden" (Diadan met with Diadan), published at Valencia in 1676, is borrowed from Lope de Vega's "Milagros del desprecio" (Scorn works Wonders), and is generally conceded to be better than the original. Mollère, in his "Prince d'Elde", tried to repeat Moreto's success, but fell far short of his model. The "Biblioteca de Autores Españoles", XXXIX (Madrid, 1856), contains a collection of Moreto's plays with a biography of the author by Luis Fernández Guerra.

Consult, besides the above-mentioned life by Guerra, Ticknor's History of Spanish Literature (Boston, 1860); AITKEN-BURCH-KELLY, History of Spanish Lilt. (New York, 1900).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Moreto de Brescia, Il. See Bonvicino, Alessandro.

Morgagni, giovanni Battista, called by Virchow, the "Father of Modern Pathology", a distinguished Italian physician and investigator in medicine; b. at Forli, 25 February, 1682; d. at Bologna, 6 December, 1771. His father died when Morgagni was very young, but his mother, a woman of uncommon good sense and understanding, devoted her life to the education of her gifted son. At sixteen he went to the University of Bologna for his higher studies, where before his graduation he attracted attention by his powers of observation. His two great teachers, Albertini and Valsalva, became deeply interested in him, and Valsalva picked him out as his special assistant in anatomy. In the year following his graduation as Doctor of Medicine and Philosophy, though not yet twenty-two, he was sometimes allowed to take Valsalva's classes during his master's absence. He became a leader in thought among the young men and founded a society called the "Academia Inquisitorum" (the Academy of the Restless), a title indicating that the members were not satisfied with previous knowledge but wanted to get at science for themselves by direct observation and experiment. After several years of graduate work at Bologna, Morgagni spent a year in special medical investigations at the Universities of Pisa and Padua. His incessant work impaired his sight and he returned to his native town to recuperate. At the age of 24 he

P. J. Marique.

Moreto y Cabaña, Augustín, Spanish dramatist; b. at Madrid, 9 April, 1618; d. at Toledo, 28 October, 1669. He received what little academic training he had at the University of Alcalá de Henares and graduated Licentiate in Arts in 1639. From a very early age he began to write for the stage, and it is known that from 1640, probably through his friendship with Calderón, his plays began to be produced. The Spanish drama had reached the height of its success during Moreto's boyhood, and a gradual decline had set in. The clergy began to preach against plays as they were then given, and in 1644 the Royal Council instituted radical reforms by reducing the number of dramatic companies, modifying stage costumes, and establishing a strict censorship. It was furthermore ordered that henceforth no comedies were to be played but those of an historical nature, or those dealing with the lives of the saints. The playhouses were taxed heavily, and Moreto devoted himself to this kind of drama. Like many famous writers of his time, Moreto received Holy orders toward the end of his life, though it is not known exactly when he did so. He entered the household of the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, Don Baltasar de Mendoza, and in 1659 joined the Brotherhood of St. Peter.
went to Bologna to lecture on anatomy, and there published a series of notes called "Adversaria Anatomica" (1706). These gained him such a reputation that he was called to the University of Padua, and later became second professor of anatomy at Bologna. He was particularly the throat, and the hyoid of Morgagni in this region; Morgagni s name. After a few years he succeeded to the first professorship of anatomy, the most important post in the medical school, for anatomy was to medicine at that time what pathology is now. Here Morgagni wrote his great book, "De sedibus et causis morborum per anatomen inexactis" (1761; The Seats and Causes of Diseases) (Venice, 1771, trans. French, English, and German) which laid the foundation of modern pathology. Benjamin Ward Richardson said (Disciples of Æsculapius): "To this day no medical scholar can help being delighted and instructed by this wonderful book. Morgagni's studies in aneurisms and in certain phases of pulmonary disease were especially valuable. He thought tuberculous contagious and refused to make autopsies on tuberculous subjects. As a consequence of his teaching laws were introduced at the end of the seventeenth century in Rome and Naples, declaring tuberculous contagious and requiring upon the death of the patients that their rooms be disinfected and their clothing burned. Veneseculation was abolished. Morgagni, in his books of this time, but Morgagni himself was unable to credit its power for good and would not allow it to be performed on himself. He studied the pulse, and especially palpitation of the heart apart from organic cardiac affection, thus anticipating most of our modern teaching. With regard to cancer, Morgagni insisted that it was the custom to try many remedies, but the knife was the only remedy that gave fruitful results.

Morgagni was most happy in his private life. He lived with such simplicity that he was blamed for parsimony, but his secret charities, revealed after his death, disprove this charge. Of his fifteen children there were three sons, one of whom died in childhood, another became a Jesuit and did some striking scientific work after the suppression of the Society, while the third followed his father's profession but died young. All of Morgagni's daughters who grew to womanhood, eight in number, became nuns. The estimation in which he was generally held can be judged from the fact that, when invading armies laid siege to Bologna, the inhabitants grumbled that no harm was to come to Morgagni. He was one of the most profoundly learned men of his time not only in science, but in the literature of science. The Royal Society of England elected him a fellow in 1724, the Academy of Sciences of Paris made him a member in 1731, the Imperial Academy of St. Petersburg in 1735, and the Academy of Berlin in 1754. He was in correspondence with most of the great scientists of his time, among them such men as Ruysech, Boerhaave, Sir Richard Meade, Haller, and Meckel. Cooke, his English biographer, declares "that the learned and great who came into his neighbourhood did not depart without a visit to Morgagni." The patriots of Venice counted him a disinterested friend. King Emanuel III of Sardinia often turned to him for advice. The five popes of the second half of his life consulted him on educational and medical matters. Benedict XIV (De Beatificazione) mentions him in special terms of commendation. Clement XII lodged him at the papal palace on his visits to Rome. He was the most hospitable man of his time and even more beloved than respected.

Cooper, Sketch of Morgagni in Scans and Causes of Disease (London, 1823); Vivian, Morgagni and Anatomical Thought in Brit. Med. Journal, 1 (1894), 725; Richardson, Disciples of Æsculapius (London, 1891); Walsh, Makers of Modern Medicine (Fordham University Press, New York, 1907); Nichola, Morgagni, Father of Modern Pathology in Montreal Medical Journal (1893).

JAMES J. WALSH.

Morgan, Edward, Venerable, Welsh priest, martyr, b. at Bettisfield, Hamner, Flintshire, executed at Tyburn, London, 26 April, 1642. His father's Christian name was William. Of his mother we know nothing except that one of her kindred was Lieutenant of the Tower of London. From the fact that the martyr was known at St. Omer as John Singleton, Mr. Gillow thinks that she was one of the Singletones of Stening Hall, near Blackpool, in Lancashire. Of his reported education at Douai, no evidence appears; but he certainly was a scholar at St. Omer, and at the English colleges at Rome, Valladolid, and Madrid. For a brief period in 1609 he was a Jesuit novice, having been one of the numerous converts of Father John Bennett, S.J. Ordained priest at Salamanca, he was sent on the English Mission in 1621. He seems to have laboured in his fatherland, and in April, 1629, was in prison in Flintshire, for refusing the oath of allegiance. Later about 1632 he was condemned in the Star Chamber to have his ears nailed to the pillory for having accused certain judges of treason. Immediately afterwards he was committed to the Fleet Prison in London, where he remained until a few days before his death. He was condemned at the Old Bailey for being a priest under the provisions of 27 Eliz., c. 2 on St. George's Day, 23 April, 1642. At the same time was condemned John Francis Quahab, a Scots Minim, who subsequently died in Newgate Prison. The last scene of the martyrdom is fully given (apparently by an eye witness) in Father Pollen's work cited below.


John B. Waine Wright.

Morganatic Marriage. See Marriage.

Morgenson, Raffaello, an Italian engraver, b. at Portici, 19 June, 1758 (1757?); d. at Florence, 8 April, 1833. His father, Filippo, came of a family of German engravers, his mother was the daughter of Lianii, court painter to Charles III. Raffaello's first teachers were his father and his uncle Jean, and before he was twelve he had achieved a good plate. When only twenty he produced seven noteworthy plates illustrating the carnival of 1778, and later went to study in Rome, under Volpato, whose daughter he married. Impressed with Sanzio's pictures in the Vatican, Morgan engraved his "Poetry" and "Theology". In 1787 he finished one of his principal works, Guido's "Aurora" from the fresco in the garden-house of the Rospiollos Palace, his art and his time being far better suited to this style than to translating the work of greater masters. When he visited Naples in 1790, the court offered him a salary of six hundred ducats, which he declined, but later accepted (1793) the invitation of Ferdinand of Tuscany to live in Florence. Here he received only four hundred scudi, but he was free to found a school of engraving, to engrave what he chose, and own all the prints from his plates. His next
important plate, Raphael's "Transfiguration", was begun in 1798, but so many were his commissions that it was not finished until 1812. While some of the etchings lack in tone and aerial perspective, this engraving exhibits brilliant technique and immense dexterity. The first edition brought him one hundred and forty thousand francs. The dedication of this plate to Napoleon I resulted in a summons to Paris, where he was urged to establish a school of engraving; but the French proceeded to destroy those who would be detrimental to their own artists and the plan was never carried out. Morgheh engraved a portrait of Napoleon, poor in resemblance and weak in execution.

The most celebrated work of the Volpato School and Morgheh's chef-d'oeuvre was his engraving from da Vinci's "Supper" which he began in 1794 and finished in 1800. It was immediately successful despite the fact that it is flat and the figures resemble Sanzio's more than da Vinci's. This flatness, however, is not a serious fault, since the original is practically in one plane. Morgheh's greatest artistic success is the equestrian portrait of Francois de Moncade (Van Dyck), wherein he shows more of sentiment, temperament, and vigor than in any of his two hundred and fifty-four engravings. His plates are pleasing, quiet, harmonious, typifying the graver's art at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and mark the revival of classical line engraving in Italy. Great paintings were to him more themes for technical skill than masses to be followed; hence his reproductions of the Masters are all much alike. His prolific burin "flew over the plate" to witness his mastery of hatch, dot, and flick. Morgheh began many of his plates by etching the salient lines and was probably the first engraver to dry-point the flesh-tints of his portraits. He etched some very spirited and delicate compositions and produced many vignettes. He was made professor in the Florence Academy of Art, engraver to the Grand Duke of Tuscany and associate of the Institut de France (1803). Louis XVIII gave him the Order of St. Michel, and made him a member of the Legion d'Honneur. When he died Italy resounded with sonnets to "the imperishable glory of the illustrious engraver of the Last Supper". Among his works should be noted the "Miracle of Bolsena" (Raphael Sanzio), "Charity" (Correggio), and "Shepherds in Arcady" (Poussin).

LEIGH HUNT.

MORIGI, CARAVAGGIO. MICHELANGELO, Milanese painter, b. at Caravaggio in 1569; d. at Porto d'Ercole in 1609. His family name was Morigi, but he assumed that of his birthplace, and was known by that almost exclusively. He was the son of a mason, and as a boy worked at preparing the plaster for the fresco painters of Milan, acquiring from them a great desire to become an artist. He received no instruction as a youth, but trained himself by copying natural objects, doing the work with such rigid accuracy that in later life he was seldom able to rid himself of a habit of slavish and almost mechanical imitation. After five years of strenuous work he found his way to Venice, where he carefully studied the works of Giorgione, and received instruction from an unknown painter. Thence he went to Rome, and on account of his poverty engaged himself to Cesare d'Arpino, who employed him to execute the floral and ornamental parts of his pictures. He soon, however, acquired a reputation for his own work, and his accurate imitations of natural objects were attractive. The artist's hot temper, however, led him into trouble, and in a fit of anger he killed one of his friends and had to leave Rome in haste. For a while he was at Naples, and then in Malta, where twice he painted the portrait of the Grand Master of the Knights of Malta, but he quarrelled with one of the Order, who threw him into prison, and it was with difficulty that he escaped, fled to Syracuse and returned to Naples. There he obtained a pardon for the manslaughter of his companion, set out again for Rome, was taken prisoner on the way by some Spaniards who mistook him for another person, and when set at liberty found that he had lost his boat and all that it contained. At Porto d'Ercole he fell ill and died of a violent fever.

His paintings are to be found at Rome, Berlin, Dresden, Paris, St. Petersburg, Malta, Copenhagen, Munich, and in the National Gallery, London. His colouring is vigorous, extraordinary, and daring; in design he is often careless, in drawing frequently inaccurate, but his flesh tints are exceedingly good, and his skill in lighting, although inaccurate and full of tricks, is very effective. His pictures are distinguished by startling contrasts in light and shade, and by extraordinary effects of light on half-length figures, giving the desired appearance of high relief, the general effect of the remainder of the picture being over sombre.
His chief works are: "Histoire de la délivrance de l'Eglise chrétienne par l'empereur Constantin" (Paris, 1630); "Excerpta ecclesiasticae in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum" (Paris, 1631), in which he maintained that the Samaritan text and the Septuagint should be preferred to the Hebrew text, a position he upheld again in the following work: "Excerpta from the Bible of the Samaritans in the ancient script and the Latin text" (Paris, 1633, 1636, 1686); "Commentarius historico de disciplina in administratione sacramenti Pentenitentiae XIII primus seculi" (Paris, 1651); "Commentarius de sacris Ecclesiae ordinationibus" (Paris, 1655; Antwerp, 1655; Rome, 1751). The two preceding works are very important for the history of the Old Testament. Morm on published: "Bibliotheca graeca et Latina testamenti secundum Septuaginta" (Paris, 1628); and in Lejay's "Polyglotte", vol. V (1645), "Pentateuchos hebraeo-samaritanus" and "Pentateuchos samaritanus". He left several manuscript works.

MORMONES, or the CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS.—This religious body had its origin during the early part of the nineteenth century. Smith, the founder of the sect, was the son of a Vermont farmer, and was born in Sharon township, Windsor County, in that state, on 23 December, 1805. In the spring of 1820, while living with his parents at Manchester, Ontario (now Wayne) County, New York, he became deeply concerned upon the subject of his salvation, a condition produced by a religious excitement which agitated a few of his relatives to the Presbyterian sect. He sought Divine guidance, and claimed to have received in answer to prayer a visitation from two glorious beings, who told him not to connect himself with any of these Churches, but to return to the coming of the Church of Christ, which was about to be re-established. According to his own statement, there appeared to him on the night of 21 September, 1823, a heavenly messenger, who gave his name as Moroni, and revealed the existence of an ancient record containing the fullness of the Gospel of Christ as taught by Jesus Christ. This book or record, containing the history of the Nephites, a branch of the House of Israel which inhabited the American continent ages prior to its discovery by Columbus. Moroni in mortal life had been a Nephite prophet, the son of another prophet named Mormon, who was the compiler of the record buried in a hill anciently called Cumorah, situated about two miles from the mormon town that was converted. Joseph Smith states that he received the record from the Angel Moroni in September, 1827. It was, he alleges, engraved upon metallic plates having the appearance of gold and each a little thinner than ordinary tin, the whole forming a book about eight inches long, six inches wide, and six inches thick, bound together by nails. The characters engraved upon the plates were in a language styled the Reformed Egyptian, and with the book were interpreters—Urím and Thummim—by means of which these characters were to be translated into English. The result was the "Book of Mormon", published at Palmyra, New York, in March, 1830; in the preface eleven witnesses, exclusive of Mr. Smith, swore to the authenticity of the plates from which it was taken. On renouncing Mormonism subsequently, Cowdery, Whitmer, and Harris, the three principal witnesses, declared this testimony false.
The "Book of Mormon" purports to be an abridged account of God's dealings with the two great races of prehistoric Americane—the Jaredites, who were led from the Tower of Babel at the time of the confusion of tongues, and the Nephites, who came from Jerusalem just prior to the Babylonian captivity (600 B.C.). According to this book, America is the "Land of Zion", where the New Jerusalem will be built by a gathering of scattered Israel before the second coming of the Messiah. The labours of such men as Columbus, the Pilgrim Fathers, and the patriots of the Revolution, are pointed out as preparatory to that consummation. The work of Joseph Smith is also prophetically indicated, he being represented as a lineal descendant of the Joseph of old, commissioned to begin the gathering of Israel foretold by Isaiah (xi, 10-18) and other ancient prophets. In another part of his narrative Joseph Smith affirms that, while translating the "Book of Mormon", he and his scribe, Oliver Cowdery, were visited by an angel, who declared himself to be John the Baptist and ordained them to the Aaronic priesthood; and that subsequently they were ordained to the priesthood of Melchisedech by the Apostles Peter, James, and John. According to Smith and Cowdery, the Aaronic priesthood gave them authority to preach faith and repentance, to baptize by immersion for the remission of sins, and to administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; the priesthood of Melchisedech empowered them to lay on hands and bestow the gift of prophecy. It is now published in its final form, consisting of five books, the first of which is called "Joseph Smith's Testimony", and the second, "The Book of Mormon", published several months before. Up to that time Rigdon had never seen the book, which he was accused of helping Smith to write. The Mormons are equally emphatic in their denial of the identity of the "Book of Mormon" with Spaulding's "Manuscript Found", now published in the New York Observer. In connexion James H. Fairchild, president of that institution, who, in a communication to the "New York Observer" (5 February, 1885), states that Mrs. L. L. Rice and he, after comparing the "Book of Mormon" and the Spaulding romance, "could detect no resemblance between the two, in general or detail", and that the companions, after baptizing about one hundred persons in Ohio, went to western Missouri, and, thence crossing over at Independence into what is now the State of Kansas, laboured for a time among the Indians there. Meanwhile the Mormons of the East, to escape the opposition awakened by their extraordinary claims, and to be nearer their proposed ultimate destination, moved their headquarters to Kirtland, Ohio, from which place, in the summer of 1831, departed its first colony into Missouri, Jackson County in that state having been designated as the site of the New Jerusalem. Both at Kirtland and at Independence efforts were made to establish "The United Order", a community of men, of pure character, designed to make the church members equal in things spiritual and temporal. The prophet taught that such a system had sanctified the City of Enoch, whose people were called "Zion, because they were of one heart and one mind, and dwelt in righteousness", with "no poor among them". He also declared that the American Indians were destined to restore the "Book of Mormon", if they had endeavored to establish such an order at Jerusalem (Acts, iv, 32-37), and that, according to the "Book of Mormon", it had prevailed among the Nephites for two centuries after Christ. In the latter part of 1833 trouble arose between the Mormons and the Missourians, based largely, say Mormon writers, upon a feeling of apprehension concerning the aims and motives of the new settlers. Coming from the north and the east, they were suspected of being abolitionists, which was sufficient of itself to make them unpopular in Missouri. It was also charged that they intended to unite with the Indians and drive the older settlers from the land. The Mormons denied their innocence, but their denial did not avail. Armed mobs came upon them, and the whole colony—twelve hundred men, women, and children—were driven from Jackson County, and forbidden on pain of death to return.
In Ohio the Mormons prospered, though even there they had their vicissitudes. At Kirtland a foreign mission was opened in the summer of 1837, when Heber C. Kimball and Orson Hyde, two of the "twelve apostles of the Church", were sent with other missionaries for that purpose. While this work of proselytizing was in progress, dissatisfaction was rife at Kirtland, and the ill-feeling grew and intensified until the "prophet" was compelled to flee for his life. It is of importance to bear in mind that the opposition to the Mormons in the localities where they settled is, from the contradictory and divergent states of mind of the people of the States and the neighbors not of their belief, difficult of explanation.

It is safe to assume that there was provocation on both sides. The main body of the Mormons, following their leader to Missouri, settled in and around Far West, Caldwell County, which now became the chief gathering-place. The sect had been organized by six men, and a year later it was said to number about two thousand souls. In Missouri it increased to twelve thousand. A brief season of peace was followed by a series of calamities, occasioned by religious and political differences. The trouble began in August, 1838, and during the strife considerable blood was shed and much property destroyed, the final act in the drama being the mid-winter expulsion of the entire Mormon community from the state.

In Illinois, where they were kindly received, they built around the small village of Commerce, in Hancock County, the city of Nauvoo, gathering in that vicinity to the number of twenty thousand. Another temple was erected, several towns founded, and the new country was divided. Up to this time there had been no Mormon recruiting from abroad, all the converts to the new sect coming from various states in the Union and from Canada. In 1840-1 Brigham Young and other emissaries visited Great Britain, preaching in all the principal cities and towns. Here they baptized a number of people, published a new edition of the "Book of Mormon", founded a periodical called the "Millennial Star", and established a permanent emigration agency. The first Mormon emigrants from a foreign land—a small company of British converts—reached Nauvoo, by way of New York, in the summer of 1840. Subsequently the immigration came via New England. The people of Illinois granted a liberal charter to Nauvoo, and, as a protection against mob violence and further drivings and spoliations, the Mormons were permitted to organize the "Nauvoo Legion", an all but independent military body, though part of the state militia, commanded by Joseph Smith as lieutenant-general. However, a municipal court was instituted, having jurisdiction in civil cases, as well as in legal proceedings of a persecuting or vexatious character. Similar causes to those which had resulted in the exodus of the Mormons from Missouri in 1841, brought about their expulsion from Illinois, prior to which a tragic event robbed them of their prophet, Joseph Smith, and their patriarch, Hyrum Smith, who were killed by a mob in Carthage jail on 27 June, 1844. The immediate cause of the murder of the two brothers was the destruction of the press of the Nauvoo "Expositor", a paper established by seceders from Mormonism to give voice to the widespread indignation caused by the promulgation of Smith's revelation of 12 September, establishing polygamy, which had been practised personally by the prophet for many years. Another avowed purpose of this paper was to secure the repel of the Nauvoo Charter, which the Mormons looked upon as the bulwark of their liberties. The "Expositor" issued but once, when it was condemned as a public nuisance by order of the city council, its printing-office being destroyed and its editor, Foster, expelled. This summary act united anti-Mormon sentiment, and, on Smith's preparing to force by the warrant procured by Foster for his arrest, the militia were called out and armed mobs began to threaten Nauvoo. At Carthage was a large body of militia, mustered under Governor Thomas Ford to compel the surrender of Nauvoo. Smith submitted and returned to Carthage, and on 27 June he and his brother Hyrum, with others, were placed in jail. Fearful of a bloody collision, the governor disbanded most of his force, and with the remainder marched to Nauvoo, where the Mormons laid down their arms. During the governor's absence, a portion of the disbanded militia returned to Carthage and assaulted the jail. After the jail was breached, the prisoners were imprisoned, shooting Joseph and Hyrum Smith, and all but fatally wounding John Taylor; Willard Richards, their fellow-prisoner, escaped unhurt.

In the exodus that ensued, Brigham Young led the people westward. Passing over the frozen Mississippi (February, 1846), the main body made their way across the prairies of Iowa, reaching the Missouri River about the middle of June. A Mormon colony, sailing from New York, rounded Cape Horn, and landed at Yerba Buena (San Francisco) in July, 1848. Prior to that time only a few thousand Americans had settled on the Pacific Coast, mostly in Oregon, where in 1840 there was then claimed by the Mexican and the United States. So far as known, no American had then made a permanent home in what was called "The Great Basin". The desert region, now known as Salt Lake Valley, was then a part of the Mexican province of California, but was inhabited by Indians and a few wandering trappers and hunters. The Mormons entered Missouri in April, 1847, arrived in Salt Lake Valley on 24 July. This company, numbering 143 men, 3 women, and 2 children, was led by Brigham Young. Most of the exiles from Nauvoo remained in temporary shelters on the frontier, where they entered into winter quarters in what is now Nebraska. Well armed and disciplined, they accomplished the journey of over a thousand miles to Salt Lake Valley without a fatality. A few days after their arrival they laid out Salt Lake City. The people left the Missouri migrated in the autumn of 1848, and after them came yearly to the Rocky Mountains, generally by the old wagon road to the Great Salt Lake. Mormon emigrants from the states, from Europe, and from other lands to which missionaries continued to be sent. Most of the converts were drawn from the middle and working classes, but some professional people were among them.

While awaiting the time for the establishment of a civic government, the Mormons were under ecclesiastical rule. Secular officers were appointed, however, to preserve the peace, administer justice, and carry on public improvements. These officers were often selected at church meetings, and civil and religious functions were frequently united in the same person. But this state of affairs did not continue long. As soon as a civic government was organized, many of the forms of civil procedure already in use in American commonwealths were introduced, and remained in force till statehood was secured for Utah. In March, 1849, thirteen months after the signing of the treaty by which Mexico ceded this region to the United States, the settlers in Salt Lake Valley founded the provisional G.OVERNMENT. On 9 December, 1849, a bill was introduced by the American Congress upon their petition for admission into the Union. Deseret is a word taken from the "Book of Mormon", and signifies honey-bee. Brigham Young was elected governor, and a legislature, with a full set of executive officers, was also chosen. Congress denied the petition for
statehood, and organized the Territory of Utah, naming it after a local tribe of Indians. Brigham Young was appointed governor by President Millard Fillmore (September, 1850) and four years later was reappointed by President Franklin Pierce. The period between 1850 and 1858, during which the Mormons defied the authority of the Federal Government, is one of the least creditable chapters of their history.

One reason given for the persistent hostility to the Mormons was the dislike caused by the acrimonious controversy over polygamy or plural marriage. Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism, claimed to have received a revelation and a command ordering him to re-introduce plural marriage and restore the polygamous condition tolerated among the pre-Judean tribes. Polygamy now became a principle of the creed of the Latter-Day Saints, and, though not enforced by the laws of the Mormon hierarchy, was practised by the elders and practised by the chiefs of the cult and by many of the people. The violation by the Mormons of the monogamous law of Christianity and of the United States was brought to the attention of Congress, which prohibited under penalty of fine and imprisonment the perpetuation of the anti-Christian practice, refusing, however, to make the prohibition retroactive. The Mormons appealed to the Supreme Court, which sustained the action of Congress, and declared the existing laws of the anti-polygamy statutes invalid. The Latter-Day Saints, strangely enough, submitted to the decrees of Congress, unwittingly admitting by their submission that the revelation of their founder and prophet, Joseph Smith, could not have come from God. If the command to restore polygamy to the modern world was from on high, then the latter-day Saints, in violation of the decision of the Supreme Court, the Mormon hierarchy reversed the apostolic proclamation and acknowledged it was better "to obey man than to obey God".

So long as Utah remained a territory there was much bitterness between her Mormon and non-Mormon citizens, the latter termed "Gentiles". The Mormons submitted, however, and their president, Wilford Woodruff, issued a "Manifesto", which, being accepted by the Latter-Day Saints in General Conference, withdrew the sanction of the Church from the further solemnization of any marriages forbidden by the law of the land. One of the results of this action was the admission of Utah into the Union of States on 41st November 1896.

Instances of the violation of the anti-polygamy laws subsequent to the date of the "Manifesto" having been brought to light, the present head of the Church, President Joseph F. Smith, in April, 1904, made the following statement to the General Conference assembled at Salt Lake City, and it was endorsed by resolution and adopted by unanimous vote:

"OFFICIAL STATEMENT.

"Inasmuch as there are numerous reports in circulation, that plural marriages have been entered into, contrary to the official declaration of President Woodruff, of September 24th, 1890, commonly called the Manifesto, which was issued by President Woodruff and adopted by the Church at its General Conference October 6th, 1890, which forbade any marriages violative of the law of the land; I, Joseph F. Smith, President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, hereby affirm and declare that no such marriages have been solemnized, or knowledge of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; and "I hereby announce that all such marriages are prohibited, and if any officer or member of the Church shall assume to solemnize or enter into any such marriage, he will be deemed in transgression against the Church, and will be liable to be dealt with according to the rules and regulations thereof, and excommunicated therefrom.

Joseph F. Smith,
President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints."

In an "Address to the World", adopted at the General Conference of April, 1907, President Smith and his counsellors, John R. Winder and Anthon H. Lund, in behalf of the Church, reaffirmed its attitude of obedience to the laws of Congress. The practice of plural marriage is indeed fast becoming a thing of the past.

Mormonism announces as one of its principal aims the preparation of a people for the coming of the Lord; a people who will build the New Jerusalem, and there await His coming. The United Order, the means of preparation, is at present in abeyance, but the preliminary work of gathering Israel goes on, not to Zion proper (Jackson County, Illinois), but to the Saint of Zion, now numbering sixty-one, most of them in Utah; the others are in Idaho, Arizona, Wyoming, Colorado, Oregon, Canada, and Mexico. A stake is a division of the Mormon Church, organized in such a way as to constitute almost a "church" in itself; in each stake are subdivisions called wards, also fully organized. The apostles, or "Prophets", as they are called, are usually that of a county, though the extent of territory differs according to population or other conditions. Each stake is presided over by three high-priests, who, with twelve high councilors, constitute a tribunal for the adjudication of differences among church members within their jurisdiction. Each ward has a bishopric of three; a presiding bishop, and two counselors. The ward is usually that of a town, village, or hamlet, being in a county, but taken to the high council. The extreme penalty inflicted by the church courts is excommunication. In each stake are quorums of high-priests, seventies, and elders, officers and callings in the Melchisededc priesthood; and in each ward, quorums of priests, teachers, and deacons, who officiate in the Aaronic priesthood.

Presiding over the entire Church is a supreme council of three high-priests, called the First Presidency, otherwise known as the president and his counsellors. Next to these are the twelve apostles, equal in authority to the First Presidency and the bishops serving under their direction. Whenever the First Presidency is dissolved, which occurs at the death of the president, the apostles take the government and reorganize the supreme council—always, however, with the consent of the Church, whose members are called to vote for or against this or any other proposition submitted to them. The manner of voting is with the uplifted right hand, women voting as well as men. Besides the general conferences held semi-annually and the usual Sabbath meetings, there are stake and ward conferences, in which the consent of the people is obtained before any important action is taken. The special function of the apostles is to preach the Gospel, or have it preached, to all nations, and to set in order whenever necessary, the affairs of the entire Mormon Church. Among the general authorities there is also a presiding patriarch, who, with his subordinates in the various stakes, gives blessings to the people and comforts them with sacred ministrations. The first council of the Seventy, seven in number, assist the bishopric and preside over branches consisting of seventies. Upon a presiding bishopric of three devolves the duty of receiving and disbursing the revenues of the Church, and otherwise managing its business, under the general direction of the first presidency.

The Mormon Church is supported by the tithes and
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offerings of its members, most of whom reside in the
Stakes of Zion, though a good number remain in the
seven missions scattered in various countries of the
globe. About two thousand missionaries are kept in
the field; while they consider themselves under the
Divine injunction to "preach the Gospel to every creature", they have special instructions to baptize no
married woman without the consent of her husband,
and no child under age without the consent of its par-
ents. Their services are used for the building of temples
and other places of worship, the work of the ministry,
the furtherance of education, the support of the sick
and indigent, and for charitable and philanthropic pur-
poses in general. Nearly every male member of the
Church holds some office in the priesthood, but only
those who devote their entire time to its service re-
cieve it. The Church school system comprises the Brigham Young
University at Provo, the Brigham Young College at
Logan, and the Latter-Day Saints University at Salt
Lake City. There are also nearly a score of stake
academies. There are four Mormon temples in Utah,
the principal one being at Salt Lake City. It was
begun in 1854 and completed in 1893. The cost of con-
structing it is said, about $4,000,000. In these temple
ordina-
cences are administered both for the living and the
dead. It is held that vicarious work of this character,
such as baptisms, endowments etc., will be effectual in
saving souls, once mortal, who believe and repent in
the spirit state. The Mormons claim a total member-
ship of 584,000. An annual conference of the Church was
held in Salt Lake City on the April 18, 1910. The
church report for 1909, published May 1, 1910, states
there were 256,647 Mor-
mons within the Federal Union.
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W. R. HARRIS.

MOROCCO. Prefecture Apostolic of.—The coun-
try known as Morocco (from Marrakesh, the name of
one of its chief cities) forms the northwest corner of
the Continent of Africa, being separated from French
Algeria by an imaginary line, about 217 miles in
length, running from Nemours to Teniers as Suesi. It is
the Gattulia or Mauretania Tingitana (from Tingis = Tan-
gier) of the ancient Romans. The natives call it
Gharb (West), or Magreb el Aksa (Extreme West).
The total area is a little more than 308,000 square
miles; the population, about 10,000,000. Excepting
Abyssinia, it is now the only independent native state
in Africa which can put a frontier between itself and
Europeans to penetrate. Though Morocco is often
spoken of as an empire, the authority of the sovereign
is a mere fiction throughout the greater part of its ter-
ritory, which is, on this account, divided, more or less
precisely, into the Bled el Maksen, or "country subject
to taxes", and the Bled el Siba, or "unsubdued coun-
try". Physically, the surface is broken into two
parallel mountain-chains: the most important of
these, the Great Atlas, forms a plateau, forty to fifty
miles in width, from which rise peaks, often snow-
clad, 10,000 to 13,000 feet high. Facing the Medi-
terranean are the mountains of the Rif, below which
stretches the well-watered and fertile range of the
Tell. On the other side, to the extreme south lies
the Arid Sahara, broken only by a few oases. Between
the Mediterranean littoral and the Sahara, the Atlas
Plateau, broken by ravines and valleys, rivers and
smaller streams, contains many tracts of marvel-
ously fertile country. The sea-coast of Morocco is
for the most part dangerous, and offers few advan-
tages. On the other side, to the extreme south, lies
the Orange Valley, Tangier, Mogador, and Agadir. El Arâds, or Lar-
ache, and Tangier are the maritime outlets for Fes, which is one of the three capitals of Morocco, the other
two being Marrakesh and Meine. Owing to the
high mountains, the sea breezes and the openness of
the country, the climate is healthy, temperate, and
invigorating. The climate is, on the whole, a little
south than in the north; the heat, in certain districts,
becoming at times insufferable. The soil is adapted
to every kind of crop, and sometimes yields three har-
vests in a year. Cattle-breeding is also carried on.
There is very little industry, and commerce is chiefly
in the hands of Europeans and Jews.

The history of Morocco has been inhabited by the Berbers (whence the name
Barbar) These people were known to the Romans as Numida, but to the Phcenicians as Madorim (Westerners); from the Phcenician name the Greeks,
and, after them, Latin writers, made Murni, whence the English Moors. These Moors, Numidians, or Vandals, were subdued by the Stagirens, Vandals, the Byzantines, the Visigoths, and, lastly, the Arabs, whose political and religious conquest began in 681. The Moors and Berbers together crossed over into Spain, and thence into France, where their pro-
gress was stopped at Poitiers (732) by Charles Martel.
Not until 1492, when Granada fell, were the Christians of the Iberian Peninsula definitively rid of the Moors
in Europe, and able to carry the war against them into Africa. Portugal no longer retains any of
her possessions in Morocco; but Spain still holds eight
ports, known as the prescidos, one on the Atlantic
Coast and seven on the Mediterranean. Besides the
Berbers, the population of Morocco includes Jews, and all the cities are under the control of the Mellah (melh), Sudanese negroes, mostly slaves, and Euro-
peans engaged in commerce on the coast, chiefly at
Tangier and Mogador. For two hundred years Mo-
rocco has been ruled by a dynasty of Arab shers, who claim descent from Ali, the uncle and son-
in-law of Mohammed. The shers, or sultan, is theo-
retically supreme in both temporal and spiritual
affairs, his wishes being carried out by viziers, or
secretaries, in the various branches of the adminis-
tration (magneh). As a matter of fact, the normal
condition of the country is revolution and anarchy.
In 1906 the International Conference of Algeciras
provided for a combined French and Spanish system
of police, but the Moroccan question is still (1910)
unsettled.

With the exception of the European residents, the
segregated Jews mentioned above, and a body of
aborigines (Berbers), living in the Atlas, who have
proved refractory to Islam, the whole population of
Morocco is Mohammedan, and is inaccessible to
the French and Catholic missions; this country was organized in 1234, when Father An-
geo, a Franciscan friar and papal legate, was ap-
pointed Bishop of Morocco. The succession lasted
until 1566, when the see was suppressed, and its jur-
tinction given to the Archbishop of Seville. In 1831 the Prefecture Apostolic of Morocco was founded; its first incumbent, Blessed Giovanni da Prato, O.F.M., was martyred at Marrakesh in that year, and his feast is kept by the Franciscan Order on 29 May. Other missionaries continued to exercise their ministry through trials and persecutions of every kind until 1859, when the prefecture was reorganized on its present basis. It is administered by the Franciscans of the College of Compostella. There are in Morocco about 10,000 Catholics, nearly all Europeans; 24 missionaries, 8 stations (in the leading ports), 16 schools, with 1200 children, and a hospital at Tangier, where the prefect Apostolic resides.

Statemen's Year Book (London, 1910); Missiones Catholicae (Rome, 1907), 372.

A. LE ROY.

Morone, Giovanni, Cardinal, Bishop of Modena, b. at Milan 25 Jan., 1509; d. at Rome, 1 Dec., 1580. He belonged to a distinguished Milanese family, raised to the nobility in the twelfth century. His father held the dignity of chancellor of Milan, and it was probably to bind the father to his interest that Clement VII in 1529 named his son Giovanni, then only twenty years of age, to the See of Modena. By this appointment great offence was given to Cardinal Ippolito d'Este, who on the pretext that the See of Modena had previously been promised to himself, invoked the aid of Paul IV, who overthrew the pope's possession of the see, appropriating all its revenues. The dispute was not settled until 1532, when Morone at last bought off the opposition of d'Este by agreeing to pay him an annual pension of 400 ducats. Even as early as 1529, the young bishop-elect, whose talents had already attracted attention at the University of Bologna, began the preparation for his episcopal mission to France. Under Paul III Morone's gifts as a negotiator placed him at once in the very front rank of ecclesiastical politicians. He was sent as papal envoy to Duke Sforza of Milan in 1535, and in the following year accepted, not altogether without reluctance, the important mission of nuncio at the court of Ferdinand, King of the Romans. His instructions were to press on the affair of the council in Hungary and Bohemia. He was to obtain from Ferdinand a safe-conduct for those who intended to take part in it, and to insist upon Mantua or some other Italian city as the place of meeting.

Except for the exception of an interval from September, 1538 to July, 1539, and another in 1541, Morone remained at his post in Germany for nearly six years, and he was present at the diets of Hagenau in 1540 and Ratisbon in 1541, while at the important meeting of Spiers in 1542 he appeared as the pope's special representative, and played a leading part, though even his great tact and resources were but little in the complicated tangle of German religious affairs. During these early years in Germany, and indeed throughout his life, Morone remained a conspicuous member of a little group of moderate and intellectual men who saw that in the deadly struggle with Lutheranism, the faults were not all on one side. When Cardinal Sadoletto in 1537 was addressing a courteously worded appeal to Melanchthon he denounced by many of his own side as little better than a traitor and a heretic, Morone wrote the cardinal a letter of sympathy. "There are in these parts," he said, "many reputed defenders of the Catholic faith who think that our religion consists in nothing but having a reverend interminius" which makes it, and they are so wedded to this point of view that, without ever looking into the matter itself, they take in bad part not only all negotiations with the Lutherans, but every single word spoken about them which is not abusive." Morone further advises Sadoletto to treat his critics with silent contempt, and states his own conviction that to show charity to heretics was a better way than to overwhelm them with abusive language, adding: "if only this course had been adopted from the first, there would probably be less difficulty than there is in bringing about the union of the Church" (see the letter in "Archiv f. Reformationsgeschichte", 1904, 1, 80-311).

On 22 May, 1542, Paul III published his Bull, which had been drafted by Sadoletto, summoning the council to meet at Trent, on 1 Nov., of the same year. On 2 June, Morone was created a cardinal, and on 16 Oct., he and Cardinals Parvisio and Pole were named legates to preside over the assembly as the pope's representatives. But this first attempt to launch the long-desired council was a failure, and Morone went to Trent and waited until the handful of representatives, who never met in public session, gradually dispersed, the council being formally prorogued 6 July, 1543. Before the assembly was again convened Morone was named legate (practically papal governor) at Bologna, and he had nothing to do with the sessions of the council which took place at Trent between December, 1545 and June, 1546, though after the council had been ostensibly transferred to Bologna, he was named by Julius III as one of the commissioners to arrange for its return to Trent. In 1555 he was sent to the Diet of Augsburg, but the death of Julius necessitated his recall and under the Pontificate of Pius IV Morone was able to turn his liberal views had the misfortune to awaken the pope's suspicions when the latter presided over the Roman Inquisition, was arrested by the pontiff's order, confined in the Castle of Saint Angelo (31 May, 1557), and made the object of a formal prosecution for heresy, in which his views on justification, the election of saints, the veneration of relics and other matters were inculcated and submitted to rigid inquiry.

The cardinal strenuously repudiated these charges, but he was kept in confinement until the death of Paul IV. In 1560 his successor Pius IV authorized a revision of the process against Morone, and as a result the imprisonment of the cardinal and the whole procedure against him were declared to be entirely without justification; the judgment also recorded in the most formal terms that not the least suspicion rested upon his orthodoxy. A few years later when the cardinal legates Gonzaga and Seripandi died at Trent, Morone and Cardinal Navagero were appointed to succeed them, and at the conclusion of the session the concluding sessions of the council with conciliar decree were duly carried into execution. Under the succeeding pontiffs his credit was in no way impaired. He was sent on a mission to Genoa in 1575, and in 1576 was appointed to the See of Ratisbon as papal legate. As Cardinal Protector of England, Morone in 1578-1579 had much to do with the administration of the English College (see Catholic Record Society, "Miscellanea", II, London, 1906); and when he died he had been for some time Cardinal Bishop of Ostia. Few ecclesiastics in that century were so successful in retaining the esteem of men of all parties and all creeds as this large-minded and eminently able and honest churchman. His reports as nuncio, recently published of late years in the German series of "Nuntiaturberichten", throw a flood of light upon the religious conditions of the empire, and it is interesting to note that the "Claustrum interminius" which he denounced to good account by Raynaldi proves to be no other than Morone himself (see Ehres in "Römische Quartalschrift", 1903). It may be mentioned in conclusion that Morone had much to do with the founding of the important Collegium Germanicum in Rome,
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**MORONI, GIOVANNI BATTISTA,** painter, b. at Bondo, near Albino, in the territory of Bergamo, between 1520 and 1525; d. at Bergamo, in 1578. He was the pupil of Alessandro Bonvicino, called Moretto da Brescia (about 1498-1555), and one of the best imitators of his style. Moroni’s work was done chiefly at Bergamo and in the vicinity. He was remarkable as a portrait painter, and as such was not to be understood. He has the same sincerity and nobility, but more originality. His portraits are amongst the most vigorous of the Renaissance; of these we may mention a “Scholar with an open book before him” and a “Man in Black” at the Uffizi (Florence); at the Gallery of Bergamo a “Young Man” and a “Woman”, of excellent workmanship; at the Brera (Milan) the portrait of Antonio Navagero, podestà of Bergamo; at the Ambrosiana Library in Milan, a “Man of sickly appearance”; at the National Gallery (London), portrait of a member of the Fenaroli family, “The Tailor”, and Canon Lodovico Terzi of Bergamo; at the Louvre “An Old man seated holding a book”, “A Gentleman and his two children”; in the Museum of Madrid a “Venetian Captain”; in the Dresden Gallery, portrait of a man; in the Gallery of Vienna, two portraits of men. In religious pictures, on the other hand, Moroni is inferior to Moretto, especially in the way he gives the appearance of grace, but his colouring, of a clear greyish tone, is not disagreeable. “It is only in his last works that the grey tone becomes monotonous and soft, together with a rather hard reddish colouring” (J. Burckhardt and Bode). Worthy of note are the “Coronation of the Virgin”, painted for the church of the Trinity at Bergamo; the “Last Judgment” for the parish church of Gorlago, near Bergamo; “Virgin and Saints” and “St. Jerome” at the Carrara Academy of Bergamo; the “Assumption of the Virgin”, the “Virgin surrounded by Saints” (two pictures) at the Brera of Milan; “The Jesuit” (portrait of Eufrosino Lauro) at Stafford House, the London residence of the Duke of Sutherland.

**BLANC, Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles (Paris, 1865-77).**

**MORRIS, JOHN,** canon, afterwards Jesuit, F.S.A., b. in India, 4 July, 1826; d. at Wimbledon, 22 Oct., 1893, son of John Carnac Morris, F.R.S. He was educated in the diocesan, including Wiseman, and of other illustrious men. In the index of the “Dizionario” (a.v., Moroni), he indicates the various passages of the work in which he speaks of himself, and which thus constitute a kind of autobiography.

**U. BENIGNI.**

**HERBERT THURSTON**

---

_The Tailor_  
**GIOVANNI BATTISTA MORONI, NATIONAL GALLERY, LONDON**
partly in India, partly at Harrow, partly in reading
or Cambridge with Dean Alford, the New Testament
scholar. Under him a great change passed over Mor-
ris's ideas. Giving up the thought of taking the law
as his profession, he became enthusiastic for ecclesi-
aucal antiquities, a deep interest in the Tracta-
tian movement, and resolved to become an Anglican
dergyman. Going up to Trinity College, Cambridge,
in October, 1845, he became the friend, and then the
pupil of F. A. Paley, grandson of the well-known di-
vine, and already one of the leading Greek scholars of
the university. The conversion of Newman, fol-
lowing the recruitions of so many others, deeply im-
pressed him, and he was invited by Bishop Wyling,
20 May, 1846. A storm followed, beginning in the
"Times", which made itself felt even in Parlia-
ment. Paley had to leave Cambridge (which led to
us subsequently joining the Church), while Morris
was practically cast off by his family. He then went
to the English College, Rome, under Dr. Grant (q. v.),
and was there during the revolution of 1848. Soon
after the restoration of the English Hierarchy in 1850,
he was made Canon of Northampton, and then re-
turned as vice-rector to Rome (1853–1856). He now
became postulator for the English Martyrs (q. v.),
whose cause owes perhaps more to him than to any
other living Englishman. Going to England, he took part
in the third Synod of Westminster, became secretary to
Cardinal Wiseman (q. v.), whom he affectionately
nursed on his death-bed, and served under Archbishop
Manning (q. v.), until he became a Jesuit in 1867. He
ought Church History from 1873–1874; he was Rec-
or of St. Ignatius' College, Malta, from 1877–78;
professor of Greek, and directed the translation of the
New Testament into English in 1888. Always remarkable
for his ardent affectionate nature, his untiring energy
and earnest holiness of life, he was also an excellent
scholar, an eloquent speaker, and a high-minded
leader of souls. His death befitted his life; for he ex-
pired in the pulpit, uttering the words, "Rendcr to
God the things that are God's." His principal works
are: "The Life and Martyrdom of St. Thomas Becket"
(London, 1859 and 1885); "The Life of Father John
Jerard" (London, 1881), translated into French,
German, Spanish, and Polish; "Troubles of our Cath-
olic Forefathers" (3 vols., London, 1872–1877); "Let-
er-books of Sir Amias Poulet" (London, 1874); and
more particularly "The Master of the Month", "The
Dublin Review", "Archeologia", and other periodicals.

MORRIS, John B. See LITTLE ROCK, Diocese of.

MORRIS, John Brande, b. at Brentford, Middle-
ex, in 1826; d. at Hammersmith, end of
1, April, 1840; he studied at Balliol College, Oxford,
graduating in 1834 (B.A. honours) and 1837 (M.A.).
He was at once elected Peruian Fellow of Exeter Col-
lege, and lectured on Hebrew. His favourite field of
study was Eastern and patriotic theology. While at
Oxford he wrote an "Essay towards the Conversion of
earned Jews" (1832), and translated "Nature: a Parable"
(1842); and translated "Select Homilies from St. Ephraem"
(1846), likewise St. Chrysostom's "Homilies on the
Romans" (1841) for the "Library of the Fathers".
Having joined the Tractarian Movement, he was re-
ceived into the Church, 16 January, 1846, resigning
his clerical use and was ordained priest at
Oscott in 1851 and in the same year was ap-
pointed professor at Prior Park, near Bath. He soon
seem parish work and for the next nineteen years
ministered in Plymouth, Shortwood (Somersetshire),
and other parts of England. He was for a time chap-
ain to Sir John Acton and Coventry Patmore. In
1870 he became spiritual director of the Scours de
M Miscerode, Hammersmith, which post he occupied
till his death. After his conversion he contributed to the
"Dublin Review", the "Lamp" and other Catho-
lic periodicals; and wrote "Jesus the Son of Mary"
(1851), a treatise on the Incarnation and devotion to
Our Lady; "Taleetha Koomes" (1858), a metrical re-
ligious drama; and "Eucharist on Calvary", an essay
on the first Mass and the Passion.

MORRIS, Martin Ferdinand, lawyer and jurist, b.
3 December, 1834, at Washington, D. C.; d. 12 Sept-
ember, 1909, at Washington, D. C. Descended from
an Irish Catholic family, he was educated at George-
town University; from which he graduated in 1854.
On leaving Georgetown he entered the Jesuit Novi-
icate, at Frederick, Md., to prepare himself for
the priesthood, to which high calling his inclinations
from early youth had impelled him, and for which, by
reason of his studious habit, scholarly tastes, and high
moral standards, he was in every way fitted. His
ambition, however, could not be realized, as the death
of his father left him the sole support of his mother
and sisters. In 1863 he began the law in Baltimore, Maryland, and in 1867 removed to Wash-
ington to enter into partnership with the late Richard
T. Merrick. He continued a member of the firm of
Merrick and Morris until the death of Mr. Merrick
(1885) when he formed a partnership with George E.
Hamilton, and continued actively to practise his pro-
Fation being connected with important cases, both in
the local courts and in the Supreme Court, un-
til appointed by President Cleveland an Associate
Justice of the Court of Appeals of the District of
Columbia upon the establishment of that Court in
1893. Modest, unassuming, almost diffident in man-
ner, he was best adapted to quiet practice, and yet,
when occasion required it, was fearless and a suag-gerator in the trial of cases. A skilled lawyer, standing high
in his profession, judicial labours did not prevent him
from taking an active interest in civic and social con-
ditions, or from broadening the scope of his re-
searches into the fields of science, of literature, and of
art. Actively interested in his Alma Mater, and in the
growth and development of Catholic education, he
was one of the founders of Georgetown Law School
(1871), then under the direction of the late P. F.
Healey, S.J., to-day one of the largest and most suc-
cessfully conducted law schools in this country. In
1877 he received from Georgetown, in recognition of
his nobility of character, and his local and national
achievements as lawyer and judge, the degree of
LL.D. He wrote "Lectures on the History of the De-
velopment of Constitutional and Civil Liberty"
(1898); also numerous monographs and addresses.

MORSE (Lat. morus), also called the MONILE, FY-
BULA, FIRMALE, PECTORALE, originally the rectan-
gular ornamented piece of material attached to the
two front edges of the cope near the breast to pre-
vent the vestment from slipping from the shoulders.
Mores were provided with hooks and eyes, which
were often richly ornamented with embroidery or precious
stones. The name was also applied to metal clasps
used instead of such pieces of woven fabric. As early
as the eleventh century such metal clasps are found
represented in miniatures and mentioned in invent-
ories. These clasps, however, gradually lost their
secular use and were disused, and were sometimes sewn
firmly to the flaps that served to fasten the cope, som-
times only attached to the flaps by hooks, so that, after the vestment had been
worn, the clasps could be removed and cared for sep-
ately. This latter was especially the case when,
as frequently happened at least in the later Middle
Ages, the cope was very heavy or very valuable. As
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early as the thirteenth century inventories mention clasps which formed distinct ornaments in themselves. Many churches had a large number of such morse. They were generally made of silver covered with gold, and decorated with enamels, niello work, architectural designs, small figures of saints, ornamental work in flowers and vines, and similar designs. Such clasps were frequently the finest products of the goldsmith's art; they were generally either round, square, quatrefoil, or like a rosette in form; yet there were also more elaborate and at times peculiar shapes. A direct proof of the desire for costly clasps for the cope is shown by the old inventories and by the numerous medieval morses preserved (especially in Germany) in churches and museums. According to present Roman usage the morse is reserved to cardinals and bishops ("Cer. episc."). I, c. vii. n; 1; S. R. C., 15 September, 1733.


**Morse, Henry, Venerable, martyr; b. 1595 in Norfolk; d. at Tyburn, 1 February, 1644. He was received into the Church at Douai, 5 June, 1614, after various journeys was ordained at Rome, and left for the mission, 10 June, 1624. He was admitted to the Society at Hendon, that at Newgate where he was arrested and imprisoned for three years in York Castle, where he made his novitiate under his fellow-prisoner Father John Robinson, S.J., and took simple vows. Afterwards he was a missionary to the English regiments in the Low Countries. Returning to England at the end of 1630 he laboured in London, and in 1636 he is reported to have received about ninety Protestant families into the Church. He himself contracted the plague but recovered. Arrested 27 February, 1636, he was imprisoned in Newgate. On 22 April he was brought to the bar charged with being a priest and with having withdrawn the king's subjects from their faith and allegiance. He was found guilty on the first count, not guilty on the second, and sentence was deferred. On 23 April he made his solemn profession of the three vows to Fr. Edward Lusher. He was released on bail for 10,000 florins, 20 June, 1637, at the instance of Queen Henrietta Maria. In order to free his sureties he voluntarily went into exile when the royal proclamation was issuing ordering all priests to leave the country before 7 April, 1641, and became chaplain to Gage's English regiment in the service of Spain. In 1643 he returned to England; arrested after about a year and a half, he was imprisoned at Durham and Newcastle, and sent by sea to London. On 30 January he was again brought to the bar and condemned on his previous conviction. On the day of his execution his hurdle was drawn by four horses, and the French Ambassador attended with all his suite, as also did the Count of Egmont and the Portuguese Ambassador. The martyr was allowed to hang until he was dead. At the quartering the footmen of the French Ambassador and of the Count of Egmont dipped their handkerchiefs in the martyr's blood. Many persons possessed by evil spirits were relieved through the application of his relics.


**John B. Wainwright.**

**Mortification.** One of the methods which Christian asceticism employs in training the soul to virtuous and holy living. The term originated with St. Paul, who traces an instructive analogy between Christ dying to a mortal and rising to an immortal life, and his followers who renounce their past life of sin and rise through grace to a new life of holiness. "If you live after the flesh", says the apostle, "you shall die, but if through the spirit you mortify the deeds of the flesh, you shall live" (Rom. viii, 13; cf. also Col., iii, 5, and Gal., v, 24). From this original use of the term mortification, though under one aspect it is a law of death, under another and more fundamental aspect it is a law of life, and so does not destroy but elevates nature. What it slays is the disease of the soul, and by slaying it this restores and invigorates the soul's true life.

Thus the diseases it sets itself to slay, sin, the one mortal disease of the soul, holds the first place. Sin committed it destroys, by impelling to true penitence and to the use of those means of forgiveness and restoration which our Lord has confided to His Church. Temptations to sin it overcomes by inducing the will to accept hardships, however grave, rather than yield to the temptations. To this extent, mortification is obligatory on all, but those who wish to be more thorough in the service of Christ, carry it further, and strive with its aid to subdue, so far as is possible in this life, that "rebellion" of the flesh against the spirit which is the internal incentive to sin. What is needed to achieve this victory is that the passions of man should be subdued to the control of the spirit, that indulgence in sensual concupiscences, which when freely indulged exercise so pernicious an influence on human conduct, should be trained by judicial repression to subordinate and conform their desires to the rule of reason and faith, as discerned by the mind. But for this training to be effectual it is not sufficient to restrain these desires of the flesh only when their denial is deemed unlawful; they must be disciplined in nature, and must be treated as one treats a twisted wire when endeavouring to straighten it, namely, by twisting it the opposite way. Thus in the various decretals of ascetic observance, earnest Catholics are constantly found denying themselves even in matters which in themselves are confessedly lawful. Of this mortification, viewed as the carrying off bad habits and implanting good ones, has its recognized place in the methods even of those who are engaged in pursuing purely natural ends. What is peculiar to Christian mortification is that it relies for the attainment of its spiritual objects, not merely on this natural efficacy of its methods, but still more on the aids of the graces, for which the discipline of the spirit is the means and the Christian motive which inspires it, it can plead so powerfully with God. And here, as further contributing to increase its spiritual efficacy, another motive for which it is practised comes in. It is practised likewise as an expiation for past sins and shortcomings, for it is the belief of the Catholic Church that, through only the Atonement is efficacious for the expiation of the sins of men, men ought not to make that an excuse for doing nothing themselves, but should rather take it as an incentive to add their own expiations to the extent of their power, and should regard such personal expiations as very pleasing to God. This explains why many of the mortifications recommended by devout persons are of evil propensities, but take the form of painful exercises or privations self-inflicted because they are painful, e.g., fastings, hard beds, abstention from lawful pleasures, etc. Not that these external mortifications are of themselves available, for spiritual writers never tire of insisting that the internal mortification of pride and self-love in their various forms is essential, but that external penances are good only so far as they spring from this internal spirit, and react by promoting it (see ASCETICISM).


**Syden F. Smith.**
Mortmain (Old Fr., morte meyn), dead-hand, or "such a state of possession of land as makes it inalienable" (Wharton, "Law Lexicon", 10th ed., London, 1902, s. v.), is "the possession of land or tenements by any corporation" (Bouvier, "Law Dictionary", Boston, 1897, s. v.). When the union came ad manum mortuam, which was then it came to some corporation" (Lord Bacon, "Reading on the Statute of Uses"), alienation of lands or tenements to a corporation being termed alienation in mortmain (Stephen, "New Commentaries on the Laws of England", 18th ed., London, 1908, i, 296). The alienation was formerly expressed by the now obsolete words amortization and amortissement, the personal so alienating being said to amortize (Murray, "New English Dictionary", Oxford and New York, 1888), a verb used by Chaucer in connexion with good works "amortised by sinne following" (The Personaes Tale). In Old French amortissement was used in connexion with licences termed choses d'amortissement, validating an alienation, amortir being defined etoidre en tout ou en partie les droits de la seigneurie féodale ("La Grande Encyclopédie", Paris, s. d.; "Century Dictionary", New York, s. d., s. v. amortization; cf. the same use of the English word in statute 15 Richard II, c. 5). Corporate ownership, recognized by the Roman Law as one of the sources of law, not codified in the Moslem law (s. v. pergamens quas in ea nemo unquam mortuar (an everlasting body continuing perpetually the same as if in it no one may ever die). A third of the value of property is said to have been sometimes the price of its amortissement (Littre, "Dictionnaire de la langue française", Paris, 1889, s. v.).

The Catholic Church, having been recognized "since the time of the Emperor Constantine" in the countries which adopted the feudal system "as possessing a legal personality and the capacity to take and give, in Roman Law (Pius IX, Roman Catholic Church, 210 United States Supreme Court Reports, 311), feudalism recognized not only the Church, but its religious communities, as spiritual corporations. Such a community has been thought to be appropriately described to be gens aeterna sed perpetuo peramans quasi in ea nemo unquam moritur (an everlasting body continuing perpetually the same as if in it no one may ever die). The communities might consist of men, each of whom was deemed, because of his vows, civilly dead. But to the communities themselves, viri religiosi, "people of religion", gens de main morte, the law attributed a perpetual existence and perpetual ownership of property. Therefore, when dealing with the corporate existence of associations, which were corporations aggregate, and also allowing of such an artificial existence in an official individual, considered not only the king, but each bishop, parson, and vicar as a corporation sole. And such might be a chantry (q. v. priest, to whom land had been given by its owner, subject to a perpetual service a chânter pur y e pur ces heures du jour (see Year Books of the reign of King Edward the First, Years XX-XXI, London, 1866, 265).

Corporate ownership of land, however, by subjects of the realm was repugnant to feudal theory. According to this theory all land of subjects was deemed to have been acquired, immediately or mediately, by grant or fee out of mortmain; in mortmain had been necessary "among the Saxons" (B. 11, c. 18, 269) does not apply. Magna Carta,
nor, in any general sense, by the fact that the allusion in the Constitutions of Clarendon (1164) to mortmain was confined to advowsons (ibid.).

The mortmain statute of Edward I, known as "Statuta de viris religiosis", 7 Edward I, enacted in 1279, and so often referred to by writers on English real property law, recites that religious men have entered into their own fees as well as into the fees of other men, and that those services due "and which at the beginning were provided for the defence of the Realm, and long as withdrawn and the escheats lost to the chief lords" (Duke, "The Law of Charitable Uses", London, 1805, 193).

The statute therefore ordains that "no person, religious or other, nullus religiosus aut alius quisquaque, shall buy or sell lands or tenements or receive them, or appropriate them (under pain of forfeiture) so as to cause the land to come into mortmain, per quod ad manum mortuam terrae et tenementum hume mortuorum demens fuerit quoque modo.

A violation of the statute renders lawful to the king "and other chief lords of the fee immediate", nobis et aliis immediatis capellibus dominis fidei, to enter and hold the land. The chief lord immediate is afforded a six month's grace period, and a further half-year next ensuing, and so every lord immediate may enter into such land, if the next lord be negligent in entering. If all the chief lords who are "of full age, within the four seas and out of prison be negligent or slack", "we", the king, namely, "shall take such lands and tenements into our own hands", copiam in manum nostram.

The term manus mortuis is not applied to the sovereign, yet land so taken "in manum nostram" is not to be retained. Such a retaining would be in mortmain. And the king promises to convey the land to other persons subject to services from which ownership by the "religious men" or others had withdrawn it, services for which the royal tenants in chief per certa servitut notis et alius dei futuros, facing to the lords "their wards and escheats and other services". A statute of 1290 permits any freeman to part with his land, the feoffe to hold of the same lord and by the same services as his feoffor held. But the statute cautiously adds that in no case was the tenant who survived the landor the statute against the statute (see 18 Edward I, c. 1, c. II, c. III).

Where churches stood "the ground itself was hallowed" (see Ponce vs. Roman Catholic Church, 210 United States Supreme Court Reports, 312). And a statute of Richard II (15 Richard II, c. V; 1391) re- cites that "some religious persons, persons, vicars and others have entered in diverse lands and tenements, which be adjoining to their churches and of the same by sufferance and assent of the tenants, have made churchyards and by bulls of the bishop of Rome [sic]—the French and more authoritative text reads: par bulles del apostollis] have dedicated and hallowed the same" and in these make "profits with ease". Thereby all persons possessed of land "to the use of religious people or other spiritual persons", of which these latter take the profits, are required upon pain of forfeiture to procure licence of amortization within a time limited, or to "sell and alien" to some other use.

This statute does not confine its operation to "spiritual persons" and churchyards, but enacts that the statute of 1279 shall "be observed of all lands, tenements, fees, advowsons, and other possessions purchased or to be purchased to the use of guilds and fraternities" and "Mayors, Bailiffs and Commons of Cities, Boroughs and other towns that have a perpetual commonality", all of whom are forbidden to purchase. Licences by the respective or religious persons, transferred into mortmain, notwithstanding the statute, were issued from time to time. The text of a licence of Edward I himself has been preserved, permitting a certain person to give a parcel of land to a certain priory and convent to be held sibi et successoribus suis in perpetuum, but subject to the due and accustomed services to the capellan in the precincts of the Books of the reign of King Edward I, years XXXI- XXXIII, London, 1864, 499). This licence recites that it is given ob affectionem et benevolentiam towards the religious order. Nor do licences in mortmain seem to have ever become in England, as in France, recognized sources of royal revenue.

Legal devices, too, as in the times before the Magna Carta of Henry III, were resorted to for the purpose of escaping the operation of the statute, such as purchases alluded to in the statute of Richard II "to the use" of persons other than those to whom the legal title was transferred. These devices have produced far-reaching and enduring influence on the development of English jurisprudence. Concerning English aggregate ecclesiastical bodies of former times, Sir Edward Coke observes in language which we might imagine to be applied to modern "trusts" and combinations of capital, that those bodies "in this were to be commended, that they ever had of their counsel the best learned men that they could get" (Blackstone, "Codex immediatissimus", 16.)

Before the coming of the Conqueror and his feudal lawyers much land in England had been acquired to be held by the spiritual tenure of frankalmoino, a tenure subjecting the holders to what was termed the triumia necessitas (or threefold obligation) of repairing highways, building castles, and repelling invasions, but other wise to no service. A tenant entered in divers lands of the donor and his heirs, dead or alive (Stephanus, op. cit., I, 139, 140). To such pious foundations already established none of the mortmain legislation applied.

When Henry VIII commenced his ecclesiastical alterations, the general body of the parochial clergy being, in a corporate way, their lands by this tenure (ibid.) "acknowledged", to quote Sir Edward Coke (1 Reports, 24, a), "King Henry VIII to be supreme head of the church of England", and thus continued to hold their lands by the Saxon tenure, by which "the parochial clergy and very many ecclesiastical and deanery foundations", observes Sergeant Step- then, "hold their lands this day" (op. cit., I, 140).

Land held in mortmain by some of the religious corporations were confiscated by the statute 27 Henry VIII, c. 28 (1535), and thus, according to Lord Bacon (Reading on the Statute of Uses), "the possessions that had been in mortmain began to stir and be 'stirring' extended in divers lands and tenements, which be adjoining to their churches and of the same by sufferance and assent of the tenants, have made churchyards and by bulls of the bishop of Rome [sic]—" the French and more authoritative text reads: par bulles del apostollis] have dedicated and hallowed the same" and in these make "profits with ease". Thereby all persons possessed of land "to the use of religious people or other spiritual persons", of which these latter take the profits, are required upon pain of forfeiture to procure licence of amortization within a time limited, or to "sell and alien" to some other use.

This statute does not confine its operation to "spiritual persons" and churchyards, but enacts that the statute of 1279 shall "be observed of all lands, tenements, fees, advowsons, and other possessions purchased or to be purchased to the use of guilds and fraternities" and "Mayors, Bailiffs and Commons of Cities, Boroughs and other towns that have a perpetual commonality", all of whom are forbidden to purchase. Licences by the respective or religious persons, transferred into mortmain, notwithstanding the statute, were issued from time to time. The text of a licence of Edward I himself has been preserved, permitting a certain person to give a parcel of land to a certain priory and convent to be held sibi et successoribus suis in perpetuum, but subject to the due and accustomed services to the capellan in the precincts of the Books of the reign of King Edward I, years XXXI- XXXIII, London, 1864, 499). This licence recites that it is given ob affectionem et benevolentiam towards the religious order. Nor do licences in mortmain seem to have ever become in England, as in France, recognized sources of royal revenue.

Legal devices, too, as in the times before the Magna Carta of Henry III, were resorted to for the purpose of escaping the operation of the statute, such as purchases alluded to in the statute of Richard II "to the use" of persons other than those to whom the legal title was transferred. These devices have produced far-reaching and enduring influence on the development of English jurisprudence. Concerning English aggregate ecclesiastical bodies of former times, Sir Edward Coke observes in language which we might imagine to be applied to modern "trusts" and combinations of capital, that those bodies "in this were to be commended, that they ever had of their counsel the best learned men that they could get" (Blackstone, "Codex immediatissimus", 16.)

Before the coming of the Conqueror and his feudal lawyers much land in England had been acquired to be held by the spiritual tenure of frankalmoino, a tenure subjecting the holders to what was termed the triumia necessitas (or threefold obligation) of repairing highways, building castles, and repelling invasions, but other wise to no service. A tenant entered in divers lands of the donor and his heirs, dead or alive (Stephanus, op. cit., I, 139, 140). To such pious foundations already established none of the mortmain legislation applied.

When Henry VIII commenced his ecclesiastical alterations, the general body of the parochial clergy being, in a corporate way, their lands by this tenure (ibid.) "acknowledged", to quote Sir Edward Coke (1 Reports, 24, a), "King Henry VIII to be supreme head of the church of England", and thus continued to hold their lands by the Saxon tenure, by which "the parochial clergy and very many ecclesiastical and deanery foundations", observes Sergeant Step- then, "hold their lands this day" (op. cit., I, 140).

Land held in mortmain by some of the religious corporations were confiscated by the statute 27 Henry VIII, c. 28 (1535), and thus, according to Lord Bacon (Reading on the Statute of Uses), "the possessions that had been in mortmain began to stir and be 'stirring' extended in divers lands and tenements, which be adjoining to their churches and of the same by sufferance and assent of the tenants, have made churchyards and by bulls of the bishop of Rome [sic]—" the French and more authoritative text reads: par bulles del apostollis] have dedicated and hallowed the same" and in these make "profits with ease". Thereby all persons possessed of land "to the use of religious people or other spiritual persons", of which these latter take the profits, are required upon pain of forfeiture to procure licence of amortization within a time limited, or to "sell and alien" to some other use.
petitions appears in a statute of Henry VIII, which preceded the confiscating statutes. This is the statute 23 Henry VIII, c. X (1531), directed against holding of lands, "to the use of parish churches, chapels, churchwardens, guilds, fraternities, commonalties, companies, or brotherhoods", purposes previously accused of being "abuses and scandals and abuses of the same kind."

Excluding from its operation cities and towns corporate, having, by their ancient customs, power to "devise into mortmain," the statute alluded to declares trusts or assurances to the uses just mentioned "erected and made of devotions or by common assent of the people without any corporation", or "to the uses and intents of theclergy or the service of a priest forever", or for sixty or eighty years, to be within the mischiefs of alienation "into mortmain"; and as to future gifts void except for terms not exceeding twenty years (cf. 1 Edward VI, c. XIV).

Sir Edward Coke explains this statute to have been directed against some purposes which were thenceforth to be condemned as superstitious, although formerly approved as charitable, "such superstitious uses", he points out, "as to pray for souls supposed to be in purgatory, and the like". Not long before the date of the statute, Coke observes "by the light of God's word", "diverse superstitions and errors in the Church of England had hac many years been thought to have their origin in the capacity of charity and devotion were discovered". With true charity, he claims, the statute was not intended to interfere. For, he observes, "no time was so barren as to abolish learning and knowledge nor so uncharitable as to prohibit relieving the poor" (op. cit., 24 a). And he allows us to infer such to be the fact, even though the charity might constitute a perpetuity.

Dispositions for charity, which the law would specially commend, a statute of Queen Elizabeth mentions (43 Elizabeth, c. IV, 1601). Dispositions in aid of "superstitions" were not to be deemed charitable, and these the courts were to ascertain and condemn, in the varying light of English Statutes, as evils like to alienations in mortmain.

An authority on the law of charitable uses (Duke, op. cit., 125) states that "religion being variable, according to the pleasure of succeeding princes, that which at one time is held for orthodox may at another be accounted superstitious". And accordingly the English courts even condemned as superstitious the projects and ambitions of Scotchmen to propagate in Scotland the doctrines of the Church of England. For, by statute, presbyteries had been settled in that portion of the United Kingdom [Methodist Church vs. Remington, 1 Watts (Pa.), Reports, p. 224].

The manner of establishing a charity was in the course of time restricted by "the statute of mortmain commonly so called", remarks the Master of the Rolls in Corbyns vs. French, 4 Vesey's Reports, 427, "but"; he adds, "very improperly, for it does not prevent the alienation of land in mortmain, nor was that the object of the Act".

Reciting that gifts of lands in mortmain are restricted by Magna Carta, and other laws as against the public utility, but that "nevertheless this public mischief has of late greatly increased by many large and improvident alienations or dispositions to uses called charitable uses", this statute (9 George II, c. XXXVI, 1736) provides that henceforth such dispositions shall be "null and void", unless executed within three years after the death of the donor, and not less than twelve months before the death of the donor.

The statutes 23 Henry VIII and this statute of George II, in their effect on the dispositions of land, which they prohibit, differ from the old mortmain acts. The statutes referred to render such dispositions void, that is, of no effect whatsoever. But alienations in mortmain properly so termed were not mere nullities, but were effectual to transfer ownership of land to a corporation, by which the land might be retained until its forfeiture.

Enforcement of a forfeiture and the declaring void a charge on, or use of, land are in their nature and result very different.

Sir Matthew Hale states the statute in the case cited from Vesey's Reports that devises for charitable uses are not in themselves alienations in mortmain, the latter word's meaning has yet been claimed to embrace any perpetual holding of land "in a dead or unserviceable hand". And such, it is claimed, "is the characteristic of alienations to charitable uses". Land dedicated to the service of the Church or religion is said to be "practically inalienable", because any disposition of it, which is incompatible with the carrying out or continuity of the benevolent purposes of the conveyance, will be restrained by Courts of Equity (Lewis, "A practical treatise on the Law of Perpetuity", Philadelphia, 1846, 689), in England the Court of Chancery.

For, notwithstanding mortmain statutes, and as if to protect the sovereign from the reproach which, according to Coke, he might otherwise have incurred, the lord chancellors seem, from a period long previous to that of King Henry VIII, to have protected and guarded trusts or uses in favour of charity. The chancellors seem to have administered this duty in the way of the rule of law, the principle of charity, and by force of an assumed, if not expressed, delegation of the royal prerogative and sovereign will.

We cannot here consider the subject of royal prerogative, nor how the modern differs from the ancient theory concerning it. Whether modern legislation against perpetual holdings of land is to be deemed to prohibit dispositions of charity and religion is said to be "practically inalienable", because any disposition of it, which implies perpetual ownership, has been the subject of extensive legal discussion and of discordant judicial decisions.

But according to the existing law of England we learn from Sergeant Stephen (op. cit., III, I74) that "there is now practically no restraint whatsoever on gifts of land by will for charitable purposes. Pure personal estate", he adds, "may, of course, be freely bequeathed for these purposes". All corporations, however, are yet precluded by English law from purchasing land "except by licence in mortmain from the Crown" (ibid., 26).

As to what dispositions of property which otherwise would be deemed secular or to be deemed legally superstitious, the modern law of England is less narrow and rigid than the law was formerly interpreted to be (ibid., 180).

The statutes of mortmain themselves were not extended to the colonies. And respecting the United States Chancellor Kent observes, "We have not in this country re-enacted the Statutes of Mortmain or generally assumed them to be in force; and the only legal check to the acquisition of lands by corporations consists in those special restrictions contained in the acts by which they are incorporated . . . and in the force to be given to the exception of corporations out of the Statute of Wills" (Commentaries on American law, 4th ed., Boston, 1873, II, 203). The commentator states, by way of exception, that the statutes of mortmain are in force in the State of Pennsylvania. The supreme court of that State, in 1832, stated that these statutes had been extended to the State "only so far as they prohibit dedications of property to superstitious uses and grants to corporations, without a solemn and solemnity not less than twelve months before the death of the donor."

The court had in mind, but seemed reluctant to follow, the "Report of the Judges" made in 1808, and which is to be found in 3 Binney's Reports. The "Report" almost follows the statute of Henry VIII, in declaring all conveyances "void made either to an individual or to any number of persons associated, but not incorporated, if the said conveyances are for
uses or purposes of a superstitious nature, and not calculated to promote objects of charity or utility."

Notwithstanding this early declaration, no such doctrine as that of the English courts on the subject of superstitious uses or trusts can well have a place in the jurisprudence of the United States, where "all religious beliefs, doctrines and forms of worship are free." (Holland vs. Acock, 108 New York Court of Appeals Reports, 329).

The people of the States make known their sovereign will by enactments of the State legislatures, to which bodies the prerogatives of sovereignty have been delegated. And, therefore, the validity of dispositions of land in favour of charity is controlled by the legislature of the State where the property is situated and without any implied delegation of prerogative to any judicial officer. And the same remark applies to the general power of corporations to acquire and to hold land in the several States. (See Property, Ecclesiastical, of the Statutes at Large (Cambridge, 1800); Sturrock, Select Charters and other Illustrations of English Constitutional History (6th ed., Oxford, 1884); BURGESS, Commentaries on Colonial and Federal Law, Vol. I (London, 1899), 11, 446, 456; Girard's Executors, 9 Howard, United States Supreme Court Reports, v, 194, 195; Fountain vs. Rasenel, 17 d., v, 384, 385, 389; DILLON, Easement Law, 2 for the Souls of Departed Persons (London, 1890); Holmes vs. Mead, 2 New York Court of Appeals Reports, 321; Auch vs. Stevens, 101 d., 122; THOMPSON, Commentaries on the Law of Private Corporations (Indianapolis, 1909), sections 2600-2601; HALSBURY, The Laws of England (London, 1909), s. v. Corporations.

CHARLES W. SLOANE.

Morton, JOHN, Cardinal, Archbishop of Canterbury, b. in Dorsetshire about 1420; d. at Knowle, Kent, 15 Sept., 1500. He was educated at Oxford (Balliol College) where he graduated B.C.L. Being ordained priest he practised in London as an ecclesiastical lawyer. The patronage of Cardinal Bourchier obtained for him much preferment and he became privy councillor, Chancellor of the Duchy of Cornwall, master in Chancery, subdean of Lincoln (1450), principal of Peckwater Inn, Oxford (1453), and prebendary of Salisbury and Lincoln (1458). During the Civil War he joined the Lancastrians, was attainted by the Yorkists and lost all his offices. During the reign of Edward IV his attainted was reversed on his submission, and he was made Master of the Rolls (16 March, 1472-3), Archdeacon of Winchester and Chester (1474), and was elected Bishop of Ely on 31 Jan., 1476-9. During the reign of Richard III he was imprisoned in the Fleet, afterwards in the Tower, and after the fall of the house of Lancaster when Henry VII became king in 1485. He was much trusted by the king and was all-powerful in the government. He was elected Archbishop of Canterbury, 8 Oct., 1486, and in the following March became Lord Chancellor of England. In 1493 Alexander VI created him Cardinal of St. Anastasia. He was made Chancellor of Oxford in 1495. It is probable that he was the author of the "History of Richard III" usually ascribed to Blessed Thomas More, who as a boy was a page in his household and who subsequently translated it into English.


EDWIN BURTON.

Morton, ROBERT, VENERABLE, English priest and martyr, b. at Bawtry, Yorks, about 1548; executed in Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, Wednesday, 28 August, 1588 (the catalogue probably compiled by Fr. John Gerard), and printed by Fr. Pollard, 8, 1, in Cath. Rec. Soc. Publ. 1, V, 288-293, gives the date of the deaths of the Venerables Morton, Moor, Holford, Claxton, and Felton as 30 August, but this seems to be an error). He was the son of Robert Morton, and nephew of Dr. Nicholas Morton, was ordained deacon at Rome and priest at Reims in 1587, and condemned at Newgate 26 August merely for being a priest contrary to 27 Eliz., c. 2. At the same time and place suffered Hugh Moor, a layman, aged 25, of Grantham, Lincolnshire, and Gray's Inn, London, for having been reconciled to the Church by Fr. Thomas Stephenson, S.J. On the same day suffered (1) at Mile End, William Dean, a priest (q. v.); and Henry Wely, a layman, born at York; and (2) near the Theatre, William Gunter, a priest, born at Raglan, Monmouthshire, educated at Reims; (3) at Clerkenwell, Thomas Holford, a priest, born at Aiston, in Acton, Cheshire, educated at Reims, who was hanged only; and (4) between Brentford and Hounslow, Middlesex, James Claxton or Clarkson, a priest, born in Yorkshire and educated at Reims; and Thomas Felton, born at Bermondsey Abbey in 1567, son of B. John Felton, tonsured 1583 and about to be professed a Minim, who had suffered terrible tortures in prison. According to one account there also suffered on the same day at Holywell, London, one Richard Williams, a Welsh priest of Queen Mary's reign. Another, however, puts his death in 1592 or 1593. Fr. Pollen thinks his name occurs in this year in mistake for that of John Harrison, alias Symonds, a letter carrier, who was it seems executed at Tyburn, 5 October, 1588.


Mosaic Legislation, the body of juridical, moral, and ceremonial institutions, laws, and decisions comprised in the last four books of the Pentateuch, and ascribed by Christian and Hebrew tradition to Moses. Name. —As early as the Davidic era, the name τήρω (to watch) was particularly used to designate this collection, which, however, might not then have embraced all the enactments it now contains. After the captivity, the term became synonymous with the Pentateuch, and this usage has obtained ever since. Side by side with these meanings are others less comprehensive and more ancient. If, as is generally admitted, the word (to watch) be the root, there would be a peculiar historic interest attaching to the word, because of the implication that the first τήρω, or decisions, of whatever kind, were arrived at chiefly, or at least in important cases, by the casting of lots. The deity would then be regarded as the author of them. More developed than these are the first to avail himself of this word (to watch) as were处置 in the case of private litigation at Raphidim (Ex., xviii, 13 sq.) by Moses, relying for his direction on the analogies of precedent or custom. On the lips of the priests and prophets τήρω was sometimes referred to the moral and religious prescriptions of the Law alone, or again, to the ceremonial part of that, whether in theory or practice; in short, to any direction, written or oral, given in Jehovah's name by one enjoying an official capacity.

Quite naturally, when the period of formal codification set in, each new code was styled a τήρω, and these separate τήρω were the stepping-stones to, and afterwards the constituent parts of the "Tora" or Code, which has always been identified with the name of Moses. —More restricted in their signification are the following Biblical terms: δικαίωμα, πρότυπον, precepts; χειρ, mīqwaḥ, commandment; πράξη, ed(wo)th, testimonies, i.e. expressions of God's will to man, chiefly in moral and religious matters; ἀρχή, mishpāḥa, a judgment, usually not excluding positively and negatively, implied in the fact of a literally eventuating, implying an obligatory force arising from the nature of moral verdict, which is enhanced, not obscured, by the notion of theocratic economy; and ψηλή, ἀρχή, hūqeq (root, to engrave), statute, or thing engraved (e. g. on stone), thereby becoming fixed, so to speak, as an ordinance. From this varied terminology, however indiscriminate
the use made of it may have been as time went on, it
seems right to conclude that its originators had more
than a faint perception of the distinction between the
civilly independent and the church. If, in given cases, equal penalties were meted
out for delinquencies from the moral and ceremonial
laws, it was because the nearness of the latter to the
national God by reason of their universal character,
gave deep sense of resistance against them a peculiar hein-
ousness, not found in other crimes. The legislator
understood well that when monotheistic ceremonies
declined, polytheistic institutions would supplant
them, and then there would be no morality left to

"Origin."—The Torah, as a whole, was neither mir-
accurously communicated from heaven, nor was it
labouriously thought out and put together by Moses
independently of his race and influences. It is just
sometimes hazardously asserted that it antedated Moses
by a thousand years or more, since much that
is in the Torah is found also in the Code of Ham-
marâbi. Indeed, certain decrees in the Babylonian
code are more excellent than their Mosaic parallels;
in more important ones, however, the Torah takes
preference over the other versions (Ex., perhaps,
thebrew society that dictated Israel's first laws, by
leading to the establishment of family and tribal customs. Yet it would be wrong to maintain with too much
assurance that the same or a similar collection of laws
would have resulted spontaneously and independently
from the same natural conditions in any other peo-
l. This was the case in Mesoopotamia, where a predomi-
customs and practices as Israel adopted, among other
races with which the founders of Israel's laws had
come in contact, and it seems an irresistible conclu-
sion that, since Israel borrowed its language from its
neighbours and could be so easily won over to heathen
rites as to defy the vigilance of judges, priests, and
powers that be, not only in Israel, but in the social and
politic life of the neighbouring peoples.

The possibilities then are, the following: the migra-
tion of Abraham from Chaldea would be responsible
for the nucleus of Mosaic Legislation, which is pecu-
larily Semitic. The sojourn of the patriarchs among
the Canaanites, coupled with their relations with the
heathen, implies the attainment in his time of a slight
strenghening of the original stock during Jacob's retreat to Mesopotamia. The Egyptian op-
pression would certainly elicit some well-defined views
regarding justice and right. The education of Moses
by Pharaoh's daughter would prepare a master-mind
for tribal unification, while his experiences among the
Semitic Midianites would give him a knowledge of
certain institutions peculiar to desert life, with a due
respect for established usages, such as must be taken
into account even to-day in dealing with the Sinaitic
tribes. Any real influence from the Code of Ham-
murâbi would have to operate, as it likely did,
through one or other of these channels. The direct
result of the evidences would be a transformation of
principles through the knowledge of concrete exam-
les illustrating them, the primitive mind not being
capable of grasping or forming bare abstractions.
What these traditinary laws were, and how they were
reduced to practice in domestic and political life, is
set forth at large in the article on Biblical Anti-
quities.

No matter how much, or how little can be ex-
plained in this way, room must always be left for
direct, external, and Divine intervention, that is for
an historic revelation made by God of Himself to the
chosen people, in such a way as to guarantee them
a special Providence and direction in working out
their high destiny. Since the divine institution was
to be secured to future generations only through the Law by
which they would be governed, the Sinaitic manifesta-
tions must be explained as placing a Divine seal upon
existing laws, which they did not abrogate, and upon
any normal development of them in the future which
would be calculated to carry out the design of
Jehovah more efficiently. There, then, the sense has
been something settled and fixed on the spot, as a
norm to which subsequent prophets might appeal in
their judgments of future laws and contingencies.
It would be strange if some such remote preparation
had not been made for a stupendous event like the
Incarnation. Hence it is that the more reflecting
among Christian critics, whatever be their views as to
the literary composition of the Pentateuch, are at one
in asserting that the Pentateuchal laws, even those of
a ceremonial character, are traceable back to Moses as
their founder; hence, too, the peculiar psychological
phenomenon all through Israel's history, that observ-
ance of the law or any of its parts was superior to
(non-compulsory) sacrifice, because it was a homage of
obedience paid directly to the nation's God.

"Codification."—In its present form the Mosaic Leg-
islation appears without logical order, and interspersed
with historical reminiscences. It is largely
casuistic, as might be expected from the manner of
its early transmission. (1) The Decalogue, with its
setting forth, as it does, the sovereignty and spiritual-
uty of God, together with the sacredness of His and
the neighbour's rights. (2) The "Book of the Cove-
nant", so called in Ex. xxiv, 7, embraces Ex. xxi-
xxiii, 19 (or xx, 20-xxiii, 33), and contains judicial,
moral, and religious regulations for people living in
primitive agricultural conditions. (3) The Deuteron-
omic code amplifies the preceding and adapts it to new
conditions. (4) The "Law of Holiness" as contained
in Lev., xvii-xxvi has reference chiefly to holiness
of a moral and ceremonial nature. It forms a small
part of what is now critically styled the (5) "Priest's
Code". This latter derives from the later enactments,
and comprises nearly all Leviticus and Numbers, with a few chapters of Exodus.

In the light of criticism there is no need of abandoning the tra-
ditional belief that Moses compiled, under the influ-
ence of inspiration, any or all of these codes as they
stood originally, or in that stage of development they
had reached at the time of the composition of the
Pentateuch. We must be content to assert that
these various divisions were by later writers revised,
enlarged, and brought to date, while the changes in
Israel's life, from a nomadic to a sedentary state,
from a dispersed to a king-ruled nation, explain full
well the appearance, as time went on, of a limited
amount of new legislation, that would accord with the
soul and spirit of the old. Common Law, as it were,
grew and developed, but the statutory enactments
remained inviolable.

"Contents."—Abstracting from the distinction of
codes, the Torah exhibits a dogmatic system that is
rigorously monotheistic. A moral standard issues
from this, having for its chief end the constitu-
tion of civil, social, and religious observance, with
service performed directly and immediately for
Jehovah, and at His bidding. A ceremonial char-
terized by its picturesque and wealth of detail
follows, the evident purpose of which was to keep
the people constantly in mind of the Covenant into
which they or their ancestors had entered, and to as-
 sure them of God's fidelity to His promises, if only
they would do their part. The civil and criminal
enactments are sufficiently well explained elsewhere.

The article on Biblical Antiquities dispenses us
from treating in detail any of these topics save the
ceremonial. Even that is largely dealt with under
the paragraph on Sacred Antiquity. (loc. cit.) and the
articles Atonement, Dedication, Jubilee, Pasch,
Pentecost, Purim, Sabbath, Tabernacles, Trumpets.
MOASICS was the centre of public worship. This was a portable tent measuring fifty-two by seventeen feet, and divided by a veil into two unequal parts, the Holy Place and the smaller Holy of Holies. The latter contained only the Ark of the Covenant, and might be entered by no one but Moses and the high priests. Any priest might enter the Holy Place. This was furnished with a table for the Loaves of Proposition, a seven-branched golden candlestick, and the Altar of Incense. Outside, in the surrounding court, were the Altar of Holocauses and the brazen laver for priestly ablutions. The tribe of Levi furnished the ministers, the descendants of Aaron being priests, and the remaining majority, Levites properly so-called. The priests were consecrated, wore special vestments, offered sacrifice, attended to the Holy Place, and acted as judges and teachers. For the peculiar distinction of high priesthood, see the article AARON (section II). The Levites were the priests’ assistants. They carried the Tabernacle whenever it was moved. Bloody and unbloody sacrifices were prescribed. The former class embraced the Holocaust, in which the entire victim was consumed on the altar by fire and the Expiatory and Pacific sacrifices, when only the fat was burned on the altar. The vest was either burned elsewhere or given to the priest as in the first instance, but divided between priest and offerer as in the second, and followed by a sacrificial meal. The Unbloody sacrifices, in the first instance, were tithes, meat and drink offerings, and incense. Both oblations and sacrifices were seasoned with salt.

The most striking feature of the ceremonial legislation is the distinction between legal cleanness and uncleanness, with its concomitant provision for numerous external purifications. The faithful Hebrew had always to abstain from blood. He might not use for food any quadrupeds that did not divide the hoof and chew the cud, nor any fish that did not have both fins and scales, nor birds of prey, nor water fowl, nor reptiles, nor insects, the locust excepted. To do so would make him unclean. The use of marriage, childbirth, and leprosy also induced uncleanness. It is true that this legislation is largely hygienic, but the Hebrews did not consider it as forming a part of the Law, they were regarded as direct from Jehovah, precautions against them were designed primarily to avert them by appeasing the sender. Those, therefore, who failed to take such precautions, either necessarily or otherwise, were displeasing to Jehovah, and legal defilement was the result. How effectually the Torah prepared the Hebrews for their contention with the Chaldeans, the Scythians, the Pharaohs, the Medeans, Babylonians, Persians, and Greeks, is well shown by the many details of the Law, and the fact that in all these cases the edges of the安东，and even in the streets of Rome. There is little doubt but that mosaic in jewellery is of considerable antiquity.

History.—In passing these various species in historical review, the earliest to be mentioned is that in Exodus, a pavement (xxiv, 10), “a pavement of sapphire stones”, and the pavement of Ahasuerus at Susa “paved with porphyry and white marble, and embellished with painting of wonderful variety”, which here, probably, means varied inlaid colour, since surface painting would be out of place on a pavement. And we may well believe that the Persians knew of tessellated work when we consider the enameled bricks, which may be called a large kind
of "tessellatum," now in the Louvre from this same palace at Susa. This is the only record earlier than the existing examples in the Roman pavements of the Republic and Empire such as remain in the Reggia, the Temple of Castor, the House of Livia, Pompeii, etc. Suetonius says that Caesar was accustomed to carry in his campaign both tessellated and sectile pavements. It appears according to Pliny (XXXVI, i) that in the theatres and basilicas, as well as in certain palaces of noble Romans, the pavements were in tessellated work or in marble sectile, and the walls decorated with marble or glass subjects and patterns. Here is the passage from Holland's quaint translation: "Scaurus when he was Edile, caused a wonderful piece of worke to be made, and exceeding all that had ever been knowne wrought by man's hand . . . and a theatre it was: the stage had three lofty one above another . . . the base or nethermost part of the stage was all of marble, the middle of glass, an excessive superfuitie never heard of before or after." Signor Luigi Visconti informed Herr von Minutoli (Ueber die Anfertigung und die neu-Anwendung der färbigen Gläser bei den Alten," p. 15, Berlin, 1836) that the walls of a chamber in a palace between the gate of St. Sebastian and that of St. Paul at Rome were found covered up to five or six feet from the pavement with beautiful marbles and above that with coloured glass plaques and patterns. Some existing examples appear to have been of curious structure, the pieces of coloured glass were laid upon a flat surface and a sheet of glass laid over these and melted to a sufficient heat to join them together.

Concerning the method called "tessellatum" we have existing remains to prove the perfection to which the art was carried by the Romans in the pavements, and in remains of wall glass mosaic at Pompeii. One of the finest examples of pavements is the representation of the "Battle of Issus" from the Casa del Fauno at Pompeii [Fig. 1], now in the Naples Museum. Many of the pictures and mosaics in  

![Fig. 3—Specimen of Roman pavement Found at Silchester, England](image)

Pompeii are supposed to be traditional copies of celebrated antique paintings; and it is suggested that this "Battle" is a traditional copy of a celebrated picture by Helen, a daughter of Timon, of the Egyptian Hellenic school. From Pompeii came further the very beautiful columns in glass mosaic now in the Naples Museum [Fig. 2]. Pompeii, as we know, was destroyed on 24 August, A.D. 79, so

that these works precede the Christian Era. Their perfection argues a development of considerable antiquity, the genesis of which is at present unknown. Of the subsidiary work in mosaic of Roman pavements, mention has already been made—it consists of patterns in black and white, plain floors with ornamental borders; groups of still life, festoons of flowers, and other designs. These exist in sufficient quantity to show how general was their use. That mosaic pavements continued in use during the Christian era is proved by the numerous examples that have been discovered, apparently of Roman origin, at places as distant from one another as Carthage, Dalmatia, Germany, France, and England. In England a great variety have been found in London and in all parts of the country dominated by the Romans; an example from Silchester is given in Figure 3. The British Museum contains many mosaic fragments; amongst these is the fine specimen of work from Carthage [Fig. 4]. Some of the earlier Carthaginian pavements have glass tesserae; the later ones are of marble or ceramic cubes.

Entirely different in method from the work formed of cubes was the opus sectile, where, as already described, the ornament or picture was formed of pieces of marble, stone, or glass of different colours cut to a required shape, in the same way that a painted glass window is now made. The manufacture of the necessary opaque glass was carried to a very great perfection by the Romans, as is testified by the multitude of fragments that have been found in rubbish or in the Tiber. Opus sectile as a wall decoration seems to have been very subject to decay, the pieces of glass becoming detached by their own weight, on the wall becoming damp, decayed, or shaken. There are some very fine specimens in the Naples Museum; others have been found in the church of St. Andrea in Catabarbara, Rome, which is supposed to have been originally the basilica of the house of the Bassi on the Esquiline, dating from about A.D. 317. From this house comes the spirited work [Fig. 5] of the "Tiger and Heifer," now preserved in the church of St. Antonio Abbate. The background and stripes of the tiger are in green porphyry, the rest of the tiger's skin of giallo antico; the heifer is pale fawn marble, and its eyes of mother-of-pearl. Other decorations of the same house showed that the walls had opus sectile in glass ornament and figures, much in the manner described in the quota-
tion from Pliny, already given. Sectile work in glass is found in some examples of Christian art, but marble is more common, although the tessellated work in the same buildings may be of glass. This use of marble probably arose from the decay in the manufacture of the special glass and the difficulty of cutting and grinding it exactly to the forms. Sectile in marbles is found in Santa Sabina, Rome (425–450); in the baptistery of the cathedral, Ravenna; in San Vitale, Ravenna (sixth century); at Parenzo (sixth century); in Sancta Sophia at Constantinople and at Thessalonica, (sixth century); its use thus has been continuous ever since, and was an especial feature of the Renaissance.

The portion of this theme of the greatest importance in the present article is that concerned with the glass mosaic of Christian churches. The initial steps by which it gradually emerged from Pagan art are in a measure lost, for it rises suddenly like a phoenix from the ashes, complete, entire in its manipulation, whilst the character of the subjects and designs represented bespeak the traditions adopted by the artists of the catacombs. Mosaic, as far as one can at present ascertain, became a vehicle of Christian art in the fourth century. The earliest examples, such as those of the first basilica of St. Peter and St. Paul, are all destroyed. In the church of St. Costanza on the Via Nomentana there still remains interesting work. We have also preserved in the Chigi Library some mosaic from the catacomb of Cyriacus. A mosaic of St. Agnes in the catacomb of St. Callistus was, however, so decayed, that the existing picture was painted over it in the sixth century. Other mosaics have been found on sarcophagi in the catacombs. The most interesting early work is, however, that now existing in the apse of the church of St. Pudentiana (398) [Fig. 7]. It has been much restored in parts and was added to in 1588, but the design remains. Of the same period is the mosaic in the baptistery at Naples. It is uncertain whether the apse of St. Rufinus's is of the fourth or fifth century, but it is interesting as early work.

A great impetus to the art occurred when Constantine, in establishing himself on the throne of Byzantium, commenced to give his capital an imperial appearance as far as art was concerned. He gathered together artists from all celebrated centres, and gave to them special legal and civil or civic favours. Of the works carried out by them, the mosaics of the church of St. George at Thessalonica in many cases yet occupy their original position. The naves of St. Mary Major's in Rome still retains some of the fine mosaics placed there in the fifth century (430–440) and the churches of St. Sabina (422–433), of St. Paul without the walls, and of St. John Lateran were also so decorated in the same era (440–462). St. Paul's, destroyed by fire in 1823, has since been restored and little of the original remains. What remains of the original mosaics of St. John Lateran's dates from 432–440. The mosaics of the church of Saints Cosmas and Damian (526–530) were restored in 1600. At Ravenna the mosaic work in the various churches is the finest of its period. That in the baptistery of the cathedral dedicated to St. John the Baptist [Fig. 6] is an especially good example, the church being originally built at the end of the fourth century but burnt in 434. The mosaics of the Mausoleum of Galla Placidia (450) are also of excellent design and workmanship. Unfortunately some of these have been restored with painted stucco. Those in the chapel of the archiepiscopal palace and of the church of St. John the Evangelist are too of this period. The mosaics of the cathedrals of Novara and Astoia and the chapel of St. Satira in St. Ambrose's, Milan, are also of the fifth century. In France at Nantes, Clermont, and Toulouse historians record the placing of mosaics which no longer remain.

The greatest works of the sixth century, and perhaps the greatest of all mosaic works in extent, were those carried out under the Emperor Justinian in Sancta Sophia, Constantinople. In 533, a fire destroyed what then existed, but in a quarter of a century the restoration was commenced under Anthemos and Isidore, who, it is recorded, employed ten thousand builders, craftsmen, and artists. The colour is subdued, and the design and execution good of its period. Justinian also caused the church of Sancta Sophia at Thessalonica to be built, and decorated with mosaic. Further great works were executed at Ravenna at the same period. After the conquest by Belisarius in 533, it became the residence of the exarch in 552, and S. Apollinare Nuovo [Fig. 8], S. Maria in Cosmedin (553–566), S. Vitale (524–534) [Fig. 9], and S. Apollinare-in-Classe (534–549) were built and filled with mosaics. It will be observed that these churches were commenced under the Ostrogoths and finished under Justinian, who probably had the mosaics executed by local artists.
worn by Persians in the Pompeian mosaic of the “Battle of Issus” [Fig. 1] which is not unlike that in the painting of the three children in the furnace, in the catacomb of St. Priscilla, and that in the mosaic of the prophet Daniel at Daphne. The mosaic from S. Michele-in-affresco at Ravenna was taken to Berlin in 1847 and Pope Adrian I permitted Charlemagne to take what he chose of mar-ble and mosaic for his cathedral at Aachen. In Rome the church of Saints Cosmas and Damian (526–530) has mosaics of an entirely different character from those at Ravenna and of a ruder type. In Rome also the basilica of St. Lawrence was decorated with mosaic (577–590). These have been restored. In Paris the church of the Apo- sles which occupied the site where the Panthéon now is was decorated with mosaic about this period.

Notwithstanding the deplorable condition of Rome in the seventh century, the arts were still kept alive and Pope Honorius decorated the tribune of the apse of St. Agnes’s with a beautifully designed mo-saic which still remains. The composition represents in the centre St. Agnes, above her the Divine Hand blessing, and the popes Honorius and Sym-machus on each side. The work appears to be Greek. In the chapel of St. Venantius at St. John Lateran’s, and at St. Stephen’s on the Caelian Hill some mosaics were placed by John IV; other works were done at St. Peter’s and at St. Costanza’s on the Via Nomentana. Mo-saics were also executed for Autun and Auxerre in France. An immense and very fine pavement of this period was found by M. Renan in ancient Tyre, but it is not Christian. Of the eighth century very little mosaic re-mains. Considerable work was done in the old basilica of St. Peter, of which only a fragment, which came from one of the chapels, exists. It is in St. Maria in Cosmedin, and represents the “Adoration of the Wise Men” and strikingly resembles the design of the same subject in enamel on the “Chasse de Huy”. The mosaic was commissioned by John VII in 705–8. In the apse of St. Theodore’s, restored in the last quarter of the eighth century, there is a “majesty”: Christ is seated on an orb, with Sts. Peter, Paul, and Theo-dore. The triclinium of the Lateran Palace was

ornamented with a mosaic of Christ appearing to the Apostles. On the sides were the groups of Christ and St. Sylvester, Constantine, Coporonicus, and St. Peter with Leo III and Charlemagne—all these mosaics, never of high class, were injured by removal and restoration in the eighteenth century. The cathedral of Aachen executed from the orders of Charle-magne at this period was injured by fire in 1650, and utterly destroyed soon afterwards. Certain mo-saics are known to have existed in Picardy, and were eventually destroyed by fire in the twelfth century. Some good fragments of inter-esting mosaic of the early ninth century remain at Germeroydes-Prés, Loiret, France.

In the ninth century, although the decadence in mosaic work was complete, there was, however, an attempt at a slight revival. In Rome mosaics were placed in the churches of Sts. Nereus and Achilleus (795–813), S. Maria (817–824), S. Prassede, S. Cecilia, S. Mark, Sts. Sylvester and Martin (844–847), and portions of St. Peter’s and of S. Maria in Trastevere (885–888). Mosaic was placed in S. Margaretta in Venice (837), in St. Ambrose’s, Milan, and in Sanza Sophia at Constantinople, and some subjects were inserted in the cathedrals of Capua and Padua. Probably the most interesting of the period are those in S. Prassede, where that in the apse appears to be an adaptation of an older design in Santa Cosmas and Damian. In the tenth and eleventh centuries some mosaics were placed in St. Mark’s, Venice, one subject representing Christ with the Blessed Virgin and St. John on each side, and in 1071–1084 the Doge Do-menico Selvo had other mosaics executed, notably in the grand dome, and portions of the pave-ment. It is likely that the smalti were made by the Greeks, who were also probably the designers and executants.

A comparison of the western works of this period with those in the east is very unfavourable to the for-mer. The art had been degenerating in the West, and in certain instances, such as that of Sanza Maria Antiqua, painting on the wall had taken its place. Evidence of this decay, both in design and practice is shown in the fact that when Abbot Desiderius, formerly legate at Constantinople and who became pope as Victor III, wished to decorate the monastery of

FIG. 7—FOURTH-CENTURY MOSAIC
From apse of St. Paulentiana, Rome

FIG. 8—SIXTH-CENTURY MOSAIC
From S. Apollinare Nuovo, Ravenna, Italy
Monte Cassino with mosaics, he brought artists and workmen from Constantinople in 1066 for that purpose. These mosaics are lost or decayed, but it is not unlikely that the artists so engaged, designed and worked on the wall paintings of Sant' Angelo-in-formis, a subsidiary church of the monastery near Capua. These most interesting paintings are still in a fair state of preservation. It is probable that this action of Desiderius had a far-reaching influence in importing fresh energy, especially when he came to occupy the papal chair. The schools of Paulus Laurentius and Rainerius were founded, which were ultimately influenced by the Cosmati, and all the work of this character was at one time erroneously called cosmati work. The generation of these schools is of considerable interest in the history of mosaic, and is given by Mr. A. L. Frothingham, in the "American Journal of Archæology" I, 183. The main features of the decorative mosaic of the Roman School were derived from southern Italy, indirectly from Byzantium, in the eleventh century. The mosaics of the twelfth century are remarkable both for their number and the development of design in Christian art. A new period was inaugurated in Rome under Innocent II. In Italy, in Greece, in Syria and Arabia, as well as in Germany and France, important examples are preserved. In Rome, S. Maria in Trastevere (where the design and execution of the mosaic in the apse is extremely grand), S. Crisogono, S. Maria, and S. Francesca Romana were also so decorated.

The Roman artists exerted great influence in Umbria, and the Abruzzi, including the Marches. These men were at times both architects, mural painters, and mosaic workers. From the Roman centre their work went west to considerable distances. Other great works in Italy of this period are in the cathedral of Torcello, in the chapel of St. Zeno, and in the apse of S. Maria, in Venice, 1150; in the cathedral of Palermo, in Sicily, and in the Palatine chapel Arab workmen assisting the Greeks both in the design and execution. The Mohammedans themselves, notwithstanding the order of the prophet, had occasionally figure design in the mosaic of their mosques; that of Abd-el-Melik at Jerusalem has figures of prophets in the porch, and on the walls inside an Inferno and a Mohammedan Paradiso. The mosaic ornamentation in the mosques of Seville, Cordova, and Granada are well known to travellers. In Greece there still remain the most interesting mosaics of the churches of Daphne, and of St. Luke of Stiris in Phocis [Fig. 11]. In Syria, there remain the celebrated series of mosaics in the church of the Nativity, Bethlehem; those in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the Mosque of Omar. The mosaics of this period in the churches of Mount Athos are all lost excepting a few figures at Vatopedi. In France, Abbot Sugger had mosaics executed for the church of Saint Denis, and there are records of such work at Lyons and Troyes.

The great period of Christian mosaic was probably in the thirteenth century. Rome, Florence, Pisa, Venice, Parno, and Spoleto still possess great works of this era, and the names of Cimabue, Giotto, P. Cavallini, Gaddo Gaddi, Jacobus Torriti, Tafi, Apollonio, and others are connected with the craft. Torriti did important work in St. Mary Major's and St. John Lateran's; Pietro Cavallini designed the subjects under the apse of S. Maria in Trastevere; important mosaics were done in St. Peter's, St. Clemente's, and other churches. In 1298 the great Giotto was called to Rome to design the "navicella" for the Porch of S. Peter's; that now in situ is a restoration. In Florence the mosaics of the baptistery commenced in 1225 by Jacobus, a Franciscan, were continued at the end of the century by Andrea Tafi, Gaddo Gaddi, Apollonio, and afterwards by Arnolfo Gaddi. Gaddo Gaddi also did the beautiful "Madonna" at Santa Maria del Fiore, and the "majesty" at San Miniato is also attributed to him, but it is so much restored that it is difficult to pass judgment upon it. At the end of the century (1298-1301) there was executed the celebrated "majesty" in the apse of the cathedral at Pisa. This has generally been attributed to Cimabue and the side figures to Vicino. To this opinion Venturi adheres with strong evidence (Storia dell' Arte Italiana, V, 239-240). Gerspach, however, will not have Cimabue amongst the mosaicists (La Mosaïque, 127). At Civitã Cas-
fore the shrine of St. Thomas in Canterbury cathedral, and that of the sanctuary of Westminster Abbey was laid, and the shrine of St. Edward the Confessor, with its inlaid mosaic, was executed. Concerning this last, Robert de Ware was sent by the king to Rome in 1267 to procure workmen for the ornamentation of Westminster Abbey and to erect a new monument to St. Edward the Confessor, that made in 1241 not being good enough. The abbot brought back with him one "Petrus", who laid the mosaic pavement before the high altar and executed the tomb for the golden shrine of St. Edward. That this Petrus was an eminent person is without doubt. There are recorded many artists of this name, but he who, in the opinion of Mr. Frothingham (American Journal of Archaeology, 1889, 186), did the work in St. Edward's Chapel was Petrus Orderisi, son of Andreas. Horace Walpole (History of Painting in England, I, 17) considers that the artist so called was Pietro Cavallini; both these artists may be termed Cosmati. A portion of the inscription reads: VEC TO ESS FACTUM QUO PETRUS DUXIT IN ACTUM ROMANUS CITIV.

The work of the fourteenth century in Rome and in Italy generally was a continuation of that of the thirteenth, the design towards the end of the era becoming influenced by the rising art of the more western styles. In St. Mary Major's the "Coronation of The Blessed Virgin" was commenced at the conclusion of the thirteenth and completed early in the fourteenth century; it is signed by the celebrated artist and mosaicist, Jacobus Torriti. Gaddo Gaddi designed the smaller subjects underneath, soon afterwards. The same artist is said to have completed the work in St. Peter's left by Torriti. He was then called to Arezzo to do the result of the cathedral, which fell away before the end of the century. Torriti also did the apse of St. John Lateran's; Filippo Rusuti designed the "majesty", and Gaddo Gaddi the lower subject of the façade of St. Mary Major's, Rome. A mosaic by Müno de Zamaro, a Dominican who died in 1300, is on the floor of St. Sabina's. At the beginning of the century the work in St. Mark's, Venice, was continued. A mosaicist, Solferino, did the dome at Spoleto; and the apse at Parenzo was filled with mosaic. Perhaps the most important developments of the art are shown in the subjects decorating the lower part of the apse of S. Maria in Trastevere [Fig. 12]; in 1291 these subjects were commenced by Pietro Cavallini, who is said by Vasari to have been a pupil of Giotto, although this is questioned by modern critics on fairly substantial evidence. He was the most celebrated Roman artist of his time and his designs, while adhering more to the Byzantine than those of Giotto did, show a ten-

dency to what may be called Gothic development. His accessories show his cosmatesque affinity; this is very noticeable in the throne of the Blessed Virgin in S. Crisogono.

Mosaic work of the period remains at Salerno, Naples and Ravello; at Ferano there are mosaics by Deodato Cosmos (1332); at Orvieto by two religious, Ceco Vanni and Francesco; at Fies (in 1321) by Vicino, who finished that commenced by Gimabue, from the designs of Gaddo Gaddi. Andrea di Mino and Michele worked in the cathedral of Sienna, and Deodato Cosmos worked at Teramo. Charles IV called Italian mosaicists to Prague; they also worked at Marienweide and Marienburg, but the art did not apparently thrive in Germany. Mosaic was, however, being rapidly superseded by fresco, which as a primary art giving the sentiment and character of the artists immediately, was of course much more esteemed by persons of discrimination than a mere copy in tessere, or slabs of opaque glass. Hence in the fifteenth century the cessation of mosaic work in Italy generally was very notable, except in the case of churches in which it had been commenced. Some little was done in St. Peter's, and the work in St. Mark's, Venice, was continued in 1430, when in the chapel of the Mascoli the "Life of the Blessed Virgin" was designed and executed by Grambomo. Mosaicists named Petrus, Lazarus, Sylvester, and Antonius also worked there. In Florence, Alessandro Baldovinetti (1425-1450) did a mosaic for St. John's and restored that in San Miniato; he studied the making of smalti, etc. from a German and wrote a work on the technique of the art. He was the master of Domenico Ghirlandajo, who not only did the mosaic of the "Assumption" over a porch of the cathedrals, the chapel of St. Zeno, but also designed some of the painted windows in S. Maria Nuova, and whose brother David also followed the same vocation and in 1497 worked at Orvieto and Siena. A specimen of David's work is in the Musée de Cluny. Ridolfo Ghirlandajo, son of Domenico and a friend of Raphael, has certain later mosaics attributed to him.

In the sixteenth century the work of St. Mark's was still carried on and a great many artists of reputation were engaged on the designs. The mosaics executed in this cathedral, commencing in 1530, are far too numerous to recapitulate here, and are perhaps less fitted to the building than any hitherto placed; in fact, that greatest of painters, Titian, when rendered in mosaic, becomes coarse, heavy, and, on occasions, grotesque. Other works were designed by Tintoretto, Saliati, and the best Venetian artists of the day, and rendered in mosaic by Zucchi, Rizzo, Mariano, and
others. Unfortunately many of the earlier mosaics were destroyed by the senate, it is said, on the advice of Titian, to make room for the new work. The condition of many of them was bad. Amongst his many other works, Raphael designed for mosaic. The "Creation of the World" in the Chigi Chapel, Santa Maria del Popolo, Rome, from his design, is very fine. It was done in mosaic by Luigi di Pace, who came from Venice for the purpose. Baldassare Peruzzi also designed mosaic for Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, and F. Zucchio executed a mosaic in Santa Maria Scala-Casli, whilst the work in St. Peter's was commenced under Mussiano da Brescia. That the mosaic art had degenerated altogether and lost its vitality is evident by the work done in St. Peter's, Rome, from the seventeenth century under this same Mussiano da Brescia (1528-1592) and other artists.

The establishment of the pontifical works commenced in 1727 when the Cisterci and were appointed superintendents by order of Benedict XIII. After occupying various localities these mosaic works were finally settled in a cortile of the Vatican in 1825. In the first half of the seventeenth century the paintings and frescoes of the basilica began to be imitated in mosaic. The quality of the work was on the side of excessive smoothness, as much as some modern works are on that of excessive and affected roughness. Other works of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and great restorations kept the art alive, notably those of St. John Lateran's and St. Mark's, Venice, by the Italian mosaicists. The "Last Judgment" on the façade of St. Mark's was designed by Battistini Quercano in 1836. In 1859 a school of mosaicists arose in Russia, its primary object being the restoration of the mosaics of Santa Sophia in Kieff, and eventually Pius IX allowed certain of the pontifical mosaicists in 1850 to go to St. Petersburg and join the Russian mosaicists. An example of their work was shown in the international exhibition held in Hyde Park, London. The mosaics of the Russian church, London, are not, however, very successful.

Numerous mosaics have been executed in England during the last half century, notably the figures of great painters in the Museum of South-Kensington. The earliest of these were done by Venetians, but some of the more recent figures were executed at the works of South-Kensington itself. Many mosaics were done in St. Paul's cathedral, London; those in the choir were designed by Sir W. B. Richmond, and under the dome some strong figures were designed by Mr. Watte, R.A. The mausoleum at Frogmore is also elaborately decorated with mosaic, as is the monument of Prince Albert in Hyde Park, both designed by John Clayton, who is architect for Bramptton chapel in Westminster cathedral. Mr. W. C. Symons designed the mosaics for the chapel of the Holy Souls of Westminster cathedral in which mosaic work is still being inserted in the various chapels. The writer of the present article designed a mosaic of the "Last Judgment" for the church of the Annunciation, Chislehurst; a figure of Blessed Giacomo di Ulma for South-Kensington, and an "Epiphany" for the front of an altar at the Assumption Church, Warwick Street, with other works elsewhere.

In Aachen the mosaic of the dome of Charlemagne was restored, or rather redone, in 1869. In France, various mosaics of fair excellence have been executed, but unfortunately the speed of the early centuries, so exceptionally suitable to the art, has not been attempted. The modern French mosaic appears to have been initiated by Signor Bellini, one of the Vatican mosaicists, at the close of the eighteenth century, who became the principal of the "manufacture royale"—one of its productions is in the Salle du Paupère in the Louvre. The mosaics are the work of Gérard and M. Badary Garnier, and the mosaic by Curzon Facchino. The mosaics at the Opéra are of Italian execution. In 1876 a national school of mosaic was formed, when M. Gerspass was sent to Rome and obtained, with the consent of the pope, the services of Signor Poggioli of the Vatican works. The execution of the apse of the Madeleine and that over the grand staircase of the Louvre, M. Ravaux having executed some mosaics for the new cathedral of Marseilles.

Technique.—The making of a mosaic picture has differed in various periods and under various manufacturers, and the materials to which the tesserae were fixed have been the subject of discussion and, in some medieval examples, of secrecy. Historically the method by which it has been simplest to every ancient example not destroyed—is partially restored. The following interesting account is from the personal examination by Messrs. Schults and Barnsley of the old work at St. Luke's of Stiri:

The method of fixing the mosaic was as follows:—Over the structural network of the surfaces to be covered, a coat of plaster in ordinary wall coverings, was roughened on the face in order to make a second coat of finer stuff adhere. On the surface of this second coat, which was evidently of a very slow-setting nature, the main lines of the mosaic figure or composition were sketched on in tone with a brush, and the mosaic cubes were then pressed close against the face, forcing up the stuff between the cubes in order to act as a key. We are inclined to think that, at any rate in the case of the single figures, the first cubes put in position were the double or treble row of gold tessere which enclosed the subject; we have found in many cases that these do not correspond with the lines of the figures as executed, odd spaces between the lines and the final outline of the figure having been filled up with further gold cubes after the mosaics of figure had been finished in position. The backgrounds are universally formed of gold tessere, while the figures of subjects are composed of cubes of many colours and generally the principal coloured cubes are cut out of sheets of opaque coloured glass, while the lighter ones, such as the flesh tints, etc., are of marble. The gold mosaics are formed in the usual manner; a piece of gold leaf,
MOSAIC MAP OF CHRISTIAN PALESTINE AND EGYPT
FORMING THE GREATER PORTION OF THE FLOOR OF A FIFTH- OR SIXTH-CENTURY
CHURCH AT MEDABA (MEDEBA)—DISCOVERED IN 1896
having been laid on glass, a thin transparent film was then spread over the same, and the whole afterward exposed to the rays of the sun. The images vary greatly in size, the average being about three-eighths of an inch. They are, however, slightly larger in the main outlines of the draperies, etc., and smaller in the delicate gradations of the face and hands. The main portion of the gold background is laid fairly regularly in horizontal lines up to the rows entirely filled out. It was written out by Jettler in the "Ecclesiæ Graecæ Monumenta," II (Paris, 1861), which is reprinted in Migne, P. G., LXXXVII, III, 2851-3112. A Latin translation by Bl. Ambrose Traversari, is printed in Migne, P. L., LXXIV, 121-240, and an Italian version made from the Latin of Traversari (Venice, 1475; Vicenza, 1479). Conjointly with Sophronius, Moschus wrote the Dialogi de Subterraneis, a fragment of which is preserved in the first chapter of the "Vita S. Ioanni Eleeemosynarii" by Leontius, under the name of "Simeon Metaphrastes" (P. G., CXIV, 895-906).}


Michael Ott.

Moscow (Russian Moskva), the ancient capital of Russia and the chief city of the government (province) of Moscow, situated in almost the centre of European Russia. It lies on both sides of the River Moskva, from which it derives its name; another small stream, the Yauza, flows through the eastern part of the city. Moscow was the fourth capital of Russia—the ancient city of Kieff no longer holds the place of the Terns from 1340 until the time of Peter, the Great, in 1711. It is the holy city of Russia, almost surpassing in that respect the city of Kieff, and is celebrated in song and story under its poetic name Bieokamennaya, the "White-Walled." The population, according to the latest (1907) available statistics, is 1,355,104, and it is the greatest commercial and industrial city of Russia. It is the see of a Russian Orthodox metropolitan with three auxiliary or vicar bishops, and has 440 churches, 24 convents, over 500 schools (with high schools, professional schools, and the university besides), some 500 establishments of charity, mercy, and hospital service, and 23 cemeteries, with the level of the Moskva and its tributaries beyond. There are 1,242,990 Orthodox, 26,320 Old Ritualists, 25,540 Catholics, 26,650 Protestants, 8905 Jews, and 5336 Mohammedans, together with a small scattering of other denominations.

Historically, the city of Moscow, which has grown up gradually around the Kremlin, is divided into five principal parts or concentric divisions, separated from one another by walls, some of which have already disappeared and their places been taken by broad boulevards. These chief divisions are the Kremlin, Kitajgorod (Chinese town), Byelygorod (white town), Zemljanigorod (earthwork town), and Mietschanskygorod (the bourgeois town). The actual municipal division of the city is into seventeen wards, each of which has a set of local officials and separate police sections. The city hall or Duma is situated on Ascension Square near the Kremlin. The Kremlin itself is a walled acropolis and is the most ancient part of Moscow, the place where the city originated; it is situated in the very center of the present city, some 140 feet above the level of the Moskva. The Kitajgorod, or Chinese town, is situated to the north-east and outside of the Kremlin, and is in turn surrounded by a wall with several gates. It is irregularly built up, contains the Stock Exchange, the Gostiny Door (bazaar), the Board (great glass en-
closed arcades), and the printing office of the Holy Synod. Just why it was called the Chinese town is not known, for no Chinese have ever settled there. The allusion may be to the Tatars, who besieged and took Moscow several times, camping outside the Kremlin.

The Kremlin and Kitaigorod are considered together and known as the "City" (gorod), much as the same word is applied to a part of London. The enormous walls surrounding them were originally whitewashed and of white stone, and are even yet white in places, thus giving rise to the poetic name.

where the Tatars dwelt for a long time after they had been driven from Moscow proper. Now it is the Old Russian quarter, where old-fashioned merchants dwell in state and keep up the manners and customs of their fathers. The famous Tretiakov art galleries are situated here. There are six bridges across the River Moskva connecting both parts of the city.

The name Moscow is mentioned in Russian chronicles for the first time in 1147. In March of that year Yuri Dolgoruki (George the Long-armed), Grand Duke of Kiev and son of Vladimir Monomachus, is

Just outside of it lies the Bielygorod, or white town, extending in a semicircle from the Moskva on the one side until it reaches the Moskva again. The Bielygorod is now the most elegant and fashionable part of the city of Moscow. Containing as it does, beautiful and imposing palaces, many fine public monuments and magnificent shops, theaters, and public buildings, it presents a splendid appearance worthy of its ancient history. Around this, in a still wider semicircle, is the Zemlianygorod, or earthwork town, so called because of the earthen ramparts which were constructed there by Tsar Michael Feodorovich in 1620 to protect the growing city in the Polish wars. They have been levelled and replaced by the magnificent boulevards known as the Sadowaya (Garden Avenues).

The wealthy merchants and well-to-do inhabitants dwell here, and fine buildings are seen on every side. The remainder of the city is given over to the industrial and poor classes, railway stations, and factories of all kinds. In addition, there is that part of the city which lies on the south side of the Moskva, the so-called Zamoskvorechische (quarter beyond the Moskva) said to have met and entertained his kinmen there at the village on the Moskva. So pleased was he with the reception which he had received and so impressed by the commanding location of the situation that he built a fortified place on the hill where the meeting took place, just where the present Kremlin is situated. The word Kremlin (Russian Kreml) seems to be of Tatar origin, and means a fortified place overlooking the surrounding country. Many other Russian cities dating from Tatar times have kremlins also, such as Nizhni-Novgorod, Vladimir, Kazan, and Samara.

In the beginning of its early history Moscow was nothing but a cluster of wooden houses surrounded by palisades; in 1237 the Tatar Khan laid siege to it, and his successors for several centuries were alternately victors and vanquished before it. In 1293 Moscow was besieged and burned by the Mongols and Tatars, but under the rule of Daniel, son of Alexander Nevsky, its fame increased and it became of importance. He conquered and annexed several neighbouring territories and enlarged his dominions to the entire length of the River Moskva.
In 1300 the Kremlin was enclosed by a strong wall of earth and wooden palisades, and it then received its appellation. In 1316 the Metropolitan of Kiev changed his see from that city to Vladimir, and in 1322 thence to Moscow. The first cathedral of Moscow was built in 1327. The example of the metropolitan was followed in 1328 by Grand Duke Ivan Danilovich, who left Vladimir and made Moscow his capital. In 1333 he was recognized by the Khan of Kasan as the chief prince of Russia, and he extended the fortifications of Moscow. In 1367 stone walls were built to enclose the Kremlin. Notwithstanding

self Tsar, the Slavonic name for king or ruler found in the church liturgy, and that name has survived to the present time, although Peter the Great again changed the title and assumed the Latin name Emperor (Emperor). This latter name is the one now commonly used and inscribed on public monuments and buildings in Russia. Moscow was almost completely destroyed by fire in 1547; in 1571 it was besieged and taken by Devlet-Ghurei, Khan of the Crimean Tatars, and again in 1591 the Tatars and Mongols under Kara-Ghirei for the last time entered and plundered the city, but did not succeed in taking

this, the city was again plundered by the Tatars two years later. During the rule of Dimitri Donskoi in 1382 the city was burned and almost entirely destroyed. Vasili II was the first Russian prince to be crowned at Moscow (1425).

The city, although still the greatest in Russia, began to decline until the reign of Ivan III (1462-1505). He was the first to call himself "Ruler of all the Russians" (Hospodar uezya Rossii), and made Moscow pre-eminently the capital and centre of Russia, besides constructing many beautiful monuments and buildings.

His wife, who was Sophia Palaeologus, was a Greek princess from Constantinople, whose marriage to him was arranged through the pope, and who brought with her Greek and Italian artists and architects to beautify the city. But even after that the Tatars were often at the gates of Moscow, although they only once succeeded in taking it. Under Ivan IV, sur

named the Terrible (Ivan Goryny), the development of the city was continued. He made Novgorod and Pakoff tributary to it, and subdued Kasan and Astraksan. He was the first prince of Russia to call himself the Kremlin. During the reign of Ivan the Terrible the adventurer Yermak crossed the Ural Mountains, explored and claimed Siberia for Russia; the first code of Russian laws, the Stoglav (hundred chapters), was also issued under this emperor, and the first printing-office set up at Moscow. Ivan was succeeded by Feodor I, the last of the Rurik dynasty, during whose reign (1584-98) serfdom was introduced and the Patriarchate of Moscow established. During the latter part of the reign of Ivan the Terrible, Boris Godunoff, a man of high ambitions who had risen from the ranks of the Tatars, attained to great power, which was augmented by the marriage of his sister to Feodor. To ensure his brother-in-law's succession to the throne, he is said to have caused the murder of Ivan's infant son, Demetrius, at Uglich in 1582. When Feodor I died, Boris Godunoff was made Tsar, and ruled fairly well until 1605. The year before his death the "False Demetrius" (Lshedidimitri) appeared. He was said to have gone under the name of Gregory Otrepieff, a monk of the Chudoff monastery (Monastery of the Miracles) in the Kremlin, who fell into disgrace, escaped to Poland, gave himself
out as Demetrius, the son of Ivan the Terrible, who had in some way escaped Boris Godunov, another child having been murdered. King Sigismund of Poland espoused his claims, furnished him an army, with which and its Russian alliances the pretender followed his way back to Moscow and worshiped the rightful heir to the throne. All who looked on Boris Godunov as a usurper flocked to his standard, the widow of Ivan, then a nun, recognized him as her son, and he was crowned in the Kremlin as the Tsar of the Russians. For ten months he ruled, but, as he was too favourable to the Poles and even allowed Catholicks to come to Moscow and worship, the tide then turned against him, and in 1606 he was assassinated at his palace in the Kremlin by the Strelci or sharpshooters who formed the guard of the Tsars of Russia.

After seven years of civil war and anarchy Michael Romanoff, the founder of the present dynasty, was elected Tsar in 1613. But Moscow never regained its earlier pre-eminence, although it became a wealthy commercial city, until the first part of the reign of Peter the Great (1689—1725). He sent persons abroad, and, having observed the advancement and progress of Western Europe, determined to improve his realm radically by introducing the forms of western civilization. At earlier part of his war with the Swedish invaders and the Polish kings. In 1700 he abolished the patriarchate of Moscow, left the see vacant, and established the Holy Synod. These acts set Moscow, the old Russians and the clergy against him, so that in 1712 he changed the imperial residence and capital from Moscow to St. Petersburg, which he had chosen for the new capital on the banks of the Neva. After the departure of the Tsars from Moscow, it diminished in political importance, but was always regarded as the seat and centre of Russian patriotism. In 1755 the University of Moscow was founded. In 1812 during the invasion of Russia by Napoleon, the Russians determined after the Battle of Borodino to evacuate Moscow before the victorious French, and on 14 September, 1812, the Russian troops deserted the city, followed by the greater part of the inhabitants. Shortly afterwards the French entered, and Napoleon found that he had no submissive citizens to view his triumphal entry, but that the inhabitants would not go to meet him even from the city, and that the houses even then built largely of wood. He revenged himself by desecrating churches and destroying monuments. The Russian winter begins in October, and, with a city in smoking ruins and without supplies or provisions, Napoleon was compelled on 19—22 October, to evacuate Moscow. Moscow, retired and Nishtford, Cold and privation were the most effective allies of the Russians. The reconstruction of the city commenced the following year, and from that time hardly any wooden buildings were allowed. In May, 1896, at the coronation of Nicholas II, over 2000 persons were crushed and wounded in a panic just outside the city gates. The Grand Duke Sergius was assassinated in the Kremlin and revolutionary riots occurred throughout the city. Although Moscow is no longer the capital, it has steadily grown in wealth and commercial importance, and, while second in population to St. Petersburg, it is the latter's close rival in commerce and industry, and is first above all in the heart of every Russian.

In the religious development of Russia Moscow has held perhaps the foremost place. In 1240 Kieff was taken by the Tatars, who, in 1299 pillaged and destroyed much of that mother city of Christian Russia. Peter, Metropolitan of Kieff, who was then in union with Rome, in 1316 changed his see from that city to the city of Vladimir upon the Khiarm, now about midway between Moscov and Nizhni-Novgorod, for Vladimir was then the capital of Great Russia. In 1322 he again changed it to Moscow. After his death in 1328 Theognoetus, a monk from Constantinople, was consecrated Metropolitan at Moscow under the title "Metropolitan of Kieff and Exarch of all Russia", and strove to make Great Russia, of the monastic order, a metropolitan of all Russia. In 1371 the South Russians petitioned the Patriarch of Constantinople: "Give us another metropolitan for Kieff, Smolensak, and Tver, and for Little Russia." In 1379 Pimen took at Moscow the title of "Metropolitan of Kieff and Great Russia", and in 1408 Phiotius, a Greek from Constantinople, was made "Metropolitan of all Russia" at Moscow. Shortly afterwards an assembly of South Russian bishops was held at Novgorod, and determined to become independent of Moscow, sent to the Patriarch of Constantinople for a local metropolitan to rule over them. In 1416 Gregory I was made "Metropolitan of Kieff and Lithuania", independently of Phiotius who ruled at Moscow. But at the death of Gregory no successor was appointed for his see. Gerasim (1431—5) was the successor of Phiotius at Moscow, and had correspondence with Pope Eugenius IV as to the reunion of the Eastern and Western Churches. The next Metropolitan of Moscow was the famous Greek monk, Isidore, consecrated under the title of, he was a great advocate of union. When the Council of Florence for the reunion of the East and the West was held, he left Moscow in company with Bishop Abraham of Suzdal and a large company of Russian prelates and theologians, attended the council, and signed the act of union in 1439. Returning to Russia, he arrived at Moscow in 1441, but in his subsequent efforts for union to little liturgy at the cathedral of the Assumption in the Kremlin in the presence of Grand Duke Vasili II and the Russian clergy and nobility. At its close his chief deacon read aloud the decree of the union of the churches. None of the Russian bishops or clergy raised their voices in opposition, but the grand duke afterward upheld Isidore for turning the Russian people over to the Latins, and shortly afterwards the Russian bishops assembled at Moscow followed their royal master's command and condemned the union and the action of Isidore. He was imprisoned, but eventually escaped to Lithuania and Kieff, and after many adventures reached Rome. The relations of Russia were entirely distinct, the prelates of Moscow bearing the title "Metropolitan of Moscow and all Russia" and those of Kieff, "Metropolitan of Kieff, Halich, and all Russia". This division and both titles were sanctioned by Pope Pius II. But Kieff continued Catholic and in communion with the Holy See for nearly a century, while Moscow adhered to Orthodoxy and remained in schism. After Isidore the Muscovites would have no more metropolitans sent to them from Constantinople, and the grand duke thereupon selected the metropolitan. Every effort was then made to have the metropolitans of Moscow independent of the metropolitan of Kieff at Constantinople. After the Turks had captured Constantinople, the number of its patriarch dwindled still more. When the Bishop of Novgorod declared in 1470 for union with Rome, Philip I, Metropolitan of Moscow, frustrated it, declaring that, for signing the union with Rome at Florence, Constantinople had been punished by the Turks. This hatred of Rome was fomented to such a point that, rather than have one who favored Rome, a Jew named Zozimas was made Metropolitan of Moscow (1490—4); as, however, he openly supported his brethren, he was finally deposed as an unbeliever. Yet in 1525 the metropolitan Daniel had a correspondence with Pope Clement VII in regard to the Florentine Union, in 1545 with the Jesuit Fossevo, who visited Ivan the Terrible and sought to have him accept the principles of the Union. In 1586, after
standing. It was once a busy and prosperous town, trading in woolen goods and morocco leather, but during the nineteenth century, owing to lack of communications with the outside world and also to the opening of the Suez canal which changed the caravan route, it has decayed. At the present time it is the capital of a vilayet and has 70,000 inhabitants. Its girdle of wall more than two miles circumference has not proved large for it. The town has sulphur springs and many very fine mosques and churches. Among its more famous citizens were Baha ed-Din, Ibn el-Athir, and Ibn Khallikan, Mussalmans; Thomas of Marga, Isaac of Nineveh, Hanna of Adiabene, etc. Christians.

The Council of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, the Metropolitan of Adiabene had the united titles of Ar-bela, Hazza, Assyria, and Mosul (Chabot, "Synodical orientale," 265, 619). This is the earliest mention of the See of Mosul. It continued under the same style up to the seventh century. Soon after the Arab invasion the title of Adiabene was replaced by that of Assyria and Mosul. Le Quien (Ortes chrest., II, 1215-1220) gives a long list of titularies from the seventh to the sixteenth century. Many of the Nestorian patriarchs of Mosul became converts and resided there, beginning with Elias Denham in 1751.

As there was already a Catholic Chaldean patriarch at Diarbekir, Rome in 1838 and especially in 1830 brought the orders of the Eastern Church to improve the condition in Mosul. Elias, also known as John VIII, was recognized as the only patriarch. He transferred the residence of the see to Bagdad, and since that time the Chaldean patriarchs have again taken up their residence at Mosul. The Chaldean archdiocese numbers 20,000 souls; 45 secular priests; 12 parishes; and 13 churches. In the north the Chaldean archdiocese of Mosul, the home of the Antonian Congregation of St. Hormisidas of the Chaldean rite, who have two other convents in the diocese. The congregations numbers in all 63 religious of whom 30 are priests. The Jacobites took up their residence at Mosul at an early date, especially at the Convent of Mar Mattai, the principal centre of their activity. There also since 1089 dwells the "Maphrian" or delegate of the patriarch for the ecclesiastical provinces in Persia, a title or office now purely honorary. The Monophysites are very numerous in the city and the diocese. The Syriac Catholic diocese numbers 6,000 souls; 20 priests; 7 parishes; and 10 churches. Le Quien (Ortes chrest., II, 1559-1564) gives a list of Jacobite titularies of Mosul.

The Apostolic Mission of Mosul was founded in 1750 by Benedict XIV as a Prefecture Apostolic and entrusted to the Italian Dominicans who had repeatedly labored in the province from the thirteenth century onwards. Thanks to them, a Syrian Catholic diocese was erected at Mosul in that same year. In 1780, the Nestorian patriarch Mar Yohannan, who resided at Alkosh, 25 miles north-east of Mosul, became a Catholic together with five bishops of his nation, the greater part of the inhabitants of his town, and of six villages in the vicinity. The French monks who replaced the Italian friars in 1856, thanks to M. Boré, and to the French Consul, the Assyriologist of Botta, to open boys' and girls' schools, and to found a printing press for Arabic and Syriac works, and finally college at Mosul. The Apostolic Mission at the present day is bounded by three other French Missions, that of the Capuchins at Mardin, the Carmelites at Baghdad, and a few protesting. It includes the south-east of Mesopotamia, Kurdistan, and the north-east of Armenia Major, a stretch of territory covering the vilayets of Mosul, Bitlis, Van, and a part of Diarbekir. Besides the Arabs, Kurds, and Mussulman Turks (about 3,000,000), and the Yezidis or Devil-worshippers (about 30,000), the Mission numbers 30,000 Nestorians; 5000 Protestants; and 10,000 Jews. The Catholics of all the rites scattered through the territory amount to 80,000. The Mission has 23 Latin priests, all Dominicans, and 15 native priests who assist them in teaching. There are 9 Latin churches, 5 residential stations (Mosul, founded in 1750; Mar-Yakoub in 1847; Van in 1851; Seert in 1882; Djeireh in 1894), and 98 secondary stations visited by the missionaries. In 1910 a station was founded in the heart of the Nestorian patriarchate. The Syro-Chaldean Seminary, founded at Mosul in 1882, has educated more than 60 priests; it has between 50 and 60 students. There are 50 parochial schools for boys; 8 for girls; 1 Normal School for Chaldean Catholic teachers at Mar-Yakoub; 3 colleges for boys; 4 boarding schools for girls; 4 orphanages opened in consequence of the massacres of 1895. The Dominicanesses of the Presentation have houses at Mosul, Seert, and Van.

CAVUZZI, La Turquie d'Asie, II (Paris, 1892), 819-927; PIOZZI, Missions, I (Paris, 1855-1890), 256-271; Missions Cath. (Rome, 1907), 162, 806-8.

S. VAILLÉ.

Mostar and Markana-Trebinje, Dioceses of (MANDATRIENSIS, MARCANESI ET TIBURNENSIS).

When at the Berlin Congress (1878) Austria-Hungary was allowed to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina, the religious situation was at once regulated. The religious hatred existed as best it could. The foreign administrator, Count Keyserling (567,000, 43 per cent), Mohammedans (549,000, 35 per cent), Catholics (330,000, 21 per cent), and Jews (800, 0.5 per cent) was moderately. In 1881 the Emperor Francis Joseph formed the ecclesiastical province of Sarajevo (Bosna-Serbi; Sarashimir) with the three sees of Banjaluka (Banialucus), Mostar, and Markana-Trebinje as suffragans. The Bishop of Mostar, through his pro-vicar, administers Markana-Trebinje, in which there are only eight secular priests and 20,000 Catholics.

Mostar is the capital of Herzegovina, and numbers 15,000 inhabitants, among whom there are 3500 Catholics. Herzegovina, which lies east of southern Dalmatia, received its name from the title of Herzog (duke) conferred by the Emperor Frederick IV (1448) on the Grand Waywode Stephan Vukčić. In 1463 Stephan Tomasević, the last King of Bosnia, was made a prisoner by the Turks and beheaded, in defiance of a promise to spare him. Twenty years later Herzegovina came under the rule of Turkey. With Bosnia it received Christianity from the Franks, in the first half of the seventh century the Slavs took possession. In the eleventh century the Eastern Schism and the sect of the Bogomil the Catholic Church great and unrepaired harm. National writers trace this sect to a Buddhist priest, Jeremias, who was also called Bogomil. His followers were called Patareane; they rejected matrimony, allowed no intercourse with those of other religions, unconditionally forbade war and taking of oaths, and wished to yield obedience to no authority but God. In 1483, during the Turkish occupation of the country, the majority of the Bogomil, those of the upper classes, went over to the name of Tatar. Those who remained loyal to Christianity became outlaws (Kajaks). After the siege of Vienna and the retreat of the Turks in 1883, the poor peasants repeatedly took up arms, but only made their condition worse. During this unhappy time the Franciscans, unaided and with great difficulty, preserved the life of the Catholic Church in the country. The Divine service amid the cold and snow in the open air. They lived in the most wretched poverty, and many became martyrs.

The Franciscans deserved that one of their order should be chosen Bishop of Mostar and Markana-Trebinje in 1881. The order maintains two schools and six classes for the education of the rising genera-
tion. There are 12 secular priests and 64 Franciscans in the diocese, and the number of Catholics is estimated at 130,000.

_Steinbrucke, Bonn. Land und Leute (2 vols., Vienna, 1892, 1894); Klaic, Geschichte Bonnens (Leipzig, 1895); Neuwied, Kaiserliche Hofbibliothek in Bonn and der Herzogin in An Ehren und Siegen reich (Vienna, 1900, 351–355 sq.).

C. WOLFGRUBER.

Most Pure Heart of Mary, Feast of the. — In its principal object this feast is identical with the feast of the "Inner Life of Mary", celebrated by the Sulpitians on 19 October. It commemorates the joys and sorrows of the Mother of God, her virtues and perfections, her love for God and her compassion for mankind. In a subordinate manner, its object is also the physical Heart of Mary, which, being part of her sinless and virginal body, is the symbol and sensible object representing the sentiments and virtues of Mary (see Heart of Mary, Devotion to the). The feast originated with Blessed John Eudes as the patronal feast of his congregations of priests and nuns, and was, since 1644, kept at the seminary of Caen on 20 October. The office, which is very beautiful, was composed by Blessed John Eudes in 1641, but its text was not definitely fixed before 1672. In 1647 the date of the feast was changed to 8 February, the feast being solemnized publicly for the first time, with the permission of Bishop Ragemery of Paris, at the cathedral of Autun on 8 February, 1648. In 1665 Cardinal Vondome approved the office, and the feast was adopted the same year by the French Franciscans, the Benedictine Nuns of the Perpetual Adoration, and later by a number of diocesan and religious communities, contrary to decrees of the Congregation of Rites prohibitive of such observance. The Congregation of the Church in France claimed at this period the right to institute new feasts, and to compose offices and new breviaries without consulting the Roman authorities. In 1672 Blessed John Eudes could state that the feast had spread over nearly all France. It was mostly kept on 8 February, but at the Hôtel-Dieu of Quebec (since 1690) on 3 July, and at St. Maclou, Rouen, on the Sunday after 22 August (Office pr. 1765; triple of the first class).

The Nuns of Notre Dame de Corbell (8 Feb., 1787) were the first to obtain papal sanction for the feast from Pius VI (kept on 22 August as a double of the first class with octave). The same pope later approved the devotion of the Nuns of Fontevrault (Sunday after 2 July). On 22 March, 1799, it was granted to the city of Palermo (third Sunday after Pentecost); on 13 Aug., 1805, to the Clerics Regular of the Mother of God; in 1806 to Siena; in 1807 to the Discalced Carmelites; on 2 Sept., 1807, to the Capuchins and Hermits of St. Augustine from the Sunday after the octave of the Assumption; on 19 Sept., 1807, to Tuscany. The city of Rome adopted the feast in 1879. In the Society of Jesus it is observed on the Sunday within the octave of the Assumption. The feast has not yet been extended to the entire Church. It is kept as the patronal feast of the Republic of Ecuador, of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, of the Society of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, and of the Missionary Society of the Heart of Mary on the Sunday after 22 August. The feast is celebrated at Cosenza (Calabria) on 7 February (earthquake, 1873), by the English Benedictines on the first Sunday of May; in the ecclesiastical province of Lemberg on the last Sunday of June; at Bonn on the second Sunday after Pentecost, etc. The office of Blessed John Eudes, universally used in France for over a hundred years, was finally approved for the Eustists (8 Feb.) in 1861. The office contained in the Appendix of the Roman Breviary was granted on 21 July, 1857; the dioceses of Palermo, Salerno, Catanzaro, etc., used that composition by Père Galliffet in 1726.

The feast of the Archconfraternity of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, refuge of sinners, is celebrated on the Sunday before Septuagesima at Paris, Chartres Reims, Limoges, Vannes, Nantes, at Lucca in Toscani, in the ecclesiastical province of St. Louis, Missouri, etc.

_Études Complètes du B. Jean Eudes, XI (Vannes, 1910), 147 sq.; Nilles, De rationibus festorum usitatum Codici (Innsbruck, 1889); Holweck, Festi Mariani (Freiburg, 1912).

FREDERICK G. HOLWECK.

Mostyn, Francis. See Menevia, Diocese of.

Mostynopoule, titular see, suffragan of Trajanopolis in Rhodope. A single person is known, Paul, who assisted at the council of 875, who added to the established Phocius (Le Quen, "Orients christi", I, 1205). The see is mentioned in the "Notitiae" of Leo the Wise, about 900 (Gelzer, Ungedruckte . . . Notitiae episcopatum, 558); in that for 940 (Gelzer, "Georgii Cyprii Descriptio orbis romani", 79); in that for 1170 under the name of Misonoupolis (Parthey, "Hirciules Synecdemus", 122). The monk Ephremus (Cesares, V. 5695, in P. G., CXIII, 216) says that the city was taken in 1190 by the Emperor Frederick of Swabia; and that Caloian, Tsar of the Bulgarians, ravaged it about 1206 (Cesares, V. 7816). It is not known exactly where this town of Macedonia was situated nor what name it bears to-day.

S. VALIÈRE.

Motet.—A short piece of music set to Latin words, and sung instead of, or immediately after, the Offertorium, or as a detached number in extra-liturgical functions. The origin of the name is involved in some obscurity. The ancient meaning of the Latin term motu is from the Latin mutus, "movement"; but the French mot, "word," or "phrase," has also been suggested. The Italian motetto was originally (in the thirteenth century) a profane polyphonic species of music, the air, or melody, being in the Tenor clef, taking the then acknowledged place of the canto fermo, or plainchant, theme. Philip de Vitry, who died Bishop of Meaux, wrote a work entitled "Ars compositionis de motetis", the date of which was probably 1320. This volume (now in the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale) contains our oldest speciments of sacred motets, and these continued in vogue for over two centuries. Gerbert prints some other moteta of the first half of the eleventh century, but those with a pre-figured Tenor are rare. At any rate, motets are of such usual interest, and are mostly in two parts. It was not until the commencement of the following century, especially between the years 1390 and 1435, that a number of distinguished composers—e.g., Dunstable, Power, Dufay, Brasart, and Binchois—produced polyphonic motets that are still worthy of attention. Dunstable's "Quam pulchra est" is a charming specimen of a three-part motet, the concluding Alleluia being far in advance of any similar work during the first quarter of the fifteenth century, betraying a genuinely artistic style. Equally beautiful are the motets of Lionel Power, the manuscripts of which are at Vienna, Bologna, and Modena. One of his happiest efforts is a four-part motet in which the treatment is peculiarly melodious and of an Irish flavour. Dufay, who was a Wallon, composed numerous motets, including "Salve Virgo", "Flos florum", "Alma Redemptoris", and "Ave Regina ccelorum"; and by his will he ordered the last named exquisite composition to be sung by the altar boys and chorus of Ghent cathedral at his death-bed. Brasart, also a Wallon, whose name appears among the pontifical singers in 1431, composed motets, including a four-part "Fortis cum quevis actio" and a very pretty "Ave Maria". Binchois, another native of Flanders has left some motets in three parts, including "Beata Dei Genitrix", but the treatment is
have left us beautiful specimens. However, in the case of Monteverde (1567–1643), he broke away from the predominant traditions of the Tridentine school of music, employing unprepared discords and other harmonic devices. Croce, who was a priest, published many beautiful motets, including "O sacrum convivium". In the mid-seventeenth century, owing to the conflict between the older and the newer schools, no appreciable advance was made in motet-writing. The only new composers who nobly upheld the true polyphonic sermons were Allegri and Cascolini. Allegri was a priest and a pontifical singer, and he is best known by his famous Miserere for nine voices in two choirs. A few of Cascolini's motets are still sung. From 1660 to 1670 the modern type of motet, with instrumental accompaniment, came into vogue, and the ancient mediævalistic "modal" treatment was superseded by the prevailing scale-tonality. The masters of this epoch were Leo, Durante, Scarletti, Pergolesi, Carissimi, Stradella, and Purcell. During the eighteenth century the motet received adequate treatment at the hands of Johann Sebastian Bach, Keiser, Graun, Hasse, Handel, and Bononcini. A further development, but on different lines, took place during the next two centuries, of which may be found in the published works of Mozart, Haydn, Cherubini, and Mendelssohn. However, the motu proprio of Pope Pius X has had the happy effect of reviving the polyphonic school of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, when the motet in its true form was at its highest.}

**Motive. See Morality.**

**Motolinia, Toribio de Benavente, Franciscan** missionary, b. at Benavente, Spain, at the end of the fifteenth century; d. in the City of Mexico, 10 August, 1568. He was one of the first band of Franciscans who sailed for Mexico with Fray Martin de Valencia, and survived all his companions. Upon entering religion, he changed his name of Paredes for that of Benavente, following the then regular custom of the order. As he and his companions, on their way to the City of Mexico, passed through Tlaxcalta, the Indians, seeing the humble aspect and ragged habits of the religious, kept repeating to each other the word motolinia. Fray Toribio, having asked the meaning of this word and learned that it was the Mexican for poor, "It is the first thing I have learned, he said, "and that, I may not forget it, it shall henceforth be my name." Berna Diaz del Castillo, an eyewitness of the arrival of the first friars, singles Motolinia out from the others, saying of him: "Whatever was given him he gave to the Indians, and sometimes was left without food. He wore very torn clothing and went barefoot, and the Indians loved him much, because he was a holy person." When Motolinia and his companions arrived at the City of Mexico, Cortés went out to receive them, accompanied by all his captains and the chief men of the place. The religious carried wooden crosses in their hands; Cortés and those with him knelt and kissed their hands with the deepest respect, and then conducted them to the Indians. The Indians wondered much when they saw those whom they considered supernatural beings prostrate at the feet of these humble and apparently despicable men. Cortés seized the opportunity to address a discourse to the caciques (chiefs) and lords who accompanied him, recommending due veneration and respect, as he esteemed them, for those who had come to teach them the Christian religion.

When Cortés set out on the expedition to Las Hibueras, the influence of Motolinia over the Indians
was so great that the conqueror commissioned him to see that "no rising took place in Mexico or the other provinces" during his absence. Motolinia subsequently made a journey to Guatemala, where he made use of the faculties which he had to administer confirmation, and thence passed to Nicaragua. Returning to Mexico, he was guardian successively at Tepotzotlán, and his residence at the viceregal palace of the Province of Santo Eivangelio. When Don Sebastian Ramirez de Fuenleal, president of the second Audiencia, decided to found the settlement of Puebla, Fray Toribio, who had joined in requesting this foundation, was one of the commissioners chosen to carry out the work, with the auditor Don Juan de Saldarriaga, according to the plan of Tlaxcala, Cholula, Huejotzingo, and Tepeaca, and employing a large number of Indian labourers, they built the city. Motolinia said the first Mass here on 16 April, 1530, and with his companions made the allotments of land, choosing for the convent the site upon which is still to be seen the beautiful church of San Francisco. He himself left in writing the total of baptisms performed by him, amounting to 400,000, "which," says Padre Torquemada, "I who write this have seen confirmed by his name." The Indians loved him tenderly for his virtues and, above all, for his ardent charity. He died in the convent of S. Francisco, in the City of Mexico, and the crowd at his burial "ought to be remembered from cutting in pieces the habit in which his corpse wore, pieces of which they would have taken as relics of a saint.

Among the writings of Motolinia is his famous letter to Emperor Charles V, written on 2 January, 1555. It is a virulent attack upon Bishop Bartolomé de las Casas, intended to discredit him because of his opinions concerning his "lousy man, servile, insatiable, imprudent, turbulent, injurious, and prejudicial"—and moreover an apostate in that he had renounced the Bishopric of Chiapas. The monarch is even advised to have him shut up for safe keeping in a monastery. While it is impossible to save the memory of Motolinia from the blot which this letter has placed upon it, some explanation of his conduct can be given. He may have foreseen the extremely grave evils that would have resulted to the social system, as it was then established in New Spain, if the theories of Las Casas had become completely dominant. Indeed, when it is remembered that these theories jeopardized the fortunes of nearly all the colonists, not merely the friars, but throughout the entire New World—fortunes which they had perhaps amassed illegally, but, in many instances, in good faith and at the cost of incredible labours and perils—it may well be understood why so tremendous an anarchy should have been felt against the man who not only had originated the theories, but had effected their triumph at Court. He was endeavouring with incredible tenacity of purpose to put them into practice, and who, in his directions to confessors, asserts that all the Spaniards of the Indies must despise themselves of all their property, except what they have acquired by commerce, and no longer hold encomiendas or slaves. The theory of encomiendas was not in itself blameworthy; for the Indians, being like all other subjects bound to contribute towards the expenses of government, it made no difference to them whether they paid tribute direct to the government or to the holders of royal commissions (encomiendas). What made the system intolerable was the mass of horrible abuses committed under its shadow; had in his attack made it surely against the abuses, he might perhaps have been more successful in benefiting the Indians. It is certain that the "New Laws," the greatest triumph of las Casas, remained virtually ineffective in Mexico; in Chiapas and Guatemala they led to serious disturbances, and in Peru they resulted in a civil war fraught with crimes and horrors, amidst which the aborigines suffered greatly. Such was the man whom Motolinia sought to oppose, and his attitude was shared by men of the most upright character, e.g. Bishop Marroquin, the viceroy, Don Antonio de Mendes, and the visitador Telío. However pardonable the intention, it is impossible to forgive the aggressive and impetuous methods by which las Casas achieved his object. He wrote some works which were of assistance to Mendieta and to Torquemada, one of the chief being his "Historia de los Indios de Nueva España".

Mouchy, Antoine de (called Democharis), theologian and canonist, b. 1494, at Ressons-sur-Mats, near Beauvais, in Picardy; d. 8 May, 1574, at Paris. In 1539 he was appointed rector of the University of Paris. He was also associated with the Sorbonne, canon Penitentiarius of Noyon. As inquisitor fidei he exerted his influence against the Calvinists. In 1562 he accompanied the Cardinal of Lorraine to the Council of Trent, and in 1564 was present at the Synod of Reims. Mouchy wrote a work in defence of the Mass (Paris, 1560); he edited the "Corpus juris canonici" (3 vols. fol., including the glosses, Paris, 1561; 4 vols. 8vo, without the glosses, Paris, 1547–50; 7 vols. 12mo, Lyons, 1554).

Leo A. Keely
MOUFFANG, FRANK CHRISTOPH IGNAZ, theologian, b. at Mainz, 17 Feb., 1817; d. there, 27 Feb., 1890. His early studies were made at Mainz. In 1834 he went to the University of Bonn and then moved to Freiburg, but then turned to theology. Among his masters were Klee, Windischmann, and Walter. In 1837 he went to Munich, and the next year took the prescribed theological examinations at Giessen, after which he entered the ecclesiastical seminary at Mainz, where he was ordained priest 19 Dec., 1839. His first appointment was as curate in Seligenstadt on the Main, where his uncle, Adam Franz Lennig, later vicar-general and dean of the cathedral at Mainz, was pastor. Lennig stimulated him in a broad interest for the religious questions of the time. Moufang also taught at the pre-gymnasium at Seligenstadt. After brief charges of the parishes of Bensheim, and that of St. Quafing in Mainz he was appointed in 1845 religious instructor at the Mainz gymnasium.

When Bishop von Ketteler re-established in 1851 the philosophical and theological school in connexion with the seminary at Mainz, he appointed Moufang regent of the seminary and professor of moral and dogmatic theology. On 6 Nov., 1854, and spiritual adviser and member of the diocesan court 2 December of the same year. On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his priesthood the theological faculty of Würzburg bestowed the honorary degree of doctor of theology upon him. On the death of Lennig in 1868, the bishop wished Moufang to ascend the cathedral and vicar-general. Moufang, however, declined, preferring to devote himself to the seminary. In November, 1868, he was summoned to Rome, for the preparatory work of the Vatican Council, and was placed on the committee for ecclesiastico-political matters under Cardinal Raffo. On the conclusion of the Kulturkampf, to Moufang's great sorrow, the theological school of the seminary was closed (1877) by hostile legislation. After the death of Bishop von Ketteler (13 July, 1877), the chapter elected Moufang administrator of the diocese. The hostile attitude of the Prussian Government made this office very difficult during the ten years' vacancy of the see. On 16 April, 1886, Leo XIII made him a domestic prelate. Under Bishop Haffner the theological school of the seminary was reopened on 25 October, 1887, and Moufang again directed the seminary as regent. But ill-health prevented him from remaining long at the work that was so dear to him.

Moufang rendered great and permanent services to the Archdiocese of Mainz as an educator of the clergy and in many other ways. He was so prominent in the circle that centred about Lennig's strong, energetic personality, and he took an eager part in all efforts to improve religious and social conditions. He assisted in the formation of the Piusverein, and as a member of the "St. Vincenz- und Elisabeth-Verein" did much to promote its prosperity. In the regeneration of Catholic Germany his name is inseparably linked with the history of the general conventions (Generalversammlungen) of the Catholics of Germany. Like his colleague, Heinrich, he was, for almost forty years, one of the leading personalities and most prominent speakers. For a number of years he was also active as a legislator. After 1863, as representative of the bishop, he had a seat in the upper chamber of the Hessian Landtag, and repeatedly took a prominent part in the debates on social and political questions, and questions of Church policy. In 1871 he entered the Hochkommission of 1856 to 1706 and was he was held in great esteem by the Centre for his political services and as an intermediary in harmonizing the differences between North and South Germany. The most prominent feature of his literary activity was his work in reorganizing and publishing the "Katholik", in which he worked in collaboration with Heinrich he edited from 1851 until his death.

His other literary work was mainly in the history of the older Catholic catechisms in Germany. His chief works on this subject are: "Die Mainzer Katechismen von der Entstehung bis zum Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts" (Mainz, 1875); "Katholische Katechismen des 16. Jahrhunderts in deutscher Sprache, herausgegeben und mit Anmerkungen versehen" (Mainz, 1881). Among his numerous shorter writings are: "Die barmherzigen Schwestern, eine Darstellung ihrer Gründung, Verbreitung, Einrichtung und Wirksamkeit" (Mainz, 1842); "Der Informativ-Process. Eine kirchenrechtliche Erörterung" (Mainz, 1850); "Die katholischen Pfarrschulen in der Stadt Mainz" (Mainz, 1863); "Das Verbot der Ehen zwischen nahen Verwandten. Beleuchtung der Gründe dieses Verbotes" (Mainz, 1863), 1; "Die Handwerkerfrage" (Mainz, 1864), a speech delivered in the Upper Chamber of the Landtag at Darmstadt and published with notes; "Die Kirche und die Versammlung katholischer Gelehrten" (Mainz, 1864), a reply to Dr. Michels's "Kirche oder Partei?"; "Das kirchenrechtliche Verhältnis der Katholiken in der Kirche" (Mainz, 1865); "Der Kampf um Rom und seine Folgen für Italien und die Welt" (Mainz, 1868); "Carl August, Cardinal von Reinsch", in "Katholik", 1870, I, 129-80; "Der besondere Schutz Gottes über Papst Pius IX" (Mainz, 1871); "Aktenstücke betreffend die Jesuiten in Deutschland, sowie die Freikirchen und mit Erlaubnis v. (Mainz, 1872). He also published a prayerbook, "Officium divinum", which is very widely used and has passed through numerous editions, the first appearing at Mainz, in 1851, the nineteenth in 1905.

FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT.

MOULINS, DIACOPE OF (MOLINENSIS), suffragan of Sens—comprises the entire department of Allier. Under the old regime Moulins did not even have a parish, the churches which served as parishes were attached to the several châteaux of neighboring villages, Yeuere and St-Bonnet. In 1788 a see was created at Moulins; and des Gallois de la Tour, who exercised in that city the functions of vicar-general to the Bishop of Autun, was appointed bishop, but had not been consecrated when the Revolution broke out in 1792. The See of Moulins was restored in 1817, by Concordat of 1817, and had titulars from 1822. This new diocese was formed of dismembered parts of the Dioceses of Autun, Bourges, and Clermont-Ferrand. In this diocese the cantonal districts do not bear their geographical names, as in all other dioceses, but the name of a saint which becomes the patron of the deanery; the Vichy deanery, for instance, is called the deanery of St-Raphael. Joan of Arc came to Moulins in November, 1429, and from there wrote letters to all the important surrounding towns, asking for assistance. In 1604 Henry IV authorized the Jesuits to found a college at Moulins. The devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus was inaugurated in 1676 at the Visititation monastery of Moulins; St. Jane Frances de Chantal died in this convent in 1641. The monastery of Saint Lieu Sept Fons, in the present territory of the diocese, was founded in 1132 by monks of Citeaux on a site where there were seven springs (septem fontes) and a sanctuary of the Blessed Virgin; it was reformed in 1603 by Dom Eustache de Beaufort, abbot of Rieux Moutier de Roi, and the monastery was restored by the Trappist Dom Stanislaus Lapierre. St. Benoît Labre passed two months there in 1769. The Benedictine monastery of Souvigny, founded in 916, had a fine Gothic church, where
even yet the tombs of many Seigneurs de Bourbon can be seen. Saint Mayeu (Majolus), second abbot of Cluny, died at Souvigny in 994, and St. Odilo, third abbot of Cluny, died there in 1049. The town of Gannat arose about an ancient abbey of Augustinians; the town of St. Pourcain owes its origin to the monastery founded in the sixth century by the slave St. Pourcain (Portianus) who put a stop to the devastations of Thierry, King of Austrasia, during his campaign against Auvergne. The preacher Jean de Lenginies (1595-1666) and the schismatic Abbé Challet, founder of the "French Catholic Church" (1795-1857), were born in the territory of the present Diocese of Moulins.

The principal pilgrimages of the diocese are: Notre-Dame de St. Germain des Fossés; the body of the hermit St. Patrickus (sixth century) at Colombier; the relics of St. Mayeu at Souvigny; and the church of St. George at Bourbon l'Archambault, which possesses one of the largest known fragments of the Holy Cross, a relic given by St. Louis to his son Robert of Clermont. Before the application of the Association of Monasteries Law of 1901, there were Benedictines, Jesuits, Martinists, Lazarists, Redemptorists, Missionary Fathers of the Sacred Heart, and several orders of School Brothers in the Diocese of Moulins. At the beginning of the twentieth century the religious congregations of the diocese had charge of: 1 crèche, 15 day nurseries, 2 boys' orphanages, 10 girls' orphanages, 5 industrial rooms, 1 Magdalen hospital, 6 "houses of mercy" for the relief of the poor, 13 hospitals, 36 dormitories, 3 houses for the care of the sick in their own homes.

In 1908 the Diocese of Moulins counted 390,812 inhabitants, 31 parishes, 281 parochial priests, 55 vicarates.

Alain, Histoire de l'Établissement de l'hôpital de Moulins (Moulins, 1854); Fisquet, France pontificale, clichés de Troyes et Moulins (Paris, 1867); Faure, Histoire de Moulins (2 vols., Moulins, 1899); Moulins, En Bourbounais et en Forêt (Paris, 1873); Sept-Pons, Études historiques sur l'abbaye de Notre Dame Saint Lieu Sept Pons, by a monk of the abbey (Moulins, 1872); Curneller, Topographie, 1926.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Mount Carmel, Congregations of.—I. Daughters of Mount Carmel, founded in 1619 by Virginis Centurione (d. 1651), daughter of the Doge of Genoa and wife of Gasparo Grimaldi Braccioli (d. 1625), who about this time of famine gathered a number of abandoned children into a home, which she called Santa Maria del Refugio del Tribolati in Monte Calvario. Under her inspiration those associated with her in the work decided to lead a common life, follow the rule of St. Francis, and pledge themselves to the service of the poor and sick. They bound themselves, however, by no vows, but by a solemn promise of perseverance. Among the prominent Genoese who promoted the work of the sisters was the Marquess Emmanuele Brignole, through whose munificence a second house was founded in 1641, after which the sisters were often called "le suore Brignole". The congregation soon spread through northern Italy. In 1815 Pius VII invited the sisters to Rome, and in 1833 Gregory XVI assigned them a house on the Esquilino, near the church of St. Norbert, now the chief house of the institute.

II. Missionary Society of Mount Calvary, a congregation of secular priests, formed in 1633 by Hubert Charpentier to honour the Sacred Passion and to spread and maintain the Faith especially in regions under Huguenot control. The first houses were at Betharram in the Diocese of Lescar and at Notre-Dame de Ceraison in the Diocese of Auch. United with a similar association formed by the Capuchin Père Hyacinthe, at the instance of Louis XIII, on Mont-Valérien near Paris, the congregation received royal confirmation in 1650. Later the pastors of Paris were admitted to membership, and during Holy Week pilgrimages were made from different parishes of Paris to Mount Valérien. The society did not survive the Revolution.

CENTURIONE, Vite di Virginia Centurione, Brescello (Genoa, 1872); Streber in Kirchenlex.: "MonsINI di pubblica carità" (Rome, 1855), 133 sqq.

FLORENCE RUDGE MCGAHAN.

Mount Carmel, Feast of Our Lady of—This feast was instituted by the Carmelites between 1376 and 1386 under the title "Commemoratio B. Mariae Virg., duplex" to celebrate the victory of their order over its enemies in obtaining the approval of its name and constitution from Honorius III on 30 Jan., 1226 (see Colvenerius, "Kal. Mar.," 30, "Summa Aurea," III, 737). The feast was assigned to 16 July, because on that date in 1251, according to the Carmelite traditions, the scapular was given by the Blessed Virgin to St. Simon Stock; it was first approved by Sixtus V in 1587. After Cardinal Bellarmine had examined the Carmelite traditions in 1609, it was declared the patronal feast of the order, and is now celebrated in the Carmelite calendar as a major double of the first class with a vigil and a privileged octave (like the octave of Epiphany, admitting solemn offices of the first class) under the title "Commemoratio solemnis B.M.V. de Monte Carmelo". By a privilege given by Clement X in 1672, some Carmelite monasteries keep the feast on the Sunday after 16 July, or on some other Sunday in July. In the seventeenth century the feast was adopted by several churches in the south of Italy, although its celebration in Carmelite churches, was prohibited in 1628 by a decree contra abusus. On 21 Nov., 1674, however, it was first granted by Clement X to Spain and its colonies, in 1675 to Austria, in 1679 to Portugal and its colonies, and in 1725 to the Papal States of the Church. On 24 Sept., 1726, it was extended to the entire Latin Church by Benedict XIII. The lessons contain the legend of the scapular (q.v.); the promise of the Sabbatine privilege was inserted into the lessons by Paul V about 1614. The Greeks of southern Italy and the Catholic Chaldeans have adopted this feast of the "Vestment of the Bl. Virgin Mary" (Nilles, "Kal. Mar.", II, 548, 665). The object of the feast is the purification of any person who professes themselves her servants by wearing her scapular (see Carmelites).

HOLWECK, Patti Mariani (Freiburg, 1892); COLVINERIUS.
Mount of Olives. See Olivet, Mount.

Mount St. Mary's College, the second oldest among the Catholic collegiate institutions in the United States, is located at Emmitsburg, Maryland, within the limits of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. Its situation on high ground at the foot of the Maryland range of the Blue Ridge Mountains is remarkable for beauty and healthfulness while it affords ample opportunity for physical exercise. Mount St. Mary's Theological Seminary has been maintained in connection with the college since the foundation of the latter. The institution is directed by an association of secular clergymen who, with several lay professors, compose its faculty. Its material interests are controlled by a board of directors of which the Archbishop of Baltimore is ex officio, the president. For the academic year 1899-10 the teaching corps included 140 men, being enabled to teach in the various branches, with 298 students in the college and 54 in the seminary. Instruction is given in four departments: collegiate, academic, commercial, and modern languages. The degrees conferred are those of bachelor of arts and master of arts.

Mount St. Mary's College was founded in 1808 when Rev. John Dubois (q.v.) was transferred to Emmitsburg. Eight students formed the nucleus out of which the college developed. Its first president was Rev. John Dubois (q.v.) who had been labouring for some years in the neighbouring missions and had built a brick church on the slope above the present site of the college. In 1814 he was succeeded by Father (afterwards Bishop) Dubourg (q.v.), who directed Mother Seton also to Emmitsburg for the establishment of St. Joseph's Academy. Father Dubois had as his assistant Father Bruté (q.v.) who was consecrated first Bishop of Vincennes in 1814. Father Dubois himself became in 1826 Bishop of New York and was succeeded in the presidency by Rev. Michael de Burgo Egan (1826–28), Rev. J. F. McCerry (1828–29), and Rev. John B. Purcell (1830–33), later Archbishop of Cincinnati. In January, 1830, Father Purcell obtained from the General Assembly of Maryland a charter of incorporation for the college. This document prohibited the requiring of any religious test from any student who held the property of 1,000 acres in the Maryland to 1,000 acres and the total value of the college property to $25,000: all gifts or revenues in excess of this amount, after the payment of necessary debts, were to be held for the use of the State of Maryland. After the brief (five months) incumbency of Rev. F. Jamison during the latter half of 1833, Rev. Thomas L. Butler was chosen president (1834–38). During his administration, a new charter, still in force, was granted on 4 April, 1836, wherein the college authorities are empowered to confer all collegiate honours and degrees except that of doctor of medicine. Father Butler's successor was Rev. John J. McCaffrey, a man of great energy and zeal, whose long term as president (1838–1872) was marked on one hand by the growth and prosperity of the college, on the other by reverses that threatened its very existence. He was the builder of the new church at Emmitsburg which was dedicated in June, 1842. The cornerstone of Bruté Hall, for which $12,000 had been appropriated, was laid on 2 May, 1843, and, in 1852, the foundation of the tower was laid. In 1858 the college celebrated its semi-centennial with appropriate exercises in which many distinguished alumni took part.

The "Mountain" already counted among its graduates such men as John Hughes, later Archbishop of New York; William Quinlan, afterwards Bishop of New York and Cardinal; William Henry Elder, Archbishop of Cincinnati; William George McCloskey, president of the American College, Rome, and later Bishop of Louisville; Francis S. Chardot, president of the American College, Rome, and later Bishop of Vincennes; Michael Augustine Corrigan, later Archbishop of New York; Richard N. Whelan, first Bishop of Wheeling; Francis X. Garland, first Bishop of Savannah; Francis P. McFarland, third Bishop of Hartford.

Within three years after the celebration of its golden jubilee, the college was confronted by difficulties due to the outbreak of the war between the States. Although both North and South continued their war to the very door of the faculty as well as in the student body, the college as a whole remained neutral. But shortly after the beginning of hostilities, an exodus of students representing each section took place in such numbers that only seven were left for the graduating class of 1863, and only two for that of 1864. Moreover as parents of pupils of both sections feared for the safety of the pupils whom the college maintained during the four years of war, the financial standing of the institution was seriously compromised, and as a result the college at the end of the conflict was overwhelmed with debt. In June, 1872, Dr. J. J. McCaffrey, in consequence of failing health, with the consent and the approval of the President of the Senate of the University of the South, was succeeded by Father John McCloskey who was elected to the office with Rev. H. S. McMurrie as vice-president. Under their administration, the student body varied from 130 to 165. In 1877 Rev. John A. Watterson became president and retained the office until his promotion to the See of Richmond in 1880. He was succeeded by Rev. Michael J. Kenrick, who was a good financier and administrator. During the period of his administration, the debt was reduced by about one third, and the number of students increased to 280. The completion of the new gymnasium building was a notable feature of his administration.

Father John McCloskey once more took up the burden of the presidency, but only for a short time, as he died towards the close of 1880. In January, 1881, Rev. Wm. J. Hill, of Brooklyn, came to the college and petitioned to have a receiver appointed. The appointee was James McSherry, later Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of Maryland. He turned over the affairs of the institution, in June, 1881, to Very Rev. William M. Byrne, Vicar-General of Boston, whose firmness, prudence, and wise economy restored prosperity to the college. His policy was continued by Rev. Edward F. Carlin, who was appointed bishop of Mobile in 1897. During his administration, McCaffrey Hall was completed (1894); and under his successor, Rev. Wm. L. O'Hara (1897–1905), Dubois Hall was completed, improvements were continued to accommodate the increasing number of students.

The presidency of his successor, Very Rev. Dennis J. Flynn (1905--), has been marked by the celebration, in October, 1908, of the centenary of the college. This occasion brought to the "Mountain" a large number of men prominent in ecclesiastical, professional, and public life who claim the college as their Alma Mater (for full account see "The Mountaineer", Oct. and Nov., 1908). It may indeed be said that the highest tribute to the college and the best proof of its efficiency is found in the careers of those whom it educated. Its service to the Church is shown by the fact that among its officers and graduates at least twenty-five have been bishops, including one cardinal and five archbishops—hence its well deserved title, "Mother of Bishops". But it has been not only to the hierarchy but to every department of useful citizenship a large number of men distinguished by ability and integrity (see partial list in "The Mountaineer", Oct., 1908, 34–43). Among the causes which explain this success, the most
Movable Feast. See Feasts, Ecclesiastical.

Movers, Franz Karl, exegete and Orientalist, b. at Koesfeld, Westphalia, 17 July, 1806; d. at Breslau, 28 Sept., 1856. He attended the gymnasium of his native town, and from 1822 to 1825 the gymnasium at Münster. The next four years he studied at the academy of Münster, taking up philosophy, theology, and especially Oriental languages under Laurens Reinke. In the autumn of 1829 he was ordained a deacon in Patmos, and on January 10, 1830, he began his Oriental studies for a short time at the University of Bonn. After that he remained as tutor for several years with Baron von Geyr at Rath, near Deutz. In 1833 he became pastor at Berkum, near Bonn, in 1839 extraordinary professor of Old-Testament exegesis at the University of Breslau, and in 1842 ordinary professor at the same university.

In the field of exegesis Movers published the following works: "Kritische Untersuchungen über die biblische Chronik, ein Beitrag zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament" (Bonn, 1834); "De utrusque recensionis Vaticiniornorum Jeremia, Graec Alexandrina et Hebraica musearchie, indole et origine Commentatio critica" (Hamburg, 1837); "Loci quidam biatorum canonis Veteris Testamenti illustrati, Commentatio critica" (Breslau, 1842); and various essays which appeared in theological magazines, especially in "Zeitschrift für Philosophie und katholische Theologie", published at Bonn. The first edition of the "Kirchenlexicon" contains a number of articles by Movers.

Movers showed great scholarship as an Orientalist and performed large and lasting services by his studies of the ancient Phoenicians. His chief work, "Die Phönizier", though never completed, is still an important contribution to the subject. It appeared in parts under separate titles, as follows: Vol. I, "Untersuchungen über die Geschichte und die Götterkulten der Phönizier, mit Rücksicht auf die verwandten Culte der Cartager, Syrer, Babylonien, Assyrier, der Hebräer und der Aegypter" (Bonn, 1841); vol. II, "Das phönizische Alterthum" in three parts, part I, "Politische Geschichte und Staatsverfassung" (Berlin, 1849); part II, "Geschichte der Colonien" (Berlin, 1850); part III, first half, "Handel und Schiffahrt" (Berlin, 1856). Movers gave a shorter compendium of the results of his researches in his article "Phönizien" in "Allgemeine Encyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste" (1848), section III, part XXIV, pp. 319-443. In addition to brief essays appearing in magazines, Movers published "Phönizien, Teil der Welt" (Breslau, 1845), "Die punischen Texte im Pfunnsul, Ploitus kritisch gewidmet und erläutert" (Breslau, 1846); part I, "Das punische Texte im Pfunnsul, Ploitus kritisch gewidmet und erläutert"; part II, "Das Opferwesen der Cartager, Commentar zur Opfer- tafel von Marseille". Another work to be mentioned is "Denkschrift über den Zustand der katholischen theologischen Facultät an der Universität zu Breslau seit der Vereinigung der Breslauer und Frankfurter Universität bis auf die Gegenwart" (Leipzig, 1845).

RHIANNON, Nachrichten von dem Leben und den Schriften Münder's (Münster, 1868), 223 seq.; KURTH in "Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie", XXI, 417 seq.; "Nielsen, Geschichte der katholischen Theologie" (Munich, 1856), 544-46; WENNER, Geschichte der apologistischen und polemischen Literatur (Schaffhausen, 1887), 7, 442-452.

FRIEDRICH LAURENT.

MOXOS INDIANS (MOYOS INDIANS).—According to one authority, they are named from Musu, their Quichua name; according to others, from the Moxos word, muha, erroneously thought by the Spaniards to be the tribal name. This collective designation is that of a group of tribes famous in the mission annals of South Aru, originally ranging through the forests and pampas of the upper Morona, extending east and west from the Cuapore (Itenes) to the Beni, and centring in the present Province of Mojos, Department of Beni, Bolivia. They numbered altogether at least 50,000 souls, in perhaps a hundred small tribes or sub-tribes, speaking at least thirteen distinct languages, each with dialects, viz., Moxo (spoken with dialectic variation by the Moxos proper, Baure, Ticomiere, and several small tribes), Paicone, Mopeciana, Icabicici, Mapicena, Movima, Cayubaba, Itonama, Sapiboconas, Cheriba, Rucotona, Mure, Canichana. Of these, the Moxos and Paicone, with all their dialects, belong to the widespread Arawakan stock, which includes also the Xavantes. The Mure (q.v.), confined to the lower valley of the Tocanaan to the Beni river; the Mure are an offshore from the Mura of the great Tupian stock of eastern and central Brazil; the Movima, Cayubaba, Itonama, Canichana, and Rucotona (Ocorona) represent each a distinct stock; while the others remain unclassified. Besides all these, there were gathered in the Jesuit mission at the eastern end of the Moxos, the Chiguriano, each of different language, from the southern Bolivian missions. Of them all, the Moxos proper were the most important.

The mode of life of the Moxos, in their primitive condition, was determined by their peculiar environment. During the rainy season, lasting four months, nearly the whole country is inundated, excepting certain elevated places, where the scattered bands made their temporary villages. As the waters retreat the hot sun generates pestilence in the low grounds along the rivers, while the prevailing oppressive heat is varied by spells of piercingly cold winds from the mountains which prevent the ripening of corn. The Indians therefore went up in the mountains, but subsisted chiefly upon fish and roots during the greater part of the year, and upon the wild game of the mountains when driven from the low grounds by the floods. They were thus compelled to a wandering habit, at the same time that they were skilful fishers and river men. The constant shifting also brought the bands into collision, and each tribe was constantly making war on its neighbours.

Their houses were low huts, occupied each by a single family, instead of being communal as in so many tribes. The larger villages had also well-built "townhouses" for the celebration of tribal functions. They slept upon mats upon the ground or in hammocks, with a smouldering fire close at hand to drive away the swarms of mosquitoes and other insects. They ate when they could find food, without regard to time, feasting equally upon putrid fish taken from stagnant pools, and upon human flesh of prisoners taken in war, for all or nearly all the tribes were cannibal. Of game, the monkey was their favourite food. They used dogs for hunting, and they were addicted to intoxicating drinks, brought about by a fermented liquor of their own manufacture, and their frequent dance festivals always ended in general intoxication, frequently with bloody encounters in revenge for old injuries. Notwithstanding the generally rude culture, the Moxos proper and Baure excelled in hammock-weaving,
boat-making, pottery, and music, their favourite musical instrument being a sort of pan-pipes sometimes six feet in length. The Moxos had also a method of picture writing. The Canichana, even fattened prisoners for their cannibal feasts and afterwards fashioned their skulls into drinking cups. In some cases prisoners were held as slaves. Unlike the Iroquois, who exorcised the ghosts of their murdered victims, the Moxos moved away from the spot of the sacrifice to escape the vengeance of the dead. The savage Canichana in particular may have been put after coming into the missions they would sometimes steal children secretly for this purpose, even casting lots among themselves to decide who should give up a child, until the missionaries took steps to note each birth immediately upon delivery.

Marriages were arranged between the parents, usually without consulting the young people, and polygamy was permitted, although not common, but adultery was considered disgraceful. The wife was the mistress of the household and always chose the camping place. If the mother died the infant was buried alive with her, and if twins were born, one also was always buried. The woman who suffered miscarriage was killed by her own husband. The helpless aged were put to death by their children, and put through a severe course of training and initiation involving a year's abstinence from all animal food, together with a battle with a jaguar—regarded as an embodied god—until wounded, and thus marked, by the divinity. Their principal festivals were regulated by the new moon, beginning with a day's fast and ending with a night dance and drinking orgy.

The earlier attempts to missionize the tribes of central Bolivia met with no success. About the year 1873 the Moxos province was brought to the attention of the Jesuits of the college at Lima by José del Pilar Baraza, afterwards so noted as a missionary, at once asked and obtained the permission to undertake their conversion. In 1874, accompanied only by Brother Castillo and some Indian guides, he entered their country from Santa Cruz by way of a twelve-days' canoe voyage down the Mamoré river. In four years he had won their love and nearly mastered the language, when serious illness compelled his return to the healthier climate of Santa Cruz. He employed his convalescence in learning weaving, in order to induce them to clothe themselves, as a beginning in civilization. In the meantime, however, he was assigned to labour
among the Chiriguano, among whom he spent five years before he was permitted to return to his first charges. In 1659 he founded the first mission, Loreto, followed in rapid succession by Trinidad (1657), San Ignacio (1659), San Xavier (1690), San José (1691), San Francisco de Borja (1693), the six missions soon containing altogether nearly 20,000 Indians, Loreto alone in 1691 having 4000. Later missions were: San Pedro (the capital, 1698), Santa Ana, Fuerte, San Magdalen, Rio San Ramon, Conception, San Simón, San Joaquin, San Martín, San Luis, San Pablo, San Juan, San Nicolas, Santos Reyes, San Judas, Santa Rosa I (del Itenes), San Miguel, Patrocinio, Santa Rosa II, Desposorios, Santa Cruz. Of these, the two missions of Santa Rosa del Itenes and San Miguel occupied chiefly by the Mure, Masave, and Bourbon tribes (all were entirely broken up by the raids of the Portuguese slave-hunters (see Guarani Indians; Mameluco) subsequent to 1742, and the survivors removed to other foundations. Wars, epidemics, and removal led to the abandonment almost of San Luis, San José, San Pablo, Patrocinio, and San Juan. Santa Rosa II (1765), Desposorios, and Santa Cruz (de la Sierra) were the latest; and were occupied by Siriono, Chiriguano, and Chiquito, south of the Moxos province proper. The whole number of missions at one time was about twenty, containing in 1736 about 30,000 converts, increased to nearly 50,000 before the period of the Jesuit period, but again reduced to 20,345 souls in eleven missions in 1797, thirty years after the expulsion of the Jesuits.

Baraza himself was their great apostle and civilizer. Besides teaching the principal languages and adapting himself to the Indian life so that he was able to penetrate every part of the province and thus make successful discovery of a shorter mountain passage to Peru, he introduced cattle, weaving, agriculture, carpentry, and brick-making. The mission churches reared by the Indians under his supervision rivalled those of Peru. At last after twenty-seven years of labour he was treacherously murdered at the age of sixty-one, on 16 September, 1702, among the then unconverted Baure, a tribe of considerably higher native culture than the Chiriguano, living in palisaded villages on the eastern border of the province.

On the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spanish America in 1767 the Moxos missions were turned over to the Franciscans, under whom they continued into the modern period. The population has been greatly reduced, first by the slave raids and epidemic fevers in the earlier times, and more lately by the constant drain of the Indians to the rubber forests of Brazil, whence few of them ever return, their superiority as boatmen rendering their services in demand as far as the Amazon. They are comfortably dressed in clothing made by themselves from bark fibre. In physique they are robust, and taller than most of the Bolivian tribes. They are distinguished by a remarkably erect and upright character, and great industry. They give up less time to merry-making than their southern kinsfolk, and are generally of more laborious habits, hence their industries are greatly developed, and although living far from the large towns and markets, the other Indians as weavers, builders and wood carvers" (Reclus). They are zealous Catholics, entirely under the spiritual authority of their priests, and noted for their voluntary penances, as were their convert forefathers two centuries ago. Under the two principal names of Moxos and Baure, they number now about 30,000, of it including several hundreds of Caracan, Movima, etc.—included in the Moxos missions, but still retaining their distinct name and language.

For all that relates to the primitive condition and early mission history of the Moxos tribes, our principal authorities are the journals of the Jesuits CASTILLO, EDER, and EUSCILLI. For the language of the Moxos and its cognates with enough grammar and vocabulary, our principal source is the Arte of the Jesuit MARAN, B #LIVIAN, "Descripción geográfica de la República de Bolivia, I. Las Provincias de Moxos y Chiquitos (La Paz, 1906); BRAYTON, The American Race (New York, 1901); CASTILLO, Relaciones de la Provincia de Moxos en BALLESTIN, supra; EDER, Descripción Provincias Montaunias en Regio Peruana (Buda, 1791); EUSCILLI, La Misión de los Moxos (1698); GRAN, Exploration of the Valley of the Amazon, part II (Washington, 1854); smaller tribes: HEATH in Kansas City Review of Science, VI (Kansas City, 1883); HERRAN, Catálogo de las Lenguas, I (Madrid, 1900); LETO, Relaciones, 1-11 (Paris, 1707), especially letter of ARLET on Carancho tribe and mission of SanFalsy, Ensayo de la lengua moza, con vocabulario y cartulario (1701); reprinted, Leipzig, 1904); MARAN, Tribes in the Valley of the Amazon in Jour. Amer. Instute, XXIV (London, 1886), a brief notice: Moxos in Bibliotheca Boliviana; Catálogo del Archivo de Moxos (Santiago de Chile, 1888); OBRION, L'Homme American (II, Paris, 1929); PAIS, La Plata, the Argentine Confederation and Paraguay (New York, 1859); RECLUS, The Earth and its Inhabitants: South America, I. Los Andes Regiones (New York, 1894); SOUTHW, History of Brazil, III (London, 1819); Simplicidad educativa y progresiva de la república de Bolivia (La Paz, 1803); PERERA in Bolivar, published by the International Bureau of the American Republics (Washington, D.C., 1901).
he was never a leader in the struggle for the Catholic cause. In Austrian politics he soon abandoned his straightforward position and became reconciled to the modern trend, warmly defending the Concordat. Among his writings, in which he devoted the greatest attention to careful research and lucid arrangement, may be mentioned "Der Lehrbuch des Staatsrechts" (Ratisbon, 1840-46); "Die dempeiments matrimoni" (Munich, 1827); "Die Ehe und die Stellung der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland" (Landschung, 1830); "Das Ehrehheit der Christen in der morgenländischen und abendländischen Kirche bis zum Ende der Kulturen nach den Quellen dargestellt" (Ratisbon, 1833), by all means his best work; "Grundlinien einer Philosophie des Rechts vom Katholischen Kirchenrecht mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Oesterreich" (Innsbruck, 1857), which he edited as far as the fifth volume. Biographisches Lexicon der Kaiserthums Oesterreich, XIX (1858), 165-187; Allgemeine deutsche Biographie, XII (1859), 420.

Patricius Schlager.

Moye, John Martin, Venerable, priest of the Diocese of Metz, founder of the Sisters of Divine Providence (q.v.), missionary in China, b. at Cutting, Lorraine, 27 January, 1730; d. at Trier, 4 May, 1793. He was the sixth of the thirteen children of John and Maria. His elder brother, a seminarian, taught him the first rudiments of Latin, and he completed his classical studies at the College of Pont-à-Mousson. He then studied philosophy at the Jesuit College of Strausburg, and entered the theological Seminary of St-Simon, Metz, in the fall of 1751. Ordained a priest 9 March, 1754, he was appointed vicar in the episcopal city the same month. His great zeal for souls attracted attention; many pious ladies placed themselves under his firm and wise direction. This enabled him to find some select souls for the establishment of schools for country children whose education he had much at heart. He began the work in 1763; in 1767 in spite of the ill-will existing in that period among a few of his fellow priests, the Congregation of the Sisters of Divine Providence was founded. That same year he was appointed superior of the little seminary of St. Didier. Leaving the care of his sisterhood to two friends, Father Moye now determined to act upon his long delayed desire to become a missionary. In 1789 he joined the Séminaire des Missions de la Congrégation de Paris, and in 1773 he was at work in Oriental Szechuan, China. Nine years of hard labour, frequently interrupted by persecution and imprisonment, made him realize the necessity of native help. In 1782 he founded the "Christian Virgins", religious women following the rules of the Congregation of Providence at home, devoted to the care of the sick and to the Christian instruction of pagan Chinese women and children in their own homes. After a hundred years of success, they are still active in the Chinese mission. Exhausted by labours and sickness, Father Moye returned to France in 1784. He resumed the direction of the Sisters of Divine Providence and evangelized Lydia. In the year of 1777-78, at the outbreak of the great insurrection, the Revolution of 1791 drove him into exile, and with his Sisters he retired to Trier. After the capture of the city by the French troops, typhoid fever broke out, and, helped by his Sisters, he devoted himself to hospital work. He contracted the virulent disease and died, a martyr of Christian charity, 1793. The spot where he was buried is now a public square.

Leo XIII declared John Martin Venerable and authorized the publication of the cause of his beatification 14 January, 1891.

Marchal, Vie de M. l'Abbé Moye (Paris, 1872); Weil, Le souv. de l'Abbé, le 1er Janvier 1891; Puy-Pey, Le Directoire des Sœurs de la Providence (Paris, 1887); Rohrbacher, Histoire de l'Eglise (Paris, 1842-48, 8th ed., 1901); Lettres édifiantes (Paris).

Camillus P. Maes.

Moylan, Francis, Bishop of Cork, b. at Cork, 1759; d. in 1815. He was the son of a rich merchant. As the penal laws made it impossible for him to obtain a suitable education at home, he was sent to Paris, and educated there. His father desired that he should adopt a mercantile calling; but young Moylan's vocation being for a religious life he wished to join the Carthusians. Delicate health, however, stood in his way, and after finishing his course at the University of Toulouse, where he was graduated as doctor of theology, he was ordained priest in 1761 and for some years laboured in Paris. Returning to Cork he was appointed pastor of St. Finbarr's in the city, and remained there till 1775, when he became Bishop of Kerry. In 1787 he was transferred to the See of Cork and continued to rule that diocese till his death. Like Dr. Troy of Dublin, Dr. Moylan had no sympathy with violence as a means of redressing wrong, and therefore he condemned the Whiteboys; and, in 1796, he urged his flock to resist the French, when Hoche's fleet was in Bantry Bay. Dr. Moylan had a share in the establishment of Maynooth College and witnessed its final triumph. He was President of the Union, and was one of the bishops who agreed to the "veto" in 1799. He regretted, however, having done this, for he found that he had been tricked by Pitt and Castlereagh, and when the veto question was revived (1814) he opposed it. During his time in Cork, the Christian Brothers were introduced and also the Ursulines and Presentation Nuns. He was indeed for many years the trusted friend and adviser of Nano Nagle.

Hutch, Life of Nano Nagle (Dublin, 1879).

E. A. D'Alton.

Moylan, Stephen, American patriot and merchant, b. in Ireland in 1734; d. at Philadelphia, 11 April, 1811. He received his education in Ireland, but resided for some time in England, and seems to have travelled considerably on the Continent before he came to Philadelphia in the capacity of a broker. He was commissioned as Captain of the Continental Army. Restless again, seemingly, for a more direct participation in the conflict, he resigned this position in the following October, raising at once a troop of light dragoons, the First Pennsylvania regiment of cavalry, of which he was colonel. With this troop he served at Valley Forge through the dismal winter of 1777-78, at the Battle of Monmouth, on the Hudson River, and in Connecticut, with Wayne in Pennsylvania, and rounded out the full measure of his service with General Greene in his southern campaign at the close of the war. In acknowledgment of his indefatigable energy and bravery, before the war closed, in 1782, he was brevetted brigadier-general. After the successful termination of the war he quietly
resumed his mercantile pursuits in Philadelphia. In 1792 he was Register and Recorder of Chester County, Penn., and was Commissioner of Loans of Pennsylvania for a few years before his death. Duly allowing for the over excitability of the times, the eulogy of a fellow patriot quoted by Irving (Life of Washington, 111, ch. 30) remains a no uncertain estimate of esteem: "The world has lost not only at the time of my visitation, and I might add, in the universe," explains Wilkinson, "a man of more sublime sentiment, or who combined with sound discretion a more punctious sense of honour, than Colonel Moylan." General Moylan was one of the organizers of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Philadelphia in 1771, and for a time was in the service of his native country. One of his brothers became Bishop of Cork, Ireland, and another, John, acted during the war as United States Clothier General.


JARVIS KEELER.

Mozambique (Mozambique), the former official and still usual name given to the Portuguese possessions on the eastern coast of Africa opposite the island of Madagascar. Portuguese East Africa extends from Cape Delgado (10° 41' S. lat.) to the south of Delagoa Bay (25° 58'), that is about twelve hundred miles. It is bounded on the north by German East Africa; on the east by the Mozambique Channel, on the south by the Mozambique Channel, on the west by the Mozambique Channel, on the north by the Mozambique Channel, and on the west by the Indian Ocean, and on the west by British South and Central Africa. It is the second largest Portuguese colony, its area approximating 293,000 square miles (that of Portuguese Angola is about 400,000); its population is between two and three millions. The coasts, in general low and marshy, are intersected here and there by rivers which terminate in almost every instance in muddy deltas or estuaries choked with sand. The low-lying tract between the Limpopo River and the delta of the Zambezi is barren, sprinkled with lagoons, malarial, and infested by the terrible trychee fly, which renders cattle-raising, the one industry otherwise suited to parts of this area, impossible. Between the Zambezi and the Rovuma the soil is very fertile, especially in the basin of the former river, where the land is fertilized by periodic inundations and produces abundant crops. The climate of the regions along the coast is torrid, unhealthy, and subject to sudden and great variations; the mean annual temperature is very high (76° at Beira). As one proceeds inland the climate even becomes much more favorable, attaining a great altitude in the mountains which border on Lake Shirwa. In the interior both soil and climate are favourable to cultivation and European life; the chief crops are millet, maize, rice, wheat, sesame, earth-nuts, sugar-cane, cocoa, and tobacco. The large forests of the interior yield ebony, sandalwood, a number of other valuable timber timbers, and india-rubber. Besides an unusual variety of game, the fauna include the elephant, antelope, buffalo, lion, leopard, and, in certain districts, the rhinoceros and the hippopotamus. The mineral deposits, including coal, iron, and gold, are of exceptional importance, but not yet fully investigated.

Long before the arrival of the first European explorers, the Arabs, taking advantage of the regularity of the monsoons which greatly facilitated their voyages, carried on a brisk commerce with this portion of East Africa, and were in possession of the island of Mozambique when it was discovered by Vasco de Gama in 1488. Sofala had been already discovered by Corte Real of Portugal in 1489. The Portuguese had at first contended with the fierce opposition of the Arabs who dominated all the adjacent country. In 1505 Albuquerque established at the mouth of the Sofala River the first European settlement. Vasco de Gama captured the island of Mozambique in 1506, and thanks to his exertions and those of other Portuguese captains (Saladha, Almeida, and Tristão da Cunha) the neighbouring country was quickly brought under Portuguese rule. Although the Portuguese sent an expedition up the Zambezi about 1565 and occupied Tete in 1632, they seem to have paid scant attention to the interior. In 1607 and 1608 the Dutch made unsuccessful attempts on Mozambique, but in 1638 the town and fort of Mocambique was captured by the Dutch, which was restored to the Sultan of Maccota, reduced the Portuguese territory to the country south of Cape Delgado. The waning political importance and power of Portugal rendered efficient colonization and control impossible. To the great fleeciness of the authorities at home is due the late continuation of the slave trade between Mozambique and the colonies. One of his brothers became Bishop of Cork, Ireland, and another, John, acted during the war as United States Clothier General.

The explorations of Serpa Pinto in 1877 and subsequent years also led Portugal to take a keener interest in its possessions. In 1875 the dispute between England and Portugal for the possession of Delagoa Bay was decided by the arbitrator Marshal MacMahon, in favour of Portugal. The result of a subsequent collision between English and Portuguese claims was less favourable to Portugal. According to the treaty of 1875 by which the southern boundary of Angola was fixed between Portuguese and British South Africa, the territory situated between her possessions on the east and west coasts of Africa; but when in 1889 England proclaimed its protectorate over Matabeleland, Mashonaland, Nyassaland etc., Portugal, notwithstanding the immense indignation aroused by the occurrence at Lisbon, had to acquiesce. In 1889 lack of capital compelled the government to lend with administrative authority a large portion of the colony to the Mozambique and Nyassa Companies; the former controls the Manica and Sofala regions, and the latter the territory enclosed between the Rovuma, Lake Nyassa, and the Lurio River. It is generally accepted that the Anglo-German Secret Treaty of 1898 dealt with the partition of Mozambique in the event that Portugal should be unable to extricate itself from its financial difficulties. The chief exports of Mozambique are rubber, sugar, various ores, wax, and ivory; it imports mainly cottons, hardware, spirits, beer, and wine. Lourenco Marques (9849 inhabitants), the capital of the colony, and Beira are thriving ports. The chief exports are slavers, cotton, and tobacco; the largest number of slave traders is from Lisbon, from St. Sebastian of Mozambique, situated on the island of the same name, has diminished greatly in importance since the abolition of the slave trade. The college built by the Jesuits in 1670, which was made the governor's residence after the suppression of the order, is one of the very few buildings of importance. The early explorers were interested in their voyages by Franciscan fathers who founded under Alves of Coimbra the first mission in Mozambique in 1500. In 1560, after the arrival of the Jesuits, a glorious future seemed to await the mission, the King of Inhambane and the Emperor of Monomotapa being baptized with numbers of their subjects. The Dominicans also laboured for a period in this colony, their most illustrious representative being João dos Santos (d. 1622), whose work, "L'Ethiopía oriental e varia historia de cousas nataveis do Oriente", was long authoritative on the geography and ethnology of the country. The Jesuits returned in 1610 and were received by the Court, and the British also, with the exception of a few, had not had many settlers. The operation was, however, attended with great difficulties owing to the fickleness of the natives, the opposition of the Mohammedans, the insularity of the climate, and the irregular communication with Europe. The powerlessness of Portugal to exercise a firm control and the demoralizing effects of the slave trade resulted in an equally low standard of morals in the case of
This had not been the case somewhat earlier. In 533
Profuturus, Bishop of Braga and Metropolitan of the
Suevic kingdom, had consulted Pope Vigilios on
theological matters. This document contains infor-
mation concerning the Roman usages in the
Mass and in baptism. The Council of Braga (561), held
at the time of the conversion of the Arian Suevi to
Catholicism, decided (cc. iv, v) that the orders of
Mass and baptism obtained from Rome by Profu-
trus should be exclusively used in the kingdom.
This probably continued as long as the Suevi re-
mained independent, and perhaps until the conver-
sion of the Visigothic king Recared to Catholicism in
589.

Until this date the kings and the Teu-
tonic ruling class were Arians, the native Spanish
population was largely Catholic, and the rite—which
was possibly revised and added to by St. Leander of
Bourges and the first Council of Toledo in 589—was
described and perhaps arranged by his brother and suc-
cessor, St. Isidore (d. 636), and regulated by the
Fourth Council of Toledo in 633—was no doubt that
previously in use among the Spanish Catholics. This
is confirmed by the scanty liturgical decrees of the
various Spanish councils of the sixth century. What
Spanish rite we have here may originate in the
Christian Spain, the rite continued to be used by the
Christians in the Moorish dominions who were known
as Mozarabes or Musulrubes. The form Mostdrabes is
also found. The derivation of the word is not quite
clear; in fact, it was used in 633, 636, in the chapel of
San Salvador, and also in the cathedral of Salamanca.
The name is not a good one.

The rite originated in the fact that, after its abolition in
Christian Spain, the rite continued to be used by the
Christians in the Moorish dominions who were known
as Mozarabes or Musulrubes. The form Mostdrabes is
also found. The derivation of the word is not quite
clear: in fact, it was used in 633, 636, in the chapel of
San Salvador, and also in the cathedral of Salamanca.
The name is not a good one.
St. Moraleda y Esteban says (El Rito Monstrabe), the Words of Consecration to the Roman Use. This condition is still observed, but whether that has always been the case, and how far it is now observed, is a matter of some doubt.

The old Spanish form is as follows:

"ne antiquitas ignoretur", as Leslie says in his notes to the Mozarabic Missal—but the Roman is used in actual practice.

Of the existing manuscripts of the rite, though a very few may possibly belong to the ninth century, almost all are of the eleventh century. The oldest manuscript is that belonging to John X and the introduction of the Roman Rite in the second half of the eleventh century, during which period the old Spanish Rite held undisturbed possession of the whole of Spain, whether under Christian or Moors rule. During these centuries the Christian kingdoms were gradually driving back the Moors. Besides Asturias and Navarre, which had never been conquered, Galicia, Leon, and Old Castile had been regained, and the Kingdom of Aragon had been formed.

In 1064 Cardinal Hugo Candidus was sent from Rome by Alexander II to abolish the Spanish Rite, some vague attempts in that direction having been already made by his predecessor Nicholas II, who in 1059 abolished it in Milan. The centralizing policy of the popes of that period included uniformity of liturgical practice. The Spanish kings and clergy were against the change, and Bishops Munio, of Calahorra, Eximeno of Oca, and Fortunio of Alava were sent to Italy with Spanish office-books, including a Liber Ordinum from Albelda, which was never abolished. These books, containing the Rite of Milan, were carefully examined by the Council of Mantua (1067), and were pronounced not only free from heresy but also worthy of praise.

But in Aragon King Sancho Ramirez was in favour of the change, and on 22 March, 1071, the first Roman Mass was sung in the presence of Cardinal Hugo Candidus and his companion clerics. The Rite was not abolished by Sancho (near Jaca, at the foot of the Pyrenees, and the burial place of the early kings of Aragon). The Roman Rite was introduced into Navarre on the accession of Sancho of Aragon to the throne in 1074, and into Catalonia a little later. Meanwhile Alfonso VI became King of Castile and Leon, and St. Gregory VII became pope. A solemn framework was given to the struggle by St. Hugh of Cluny, and by his first wife Agnes, daughter of William, Duke of Gascony and Guienne and Count of Poitiers, introduced the Roman Rite into Castile and Leon in 1077. This was resisted by his subjects, and on Palm Sunday, 1077, according to the "Chronicon Burgense", occurred the incident of "El Juicio de Dios", in which a Toledan, says the chronicler,—were chosen to fight "pro lege Romana et Teletana." The champion of the Spanish Rite, Juan Ruiz de Matansas, who was the victor, was certainly a Castilian, but it is improbable that the champion of the Roman Rite, whose name is not recorded, was a Toledan, and the Annals of Castile say "the Toledan was the other of the king's party." The "Chronicon Malloceense", which alleges treachery, calls the latter "miles francorum", and at the later ordeal by fire in 1090 the Roman Rite is called impartially "romano", "frances", or "gallicano". It is said that two bulls, one named "Roma" and the other "Toledo", were set to fight, and there also the victory was with Toledo.

But, in spite of the result of the trials by battle, Alfonso continued to support the Roman Rite, and a Council of Burgos (1080) decreed its use in Castile. In 1086 Toledo was taken and the question of rites arose again. The Mozarabic Christians, who had made peace with the Toledans, again, and as well, resisted the change. This time another form of ordeal was tried. The two books were thrown into a fire. By the time the Roman book was consumed, the Toledan was little damaged. No one who has seen a Mozarabic manuscript, with its extraordinarily solid vellum, will adopt any hypothesis of Divine intervention, nor is there the slightest evidence to show. The old Spanish form is given in the modern books—"ne antiquitas ignoretur", as Leslie says in his notes to the Mozarabic Missal—but the Roman is used in actual practice.

All new churches were to use the Roman Rite, but in the six old churches, Sts. Justa and Rufina, St. Eulalia, St. Sebastian, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Torquatus, the Mozarabes might continue to have their old rite, and might hand it on to their descendants. Flores mentions also the Ermita de S. Maria de Alfìen, which is probably the church of St. Mary which Neale says "disappeared, we know not how, some centuries ago." But the rite still continued in the Moorish dominions, as well as in certain monasteries, apparently, according to Rodrigo Ximenes, Archbishop of Toledo (1210-49), even in the Christian kingdoms. When King James of Aragon conquered Valencia in 1238, he found there Mozarabic Christians using the old rite, and the same apparently happened when the Muslims and Amb Anam were conquered by Ferdinand I in 1238. When Ferdinand and Isabella took Granada in 1492, there were certainly some Mozarabic Christians there, as well as Christian merchants and prisoners from non-Moorish countries, but whether the Mozarabic Rite was used by them does not appear. With the disorganisation which began with the fall of Granada, it disappeared.

The civil privileges (fueros) of the Toledo Mozarabes, which, though in 1147 Pope Eugene III had definitely put them under the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese, including a certain amount of independence, were confirmed by Alfonso VII in 1118, by Peter in 1350, by Henry II in 1379, and by Ferdinand II in 1504, by Charles II in 1699, and by Philip V in 1740. But in spite of this the Roman Rite prevailed so much that it was introduced even into Mozarabic churches, which only used the old rite for certain special days, and that in a corrupted form from old and imperfectly understood MSS. This and the dying out of many Mozarabic churches in the tenth century, the breaking up of the old Moorish kingdoms, and the introduction of the Gothic Rite, which was more easily learnt by primitive Christians, led to the decline. There was a spasmodic attempt at a revival, when in 1436 Juan de Todesillas, Bishop of Segovia, founded the college of Aniago (originally a Benedictine house, a little to the south-west of Valladolid), where the priests were to use the Gothic Rite. The foundation lasted five years and then became Carthusian. Thus, when the last Mozarabes of Toledo became Archbishop of Toledo in 1495, he found the Mozarabic Rite in a fair way to become extinct. He employed the learned Alfonso Ortiz and three Mozarabic priests, Alfonso Martinez, parish priest of St. Eulalia, Antonio Rodrigues of Sts. Justa and Rufina, and Jeronymo Gutierrez of St. Luke, to prepare an edition of the Mozarabic Missal and the Office of the Breviary, which appeared in 1502. He founded the Mozarabic Chapel in Toledo cathedral, with an endowment for eighteen chaplains, a sacristan and two mosos servientes, and with provision for a sung Mass and the Divine Office daily. Soon afterwards, in 1517, Rodrigo Arias Maldonado de Talavera founded the Capilla de San Salvador, or de Talavera, in the Old Cathedral of Salamanca, where fifty-five Mozarabic Masses were said yearly. They were later reduced to six, and now the rite is used there only once or twice a year.

When the church of St. Mary Magdalen of Valladolid was founded by Pedro de la Gasca in 1567, an agreement was in the same year, in which it is said that she said there every month. This foundation was in existence when Flores wrote of it in 1748, but is now extinct. At that time also the offices of the titular
saints were said according to the Mozarabic Rite in the six Mozarabic churches of Toledo, and in that of Sts. Justa and Rufina the Mozarabic feast of the Samaritan Woman (first Sunday in Lent) was also observed. Except for the Capilla Muzárabe in the cathedral, all else was Roman. In 1553 Pope Julius III regulated mixed marriages between Mozarabic and Roman Christians. The children were to follow the rite of the father, but, if the eldest daughter of a Mozarabic married a Roman, she and her husband might choose the rite to which she and her children should belong, and if she became a widow she might return to the Mozarabic Rite, if she had left it at her marriage. These rules are still in force, and the writer is informed by Dom Pérotin that the present Mozarabes are so proud of their distinctive rite, involving, as it does, particular titles like “Antiphonary of the Office sung by the choir” or said by the celebrant or the deacon, were usually combined in one book, a sort of mixed sacramentary, antiphonary, and lectionary, usually with musical neumes to the sung portions. Most of the MSS. are very imperfect, and it is not quite clear under what name this composite book was known. Probably it was called “Antiphonary of the Office sung by the choir” or said such books existed also as antiphoniers with choir parts only and sacramentaries with the priest’s part only, and the usual modern practice is to call the composite books by the descriptive name of “Offices and Masses”. They contain under each day the variables of Vespers and Matins and of the Mass. The Mozarabic Rite has made few changes in the shape of some of the invariables, as a model of a complete Mass. The Missale Omnium Oferentium, the separate book answering to the Ordinary of the Mass (see Section V, The Mass), does not exist in any early MS., but there is a Missa Omnimo in the principal Silos MS. of the “Liber Ordinum”, which is a model of the type that was used. In some cases “Offices and Masses” was supplemented for the Divine Office by the Psalter, which in its fullest form (as in the British Museum Add. MS. 30851) contained the whole book of Psalms, the Canticles, chiefly from the Old Testament, sixty-seven to a hundred in number, the Hymns for the year, and the “Hore Pontificales”. For the office of Vespers there is no supplement, but the Prophecies, Epistles, and Gospels are found also in a separate book known as “Liber Comitis”, “Liber Comices” or “Comes”. The Prayers of Vespers and Matins and the Prayers which follow the Gloria in Excelsis at Mass are also found combined in the “Liber Orationum”, and the Homilies read at Mass are collected in the “Homiliarium”, though some are also given in the composite “Offices and Masses”. The occasional services of the Ritual and Pontifical are found in the “Liber Ordinum”, which contains also a number of Masses. There is one MS. (at Silos) which contains the Lessons of the now obsolete nocturnal Office. The following is a list of MSS. of these books: 

II. MSS. AND EDITIONS.—Of the existing MSS. of the Mozarabic Rite many, as might be expected, are in the cathedral chapter library at Toledo, but until quite recent times the Benedictine Abbey of Silos, between thirty and forty miles to the south of Burgos, possessed nearly as many. Most of these are now elsewhere, some having been purchased in 1878 by the British Museum, and others by the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale. There are other MSS. in the Royal Library, in the Library of the Royal Academy of History, in the Archdiocesan archives, in the Cathedral Library at Leon, in the University Library at Santiago de Compostela, and in the chapter library at Verona. It will be seen from the list which follows that nearly all the existing MSS.

come either from Toledo or from the neighbourhood of Burgos. There is also an interesting collection of transcripts, made from 1752 to 1756 under the direction of the Jesuit Father, A. M. Burriel, from Toledo MSS. in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid. All the original MSS. are anterior to the conquest of Toledo in 1085, most of them being of the tenth or eleventh century. The arrangement of the books of that period was peculiar. The variable parts of the Mass and of the Divine Office whether sung by the choir or said by the celebrant or the deacon, were usually combined in one book, a sort of mixed sacramentary, antiphonary, and lectionary, usually with musical neumes to the sung portions. Most of the MSS. are very imperfect, and it is not quite clear under what name this composite book was known. Probably it was called “Antiphonary of the Office sung by the choir” or said such books existed also as antiphoniers with choir parts only and sacramentaries with the priest’s part only, and the usual modern practice is to call the composite books by the descriptive name of “Offices and Masses”. They contain under each day the variables of Vespers and Matins and of the Mass. The Mozarabic Rite has made few changes in the shape of some of the invariables, as a model of a complete Mass. The Missale Omnium Oferentium, the separate book answering to the Ordinary of the Mass (see Section V, The Mass), does not exist in any early MS., but there is a Missa Omnimo in the principal Silos MS. of the “Liber Ordinum”, which is a model of the type that was used. In some cases “Offices and Masses” was supplemented for the Divine Office by the Psalter, which in its fullest form (as in the British Museum Add. MS. 30851) contained the whole book of Psalms, the Canticles, chiefly from the Old Testament, sixty-seven to a hundred in number, the Hymns for the year, and the “Hore Pontificales”. For the office of Vespers there is no supplement, but the Prophecies, Epistles, and Gospels are found also in a separate book known as “Liber Comitis”, “Liber Comices” or “Comes”. The Prayers of Vespers and Matins and the Prayers which follow the Gloria in Excelsis at Mass are also found combined in the “Liber Orationum”, and the Homilies read at Mass are collected in the “Homiliarium”, though some are also given in the composite “Offices and Masses”. The occasional services of the Ritual and Pontifical are found in the “Liber Ordinum”, which contains also a number of Masses. There is one MS. (at Silos) which contains the Lessons of the now obsolete nocturnal Office. The following is a list of MSS. of these books:

Offices and Masses.—(a) Toledo, Chapter Library, 35.4, eleventh century. Contains from Easter to the twenty-second Sunday after Pentecost. Belonged to the parish of St. Olalla (Eulalia) at Toledo. (b) 35.5, tenth or eleventh century, 194 ff. Contains from the first Sunday of Lent to the third day of March. (c) 35.6, eleventh century, 199 ff. Contains from Easter to Pentecost and feasts as far as SS. Just and Pastor (6 Aug.). (d) Madrid, Royal Academy of History, F. 190, tenth or eleventh century, 230 ff. Belonged to the Monastery of San Millan (St. Emilius) de la Cogolla in the Rioja. (e) Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, formerly at Toledo (35.2), eleventh century, 121 ff. Contains the Lenten Offices up to Palm Sunday. Colophon “Finitur deo gratias hic liber per manus ferrandini dominus presbiteri eglesie sanctuarum juste et ruine civitatis Toleti in mense Aprilis.” (f) Silos, eleventh century, paper octavo, 154 ff. (g) British Museum, Add. 30544, tenth century, 183 ff. Contains the Annunciation (18 Dec.), St. Thomas, Christmas, St. Stephen, St. Eugenia (27 Dec.), St. James the Less (26 Dec.), St. James the Great (30 Dec., but called St. John), St. Columba (31 Dec.), the Circumcision, Epiphany, St. Peter's Chair (22 Feb.),
Ascension, and the Sunday after the Ascension. The Mass for the Annunciation is a model Mass with something of the Mozarabic liturgy inserted in some of the Masses; and the liturgical part is preceded by a collection of Homilies. Belonged to the Abbey of Silos. (h) British Museum, Add. 30845, tenth century. Contains Offices and Masses for the Feast of St. Quiricus (4 or 20 May), and of Feasts from St. John Baptist (24 June) to St. Emilian (12 Nov.), thirteen in all, though not all in their proper order. Belonged to the Abbey of Silos. (i) British Museum, Add. 30846, tenth century. Contains Offices and Masses for Easter Week, followed by the Canticles for the same period, and the Hymns for Easter tide to Pentecost, including the Feasts of Sts. Engratia (16 April), Torquatus and Philip (1 May), and the Invention of the Cross (9 May). An edition of the MS. which deserts itself as “Antiphonarium de toto anni circulo, a festivitate S. Aciscil [17 Nov.] usque ad finem”, containing the choir parts, but not the priest’s part of the Offices and Masses. This is the book known, quite erroneously, as the “Antiphoner of King Wamba”, presented to the Cathedral Library at Leon by King Wamba c. 1010, the cellum MS. of the eleventh century (Era 1107 = A.D. 1069), 200 ff., transcribed by one Arias, probably from a much older book, which perhaps did belong to King Wamba (672–80). Dom Férotin describes it as very complete.

Sacramentaries.—(a) Toledo Chapter Library, 35.3, L. 3005, 177 ff. Contains Masses for the year. In the initial of that for St. Peter’s Chair (22 Feb.) are the words “Elenus Abbas Acsi indignus scriptus” (sic). It belonged to the parish of St. Olalla (Eulalia) at Toledo. Dom Férotin describes it as a Sacramentary, and says that it is complete. An edition by him will soon be published. (b) There is also a Sacramentary of the same date with a readable number by Burriel, Eguren, and Simonet, which is said by them to contain “Missas omnes tam de tempore quam de sanctis per totum anni circulum”. There is a copy of it among the Burriel manuscripts at Madrid, and Eguren ascribes the original to the ninth century.

Psalter.—(a) Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, formerly at Toledo (35.1), tenth century, 174 ff. Contains the Psalter with antiphons, the Canticles, and the Hymnal. On f. 150 are the words “Abundantius presbyter librum mauro presbytero scriptor” (sic). The prologue of the Hymnal is an acrostic in verse which reads “Mavricio obtante Verianino edidit. This book is of a style and construction like the Psalter, Canticles, and Hymnal in his edition of the Mozarabic Breviary. There is a copy among the Burriel MSS. (b) British Museum, Add. 30851, eleventh century. Contains Psalter, Canticles, Hymnal, and “Hore Canonice”, the last (though imperfect) being much fuller than the printed Breviary and containing the now obsolete Night Offices, as well as the other Hours and a number of offices for special occasions. It has been edited by J. P. Gilson for the Henry Bradshaw Society. (c) Santiago de Compostela, University Library, Gabinete de Reservados No. 1, dated Era 1093 (A.D. 1055), “Petrus erat scriptor, Fructuos de- nique pictor.” Contains Psalter, 100 Canticles, and the Night Offices, but not the Hymnal. The Psalter is preceded by a poem addressed by Florus of Lyons to Hydradius (here called Ysidorus Abbass), Abbot of Novalase near Susa in Piedmont (825–7). There is a full description of this MS. in Férotin’s “Deux Manu- scripts wisigothiques de la Bibliothèque de Ferdinand I.” (d) Royal Library, Madrid, 2 J. 5, dated Era 1097 (A.D. 1057). Contains Psalter and Hymnal, nearly agreeing with the Compostela Psalter. There is a formula of confession, in which the names of Queen Sancia and the Infanta Urraca appear, and which contain an extraordinary list of sins. The MS. belonged in the fourteenth century to the Benedictine monastery of St. Maria de Aniago near Simancas, which in 1455 was united with a monastery in Briviesca (Section I. History and Origin), then to the Colegio de Cuencia at Salamanca. It is fully described in Férotin’s “Deux Manuscrits wisigothiques”. (e) A Psalter and Canticles of the tenth century, 122 ff., sold at the Silos sale in 1878, present owner unknown.


Liber Comices, Liber Comitibus, Comes, containing the Prophesies, Epistles, and Gospels used at Mass. (a) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouv. Acquis. Lat. 2171, eleventh century. Belonged to Silos from 1067, when it was given to the Cathedral by Sancha, sister of King Wamba, in 1060, or about 1075. Edited by Dom Moita (Maredsous, 1893). (b) Toledo, Chapter Library, 35.8, ninth or tenth century. Imperfect, containing only from “Dominica post infantum” to the Saturday of the fourth week of Lent. (c) Leon, Cathedral Library. A little earlier than 1071, when it was given to the Cathedral by Bishop Pelagius, to celebrate the eighth Sunday of Advent and ends with what it calls “the twenty-fourth Sunday”. According to Dom Férotin it is rich in Votive Masses, but incomplete in much else.


Liber Ordinarium.—(a) Silos, dated Era 1090 (A.D. 1052), 344 ff. Copied by Bartolommeus Presbyter for Pelayo, Archbishop of San Prudentio, at San Roman in the Rioja. Dom Férotin states that it is the very copy sent in 1065 to Alexander II. San Prudentio was a cell of Albeida. Of the four books sent to Rome one was “Liber Ordinum majoris Albalden[cis] Cenobi”, and one of the deputation, Eximino of Oca, was a personal friend of St. Dominic of Silos. The MS. contains a very full collection of the Ritual and Pontifical Offices and a large number of votive and other Masses. Fully edited and described by Dom Férotin in his “Liber Ordinarium”. (b) Silos, dated Era 1077 (A.D. 1039). Written by Joannes Presbyter. Contains Calendar, Baptism, Visitations etc. of the Sick, Commendation of the Dead, Matrimony, a large collection of prayers and blessings, and Votive Masses. Edited by Dom Férotin. (c) Silos, eleventh century, 142 ff. Contains also Hours, which are offices for every hour of the twelve, as well as Ordo Peculiaris (Aurora), ante Completa, ad Completa, post Completa, ante lectulum, and in nocturnis. Edited, except the Hours, by Dom Férotin. (d) Madrid, Academia-12. 5, 131 ff., dated Era 1107 (A.D. 1124), eleventh century, 155 ff. Belonged to San Millan de la Cogolla in the Rioja. Contains a Ritual and a number of Masses. Edited by Dom Férotin.

The descriptions of all the above MSS. (except
those in the British Museum, which the writer has examined for himself) are worked out from those given by Fétroin, Ewald and Loewe, Simonet, Eguren, and the list of the Burriel transcripts in Fernandez de Navarrete’s “Coleccion de Documentos” (see bibliography). The chief MSS. are Roman, and the principal MSS. will appear in Dom Fétroin’s forthcoming edition of the Mozarabic Sacramentary. The lists of Toledo MSS. given by Lorentzana and Pinius are too vague for purposes of identification. The four MSS. (Add. 30847-30850), described in the Catalogue of Additional Manuscripts of the British Museum for 1878 as Mozarabic are all Roman, three being Romanon-monicastic and one secular.


Psalter, Canticles, Hymnal, and Hours.—In Lorentzana’s Breviary of 1775 and the Migne reprint, from the Toledo manuscript. In the Henry Bradshaw Society’s Publications, vol. XXX, edited by J. P. Gilson, London, 1905, from the British Museum MS.

Liber Comunicus. —Edited by Dom G. Morin from the Psalter in “Anecdota Maredsolanae”, I, Maredsous, 1893.

III. THE LITURGICAL YEAR.—In the present printed books, the offices are divided after the Roman fashion into “Officium Canonicum per Annunum” (answering to the Officium de Tempore) and the “Sanctorale.” As in the Roman books, the fixed feasts from Christmas Eve to the Epiphany (except that the Breviary puts two in the “Sanctorale”) come in “de Tempore”, and the Missal, but not the Breviary, includes also St. Clement (23 Nov.), St. Saturninus (29 Nov.), St. Andrew (30 Nov.), St. Eulalia (10 Dec.), the Annunciation (18 Dec.), and St. Thomas the Apostle (21 Dec.) in the same chart, thus the three Christmas feasts come in “Sanctorale.” In the manuscripts (e.g. in the two Libri Oratorium, Add. MS. 30852 and the Verona MS. printed in Bianchini’s edition of Thomasius, which has a very complete year) the two parts are not distinguished, and the whole set of days, fixed and movable, are given in one series. The “Officium per Annunum” of the modern books begins with the first Sunday of Advent, as in the Roman, but the “Sanctorale” begins with Sts. Julianus and Basilissa (7 Jan.), and ends in the Missal with St. Eugenia (12 Dec.), while the Breviary includes in it also Sts. Justus and Abundus (10 Dec.), the Annunciation (18 Dec.), St. Thomas the Apostle (21 Dec.), so as to keep the Epiphany immediately after Advent Sunday, the Missal has for St. James the Great (30 Dec.), and St. Columbus (31 Dec.). There are six Sundays of Advent, as there were in the Gallican and are now in the Ambrosian. The key day for Advent Sunday is therefore St. Martin (11 Nov.), as it is in the Ambrosian Rite, and, as according to the Council of Mâcon (581), it was in the Gallican, but Advent Sunday is that next after, not, as in the Roman, that nearest to the key. Thus Advent Sunday may be on any day from 12 to 18 Nov.

The four feasts which follow Christmas Day are now the same as in the Roman Rite, including St. Thomas of Canterbury. The next day is the Translation of St. James the Great and the last day of the year is St. Columba, Virgin and Martyr, though the Calendar of the Missal includes also St. Silvester. But, according to the Calendar of the Breviary, the twenty-ninth is “Jacobi Fratris Domini”, and there is an office for his feast, as well as a direction to use the Common of one pontiff martyr for St. Thomas of Canterbury, and for the thirtieth there is an Office for the feast (translation) “Sancti Jacobi Fratris Sancti Joannis”. In the Missal St. James the Lesser is not mentioned here in the Calendar, but the Mass of the twenty-ninth is his; there is nothing of St. Thomas, and the table of contents of the Ximenes Missal refers to the Mass of that day as “in translatione Jacobi Zebedeti”, which it certainly is not. There is no Mass for the Translation of St. James the Great in the printed books, though in the ancient Manuscript of the Breviary, the full Mass “Omnim Offenentum” instead of the Ordinary; but in Add. MS. 30844 (tenth century) there is one which follows the Mass of St. James the Lesser, though by mistake it is called by the name of St. John the Evangelist. In that MS. the days after Christmas are St. Stephen, St. Eugenia, St. James (Frater Domini), St. James the Greater, and St. Columba, leaving one day unoccupied. In Add. 30850, a tenth-century Liber Oratorium, “De Alisione Infantum”, which according to the present calendars would occupy that day (28 or 29 December), is given next after the Epiphany. In the Hymnal printed with Lorentzana’s Breviary, the vacant day is occupied by an Office for the Evangelist, and the rest are as in Add. 30844. The Circumcision is on 1 January. If a Sunday occurs between that day and the Epiphany it is “Dominica ante Epiphaniam”. The Mass is that of the Kalends of January (i.e. New Year’s Day). The three days before the Epiphany are “Jeniam in Kalendis Januarii”, said to have been set apart as fasts in contempt of Superstitiones gentium. They are “days of penance” kept during Advent ob impietatem Priscillianistarum, who, denying the Incarnation, fasted at that season. There are analogous instances of this sort of fasting (or not fasting) ad lite et contentiones in the Byzantine practice of not fasting on certain days before Lent begins because of the ambitions of the Armenians and the Ninevite Fast of the Jacobites and Nestorians. After the Epiphany (called also “Apparitio Domini”) to Lent nine Sundays are given, the last being “Dominica ante Cineres”, the rest being numbered one to eight “Post octavam Epiphaniae”.

Ash Wednesday (Penta quarta in capite jejuni) is an event in late Roman and Gallican usage, but not inserted, for the Sunday that follows, though called “Dominica prima Quadragesimae”, has a Mass and an Office in which Alleluia is used, and at Vesper there is the well-known “Ending Alleluia” (Alleluia Perenne) hymn. In the Hymnal this hymn is entitled “Ymnus in carnes tollendas”. The true liturgical Lent does not begin till the Monday after Ash Wednesday. The old Mass Lections of the Sundays in Lent have been disturbed in their order in consequence of the Gospel for the first Sunday (Christ in the Wilderness) being given to Ash Wednesday, and that of the second (The Samaritan Woman) is given to the first, that of the third (The Healing of the Blind Man) to the second, and so on; so as to keep the “Immissa deiendo” and “Immissa mediant” for Mid-Lent Sunday, that of the fifth (the Raising of Lazarus) is given to the third and a new
Gospel (The Good Shepherd) is given to the fifth. The sixth is Palm Sunday, called only "Dominica in Processu" but including, between the Prophecy and Epistle at Mass, the Traditio Symboli in the form of "Sermon on the Mount and Populum." On Maundy Thursday there occurs the same process of removing one of two consecrated Hosts to the Altar of Repose (called monumentum and Sepulchrum) as in the Roman Rite, and there is a service ad lavandos pedes, in both cases with different words. The Washing of the Feet takes place "clausis ocellis et laevis omnibus foris projectis", and the feet of certain priests are washed by the bishop and dried by the archipresbyter. "Poeiae ad cenam conveniunt." On Good Friday there is a penitential service "ad Nonam pro indulgentia," which consists largely of preces interspersed with cries of various cases of the word "indulgentia" many times repeated, and contains passages similar to the Improperia of the Roman Rite, as well as lections, including the Passion according to St. Matthew. It is the remains of the solemn reconciliation of penitents, and is mentioned by the fourth Council of Toledo (633), canon vi. This is followed by the Adoration of the Cross and the Procession and Communion of the Precruciified. The Easter Eve services are similar to those of the Roman Rite, except that the Easter Candle, the Procession (of which there are only ten, seven of which agree more or less with those of the Roman Rite, though not all in the same order), and the Blessing of the Font. But the words used throughout are very different. Even the "Exultet" is not used, but another hymn of similar import. Before the BENEDICTIO CERI there is a "Benediction of the Parchment," and the Litany is used for two processions, to the Font before the Blessing and back again after it.

From Easter to Pentecost there is no peculiarity except that the numbering of the Sundays includes Easter Day and that the four days before Whit-Sunday are called merely (e.g., the time of Satur- dioxide) these fasts came at Pentecost, though they answered to rogation or litany days. Leslie conjectures that the alteration was made because of the Whit-Sunday baptisms. There is no Blessing of the Font on the vigil of Pentecost, but there are allusions to baptism in the services of the vigil and the day itself. The following Sunday only commemorates the Holy Trinity in certain of the processions at Mass for which there is a direction to use those of Palm Sunday which have allusions to the Trinity, instead of those for the Sunday, which are to be transferred to the following Tuesday, in the title "in die Sanctissime Trinitatis," and in the hymns in the Breviary Office. One may say that any thing definite about it, is treated as the Octave of Pentecost and the allusions are to the Holy Spirit. Corpus Christi is kept on the following Thursday, and the Mass and Office, though naturally enough influenced by the Roman proper, are composed on a purely Mozarabic plan. In the Missal seven Sundays after Pentecost have Masses, and on the second Sunday before the first of December the Kalends of November. In the Breviary the Sundays after Pentecost are only three. There is a direction in the Breviary that if there is no Feast on any Sunday during that season, one of these three offices must be used. Two sets of three-day fasts occur in this season, one before the Feast of St. Cyprian (13 Sept.) and one before that of St. Martin (11 Nov.). They have nothing to do with either St. Cyprian or St. Martin, whose days only serve as key-days to them (cf. Holy Cross and St. Lucy, as key-days to the September and December ember-days). The November fast is called "jejunia Kalendarii Novembris." They are really days of Litany or Rogation, and are kept at St. Leidiana. Leidiana (29 Sept.) is evidently mentioned by the fifth Council of Toledo (can. i), though obviously by a mistake it calls it "dies Iudum Decembris," and the November one by the Council of Gerona. In the Santorale there are of course a large number of Spanish saints who either do not occur at all or receive only cursory mention in the Roman Calendar, but the Church has many that are common to the whole Church, and these have been added. There are two modern forms of the Calendar. In that prefixed to the Breviary a rather small number of days are marked, hardly any (as in the Ambrosian Calendar) during the possible Lenten period, but offices or references to the Calendar are given in the large appendix for a great number of other saints. In that prefixed to the Missal all these days are put in one series, as their Masses are in the body of the book. There are a good many discrepancies in the existing MS. calendars, and it is not always quite easy to determine the exact date of some of the older feasts, but now most of the days which are common to both have been assimilated to the Roman. The Annunciation is kept twice, on 25 March and on 18 December. The last, called "Annunciation S. Mariae Virginis de O," is really the "Expectatio Partus B. M. V." Its name is referred to a curious custom in the Toledo Use, according to which the Church ring a large bell on that day, to signify, it is said, the eager desire of the saints in Limbo, the Angels in Heaven, and of all the world for the birth of the Saviour. This or the Antiphons known as the "Great O's" may be the cause of the name, which is known outside Spain. The first day of Lent (666) ordered that the Annunciation be kept on that day, but 25 March came either in the Lenten or Easter period, and thus was unsuitable, and shortly afterwards St. Idefonseus, with reference to this decree, calls it "Expectatio Puerperi Deiparae." In the printed Missal the same Mass is ordered also for 25 March, but no Office is given in it. (Of the Breviary custom of keeping the Annunciation on the sixth Sunday of Advent for the same reason.) Sometimes there are other disagreements between the modern Missal and Breviary. Thus, the Decollation of St. John Baptist is given for 29 Aug. (the Roman, and also the Byzantine day) in the Missal, but for 24 Sept. (the old Mozarabic day, as appears from the MSS.) in the Breviary. In both, 1 May is Sts. Philip and James, and the Mass is the same, mutatis nominibus, as that of Sts. Peter and Paul, while the Office is similar to that of Sts. Simon and Jude. But in the MSS. St. Philip alone is mentioned, St. James the Less being, as we have seen, already provided with a day in Christmas week. St. Stephen is given nothing. But 1 May is also the feast of St. Torquatus and his companions, the Apostles of Spain, who naturally eclipse the other Apostles. The Sunday before the Nativity of St. John Baptist is kept as "Dominica pro adventu S. Joannis Baptistae." As its position with regard to the general sequence of Sundays and Ember Days, it is like any other Sunday in the Sandorale. The classification of feasts is very simple. There are Principal Sundays, which are those of Lent and Advent, and of course Easter Day and Whit-Sunday. Feasts are "sex capparum," "quatuor capparum," and "novem lectionum," the last being also called "duarum capparum." The distribution of these titles is occasionally rather arbitrary, and the Missal and Breviary do not always agree. If a feast comes on a Principal Sunday it is transferred to the next day, unless that is a greater feast, when it is put off to the next free day. If two equal feasts fall on the same day (the example given is Sts. Philip and James and St. Torquatus), the office which is given to that of September 29 is repeated the next day, unless the other is the Vescio (patronal feast) of the church, in which case the one with a proper is transferred. If a feast comes on an ordinary Sunday, the
Sunday is omitted (quia satis habebit locum per annum) and the feast kept. During the Octave, which are kept "secundum Regulam Gregoriam" any vacant day of the Octave, but the Office is not said solemniter except on the Octave day. If a greater feast is followed by a lesser one, the Vespers is of the greater but the last Lauda, with its prayer, is of the lesser. These rules, which do not differ in principle from those of the Roman Rite, are prefixed to the printed breviary. Their comparative simplicity is probably more apparent than real.

IV. THE DIVINE OFFICE.—The present Mozarabic Divine Office differs from all others in several points. As a general rule, which applies to every other rite, Eastern or Western, the Divine Office may be defined as the recitation of the Psalter with accompanying antiphons, litanies, prayers, canticles, etc., and the nucleus is the more or less regular distribution of the Psalter through the Canonical Hours, generally of one week. In the Mozarabic Rite there is now no such distribution of the Psalter. Psalms are used at all the Hours except Vespers—when, except in fasts, they are not used at all, but, as a rule, the fixed psalms stand. In the first three days of Lent, except the three-day fasts before the Epiphany, St. Cyprian's Day, and St. Martin's Day, and the four-day fast before Pentecost, there are three selected psalms (or sometimes one or two psalms divided into three) at Matins, Terce, Sext, and generally at None, and the Psalter is used at Vespers, but there is no consecutive order; some psalms are used many times, while others are omitted altogether. In the week after the first Sunday after the Epiphany, psalms i ... xxi, xxii, xxiv are said consecutively at Matins and Terce, three psalms or divisions of psalms at each until the Thursday, two at Terce only, and one at Prime, Vespers, and, as in the Roman, the psalms on the Saturday. In the MSS. (e.g. in the Psalter in Add. MS. 30851) there are indications of a more regular distribution of the psalms. At Matins, which is a morning and not a night Office, there are no lessons like those of the Roman Rite and its variants, but a certain similarity of construction exists in the sets of three Antiphones followed by a responsory, which sets, though normally there is only one, are increased to two, three, four, and even five on certain days, though this increase is rather capricious and inconsistent. The Silos Lectionary of 1059 consists of lessons for the now obsolete Night Office; such lessons as there are now occur at Lauds, when they are not omitted. In (9) Benediction and the sometimes called Prophetia, and at Prime, Terce, Sext, and None, where there are two short Lessons, a Prophetia from one of the Prophets or from the Apocalypse and an Epistola from one of the Epistles. These have about four variations with the seasons, except during the fasts, when there are long additional lessons at Prime, Sext, and None (cf. the lessons at Terce during Lent in the Ambrosian Rite), varying every day and also of varying number. Another peculiarity is the existence of an extra hour, called Aurora (also Ordo Peculiaris), before Prime. In a Liber Ordinum at Silos, besides the usual Hours and this Ordo Peculiaris, Offices are given for all the intermediate hours of the twelve, as well as ante Completa, post Completa, and ante Lectum. Vespers, Matins, and Lauds are very variable, but there is much less variability in the Lesser Hours and Compline. A considerable part of the Office is made up of responsoriai, constructed on similar principles to those constructed in the Mozarabic Rite, called by the various names of Antiphona, Lauda, Sona (or Sonae), or Mututinarium according to their position in the Office. (Antiphona also means the antiphon of a psalm or canticle, which is of the same form as in the Roman Rite.) They vary in form, but the general plan is: Verse, Response, Verse, repetition of first Response. Gloria second repetition of Response or of first Verse and Response. The first Lauda at Vespers and the Sona are generally without the Gloria and the second repetition of the Response. These various responsories and also the psalms, canticles, etc. are generally followed by Orationes, which are usually found on them, or with or without special reference to the day or season.

The construction of the Hours is as follows: Before every Hour except Lauds, which follows on after Matins: Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Kyrie eleison; Pater Noster; Ave Maria, are said secretly, kneeling. Then, standing, In nomine D.N.J.C. lumen cum pace. R. Deo gratias. V. Dominus sit semper vobiscum. R. Et cum spiritu tuo. This elongated form of the Dominus vobiscum is said very frequently after collects and responses and in various other places. The form of the Gloria, which also occurs very frequently, is: Gloria et honor Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto in secula seculorum. Amen.

Vespers (Ad Vesperos).—(1) Lauda followed by its oratio. Alternative names are psalmus and vesperinum, and the words are nearly always the same. This form of Lauda has the Gloria. (2) Sona on Sundays and feasts, but not on ferials except in paschal time. This is also without Gloria. (3) Alleluia, followed by an antiphona with Gloria. Sometimes there are two antiphones, each followed by its oratio. In Lent, on the fasts, and in the week after the octave of the Epiphany in both, its antiphon takes the place of this antiphona. (4) Second Lauda, with Alleluia interspersed in rather variable fashion, with Gloria. The Regula in the beginning of the Breviary has this definition: "Antiphona est quae dicetur sine Alleluia; et Lauda quae cum Alleluia dicitur", but this is not an exhaustive definition. (5) Hymn. This of course varies with the day. There is a great wealth of hymns in the Mozarabic Breviary. (6) Supplicatio, a bidding Prayer generally beginning "Oremus Redemptorem mundi D.N.J.C., cum omni supplicatione rogemus", and continuing with a clause applicable to the day, with response: "Preces aeternae omnipotentis Deus", and Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Kyrie eleison. (7) Capitula, a prayer of the diffuse Gallican type, often embodying the idea of the Supplicatio. (8) Pater noetre, divided into petitions with a response of Amen to each except "Panem nostrum etm": when it is "Quia Deos", and followed by an occasionally varying Em-}
few additions on Saturdays, the principal Feasts, in Lent (when there is also a short "Ordo ante Completoria"), and "De traditio Domini" (Passiontide) after the psalms, some variant hymns, and "Miseratione," with variant capitula and Benedictiones ora, on each day of the week, and on Paschal time, and sometimes Ps. i.ii. (4) The Antiphona. These are in sets of three antiphona and a responsorium. The last only differs from the antiphona in name. To each is appended its oratio. During the first three weeks of Lent and the fasts of Epiphany, Pentecost, St. Cyprian, and St. Martin, and on four days of the week after the Octave of the Epiphany, three varying psalms with antiphons and orations followed by a responsorium and oratio take the place of the antiphona. There is usually only one set of Antiphona etc., but there may be (e.g. on the Feast of Sts. Fructuosus, Augurius, and Eulogius) as many as five. On Sundays Matins begins with the hymn "Eterne redemptoris Christi," and except of Ps. i.ii. (i.e. only Ps. iii. is said), there are three psalms (iii.1, and lvi) with their orations, instead of only one of these.

Lauds (In Laudibus) follows immediately on Matins with no preliminary except "Dominus at semper vobiscum." Its order is: (1) A variable Canticum from the Old and occasionally from the New Testament, with a antiphona before the first; and sometimes an oratio follows. On Christmas Day the Magnificat is said in addition to the first Canticum and on the Annunciation instead of it. (2) On Sundays and feast days, the Canticum "Benedictus es Domine Deus Patrum nostrorum" (Daniel, iii. 32 sq.), which includes a verse against the exercise of the最高的, is sometimes followed by an oratio. On ferials an antiphona or responsorium, called Maturnalium, takes the place of this canticle. (3) The Sono, generally the same as that at Vespers. This, as at Vespers, is not used on ferials, except in Paschal time. (4) The Laudate Psalms (exviii, cxlvii, cxli, cl) preceded by a variable Canticum. On some ferials only Ps. cxlvii is ordered. (5) The Propheta, a lection from the Old Testament, or in Paschal time from the Apocalypse. (6) The Hymn of the day. (7) Supplicatio, as at Vespers. (8) Capitula, as at Vespers. (9) Pater noster and Embolismus, as at Vespers. (10) Lauda, as at Vespers. (11) Benedictio, as at Vespers. The order of these last two is reversed. The last six are as a rule a different set from those at Vespers.

(12) Commemorations, as at Vespers. (13) Dismissal, as at Vespers. In Lent and in the other fasts, Lauds begins with Psalm I and its antiphon. On these occasions Ps. iii. is used at Matins.

Aurore.—very simple office, without variations, said at Vespers only on ferials, Ps. cxlix, cxlvii, pta. 1-3, under the one antiphon, "Deus in adjutiori transit," 2) Lauda. (3) Hymn "Jam nami noctis transit," with its versicle, of which there are three variants. (4) Kyrie eleison etc. (5) Pater noster with Embolismus, as said at Vespers. (6) Preces, a short litany for all sorts and conditions of men. There are two forms of this.

Prime, Terce, Sext, None.—These are constructed on the same plan, and may be taken together. The order is: (1) The Psalms. At Prime, seven (lxxvi, cxli, cxlv, 1-12; cxlvii, 13-21; cxxvi, eight ps. 4-6); at Terce, four (cxiv, cxvii, pta. 7-9); at Sext, four (lxxiv, cxiv, cxvii, pta. 16, 17, 18); at None, four (cxiv, cxvii, cxlv, pta. 18, 19, 20). In each case under one antiphon, (2) Esponorium, varying with the day. These variations are chiefly "comons" of classes of saints and for Lent, Advent, Christmas, and Easter. The Psalms and Responsoria are without orations. (3) Propheta, a lection from the Old Testament or Apocalypse. (4) Epistles, a lection from the Epistles. At Prime these lessons do not vary and are very short: at Terce, Sext, and None, and on the Matins of the fasts, a short expository oration is added, following Lent and on the fasts, when these Hours are differently arranged, there are very long lections. (5) Lauda, with Alleluias or "Laus tibi etc." (6) Hymns. There are a few variants for different seasons in each hour. (7) At Prime on Sundays and Feasts here follow the Te Deum, Gloria in Excelsis, and Credo; on ferials, instead of the first two, the Benedictus es Domine Deus (Dan., iii) and the Miserere (Ps. I) are said. At the other three Hours the Clamores, short supplications for mercy and pardon (a different set for each Hour), are said here. (8) Supplicatio, as at Vespers. (9) Capitula, as at Vespers. (10) Pater noster etc., as at Vespers. (11) Benedictio, as at Vespers. The last four have only a few variants, and generally have reference to the usual events commemorated at the Hours. On the fasts and in the week after Epiphany there are special lessons varying in number, and these are generally followed by three psalms, with their antiphons and orations and a responsorium with its oratio, as at the Matins of those seasons. Then follow Preces, the Hymn, Capitula, time for the next Sacrament, etc.

At the end of Vespers, Compline, and Lauds certain fixed Commemorations, appropriate to the Hour, are said, and after Compline and the Lesser Hours, Salve Regina is said throughout the year, but after Lauds, Salve Regina, Alma Redemptoris Mater, Ecce Mater genuit Salvatorem, Sub tum praedium, and Regina celi after the Annunciation and the Ascension. There are other variations, for at Vespers, Matins, and Lauds nearly everything is variable according to the day and the season, and a good deal is so at the Lesser Hours. Some few things may have been altered and added since, but the Divine Office as described above, which is fast in form of the Roman liturgy, still preserves many essential material in structure from that indicated in the tenth and eleventh century MSS. in the British Museum, except that there were formerly also certain Night Offices—"Ordo ante Lectum," "Ad Nocturnum," "Ad Medium Noctis" etc.—which are given in Add. 30831 and elsewhere. Possibly these were only for monastic use.
ably derived from offerentia, a word which is used by Tertullian (Adv. Marc., xxxix) in the general sense of the act of presenting an offering, but which was perhaps used by the Roman to express the idea of the Gloria with but no reference to the Holy Offering. Thus it may be conjectured that the Spanish expression was originally "Missale Omnium Offerentiarum", "Missal of all Masses", which is just what it is. It has been suggested that offerens may have been used in very debased Latin in the sense of an act of offering as well as of one who offers. This would explain the Mozarabic phrase in still better.

The Order of the Mass is as follows:

(1) The Preparation.—This consists of prayers during vesting, which for the most part resemble those of the Roman Rite in meaning and sometimes in actual wording. These are followed by a responsory and oratio for pardon and purity, after which the priest goes to the altar and says Ave Maria. In nomine D.N.J.C., Sancti Spiritus adae nobis gratia, Judica me, with the Antiphon Introibo, Conforeor, with the absolution and the subsequent versicles and responses. The Confiteor differs from the Roman form and there are versicles and responses before it. Then Auer a nobis, a longer form than the Roman. Then follows the Stabat Mater. The priest first kisses the cross on the altar, kisses the altar, and says a responsory "Salve crux pretiosa" and an oratio.

A good deal of this preliminary matter was borrowed by Cardinal Ximenes from the Toletan (Roman) Missal, and is not Mozarabic. On great feasts the priest directly he enters sings to a rather florid piece of plain chant: a prayer "Per gloriam nominis tui etc." for help.

(2) The Preparation of the Chalice and Paten.—The corporal is unfolded, the chalice and paten are ceremonially purified, the wine is poured into the chalice, the water is blessed and poured in, and the bread is placed on the paten. To each of these acts there is a responsory and oratio. A duty between the Missal. The priest, before Mass, instead of at the Offertory, is to be inferred from the Irish tracts (see Celtic Rite). It is still the Byzantine practice, and is retained by the Dominicans at low Mass. Yet in the Mozarabic Missa Omnium Offerentiarum there is a direction to put wine into the chalice during the Epistle, but it is not done.

(3) The Epistle.—This is the same as at low Mass, with the difference that the reader then signs the Gospel with the cross and kisses it, saying: "Ave Verbum Divinum: reformatio virtutum: restitutio sanitarum."

(4) The Gospel.—This consists of: (a) The Lauda, a verse between two Alleluias. It is what St. Germanus calls the Sonus, sung during the procession of the Oblation. There is no point of interest, but it is being sung the Oblation ceremonies go on.

(b) The oblation of the bread and wine, with prayers resembling but not identical with the Roman. It is at the covering of the chalice with the filiola (pall) that the prayer containing the words "omnium offerentium" (see above) is said. (c) The Blessing of the oblation, for which there is a special oratio, similar to that in the Roman Rite, but the priest signs the Gospel with the cross and kisses it, saying: "Ave Verbum Divinum: reformatio virtutum: restitutio sanitarum."

(11) The Offertory.—This consists of: (a) The Lauda, a verse between two Alleluias. It is what St. Germanus calls the Sonus, sung during the procession of the Oblation. There is no point of interest, but it is being sung the Oblation ceremonies go on.

(5) The Lauda, a verse between two Alleluias. It is what St. Germanus calls the Sonus, sung during the procession of the Oblation. There is no point of interest, but it is being sung the Oblation ceremonies go on.

(6) The Prophecy.—This is a lection usually from the Old Testament, except in Paschal time, when it is from the Apocalypse. (See Ambrosian Rite.) During Lent and other Fasts, there are two of these lections, one from one of the books of Solomon and the other from the Pentateuch or one of the Historical Books.

(7) The Hymnus Trium Puerorum occasionally follows the Prophecy. This is the Benedictus es (Dan., iii, 52-5) with an abridged form of the Benedicticle, the whole preceded by Dan., iii, 49-51, rather freely quoted. The fourth Council of Toledo (can. xiv) ordered this "in omnium missarum solemnitate."

(8) Psallendo (a responsory).—On the second and third Sundays and on weekdays in Lent it is a Tractus, which consists of psalm verses without repetitions, as in the Roman Rite. The Tract or Psallendo of Sundays of Lent, a Psalm of Ps. xcv, 1-7 (in the Tractado Simbolo comes here, is followed by the Preces, a short penitential litany, differing each Sunday. Neale points out that these are in verse, though not written so.

(9) The Epistle, or in Paschal time a lection from the Acts of the Apostles, preceded by "silentiwm facite", proclaimed by the deacon before the Gospel, at the Missal is read.

(10) The Gospel, preceded only by a short prayer "Conforta me Rex Sanctorum" and the "Munda cor meum corpusque ac labia" (the rest as in the Roman Rite), followed by the Blessing, which is not in the Roman form. These of course are said secretly. The giving out of the Gospel and the response and the censing of the Gospel. The priest sings the Gospel with the cross and kisses it, saying: "Ave Verbum Divinum: reformatio virtutum: restitutio sanitarum."
Pain Bénit) was used in France, and formerly in England. The form of this is nearly identical with the first of those given in the Roman and Sarum Missals. But as it is now no longer used: (h) In the Litusbo, with only the first three verses of the psalm. It is followed by a final blessing: "super oblationem cum tribus digitis".

(12) The Prayer of Humble Access, said with bowed head by the priest.

St. Isidore in his "Eymologies" (vi, 19) mentions a dismissal of the communicants with a deacon's Proclamation as occurring at this point. Here begins the Missa Fidelitum, which contains the Seven Prayers spoken of by St. Isidore. These seven prayers are:

(13) Ad Missam Oratio, Oratio Missae, or simply Missa.—This is often, but not always, a Bidding Prayer. The Gallican name is Praefatio. It is followed in the Mozarabic by "Agios, Agios, Agios, Domine Rex eternus, tibi laudes et gratias" sung by the choir, preceded by Oremus (one of the only two instances of this word), and followed by a short invitation to intercessory prayer, a very much compressed form of the Frez (see CÆLITIC RITE; GALICIAN RITE; priest.

(14) Alius Oratio.—This, in the Gallican books, is generally headed "Collectio sequitur". The Reichenauf fragments (see GALICIAN RITE) are not always quite clear as to whether there are one or two prayers here, and whether this is to be identified with the Collectio or the Ante Nomina of those leaves, but neither of those two is the Ante Nomina which follow, nor has the Mozarabic Alius Oratio, except in the varying ending "Per misericordiam tuam, Deus noster, in cujus susceptu sanctorum Apostolorum et Martyrum, Confessorum atque Virginum nominis recitantur". This is followed by another fixed passage reciting how Sacerdotes nostreri [here, according to Leonis] Dei et regis obediremus, et suum episcopum, the bishop of Toledo and other metropolitan of Spain Papa Romensis [here the name of the reigning pope was inserted] et reliqui [i. e. according to Leslie's conjecture, the Bishops of Carthage, Milan, Lyons etc.], and all priests, deacons, clerks, and surrounding peoples offer the oblation for themselves and for all the brotherhood with a response: "Offertum pro se et pro universa fraternitate". Then follow the Dyptichs or lists of names commemorated, which are in two parts, Apostles and Martyrs, a list consisting of Our Lady, St. Zachary, St. John (Baptist), the Innocents, the Apostles and St. Mark and St. Luke. To this there is a response "et omnium Martyrum". The second list is "Icmm pro spiritibus paussianum", with forty-some names, beginning with Sts. Hilary, Athanasius, Martin, Ambrose, and Augustine, and going on with a list of Spanish persons, many of them archbishops of Toledo, both before and after the Conquest. To this the response, as in the Stowe Missal (see CELITIC RITE), is "et omnium passionis".

(15) The Oratio Post Nomina continues the intersection. This, the third prayer of St. Isidore's list, is variable with the day, except for the ending, "Quia tu es vita vivorum, sanitas infirmorum et requies omnium defunctorum in aeterna secula seculorum".

(16) The Pazz, with the prayer Ad Pacem, St. Isidore's fourth prayer. The prayer is variable with a fixed ending, "Quia tu es vera pac nostra etc." After the prayer the priest pronounces the benediction, "Gratia Dei Patriis omnipotensis, pac et die picto D. N. J. C. et communicatio Spiritus Sancti sit semper cum omnibus nobis". In all the principal Eastern liturgies except that of St. Mark, this passage from Co. 15:13-14 comes immediately before the Suresa corda dialogue, its place before the Paz being taken by eipher Natus or its equivalent. In St. Mark and in the Roman it does not occur, but in the latter ever since the late fourth, or early fifth century at least, the Paz has been associated with the Consecration, not with the beginning of the Missa Fidelitum. In the Gallican the Paz comes as in the Mozarabic. The Ambrosian now follows the Roman, but probably did not always do so. (See AMBROSIAN RITE; CELTIC RITE; GALICIAN RITE.) In the Mozarabic Mass, the priest says "Quomodo adstitit poema facite," and thechorus responses, "Pacem semem do vobis," "Novum mandatum do vobis, etc.", during which "accipiat Sacerdos pacem de patena", saying "Habete oculus dilectionis et pacis ut apsi sita sancti sanctissimi Dei," and gives the kiss of peace to the deacon (vel puerus), who passes it on to the people.

(17) The Ilatio or Italatio.—This is called Praefatio in the Roman and Contestatio or Immolatio in the Gallican. With the Post-Sanctus it forms St. Isidore's fifth prayer. There are proper Illationes to every Mass. The form is similar to the Roman Preface, but generally longer and more diffuse, as in the Gallican. It is preceded by a longer dialogue than the usual one: "Interdictio et altare Dei motum est. M. Ad Deum qui laetificat seclorum", etc. V. Aurea ad Dominum. R. Habemus ad Dominum. V. Suresa Corda. R. Leveamus ad Dominum. V. Deo ac D. N. J. C. qui est in coelis dignas laudas, dignae gratias referamus. B. Dignum et justum est. V. Dignum et justum est, etc. The Ilatio ends in all manner of blessings, but says nothing by way of an angel to the Sanctus. This is "Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth. Pleni sunt coeli et terras gloria majestatis tuae. Osanna filio David. Benedictus et Agnus, Agnos, Kyrie o Theos."

(18) The Post-Sanctus, part of St. Isidore's fifth prayer, is nearly the same regardless to the day, but almost always begins "Vere sanctae fuerunt benedictus D. N. J. C.", and generally ends "Ipse Dominus ac Redemptor aeternus". All liturgies except the Roman and the Romanized Celtic have some form of a very similar Post-Sanctus, which leads up to the Recital of the Institution. Even the Ambrosian has one for Easter Eve. The occurrence of a part of the Intercession after the Sanctus in the Roman makes a great difference here. The last words of the Mozarabic Post-Sanctus ought to anticipate "Qui pridie etc."; as in the Gallican, but there is an interpolation—"more suad imperite ut interpellationi manifesta est," as Leslie says—follows: "Adesto, adesto, Jesu bone Pontificex in medio nostrorum, Jesu sancta et sanctissima, et sancti fies hanc oblationem ut sanctificata sumamus per manus sancti Angeli tui [cf. the clause "Supplicas te rogamus" of the Roman Canon sancte Domine et Redemptor aeterno. The age of the interpolation is unknown, but it is probably much older than the Ximenian Missal, though it does not occur in the Missale Ordinale Oteri Ordinarium of 1052. It may have originated as a sort of parenthesis ed juculation (influenced by the Roman Canon) said secretly by the priest with bowed head before beginning the Recital of the Institution, which, like the Post-Sanctus, was possibly then said aloud. The present printed form of the Recital is that of I Cor., xi, 29-5: "D. N. J. C. in qua nocet transubstantiat et". This agrees with the principal Eastern liturgies, but the Gallican had "Qui pridie quam pateretur" or some variant thereof, and the Mozarabic must once have had the same, possibly (as Leslie suggests) combining both datings with "Qui pridie quam pateretur" and "in ipso nocte quam transubstantiat e tecum et" etc. The form in the Silos Ordinalium of 1052 begins the Recital immediately in Toledo 35.7 it begins "Quoniam Dominus Jesu in qua nocte." It is certain that the Roman form of the
Words of Institution was not used by the Spanish Church before the mission of Zannello (see above) in 924. It was then that the practice arose of saying the Roman form, instead of what was written, and that is what is done now. In the Ximienian edition the Roman Words were not printed at first, but later were printed on separate slips and gummed on to the margin. In the later editions they appear as footnotes in an enlarged edition in the printed Missal after the Consecration of each species.

(19) The Post-Pridie.—St. Isidore calls it confirmatio sacramenti, "ut oblatio quo Deo offeritur sanctificata per Sanctum Spiritum corpori Christi et sanguine confirmetur," which seems as if he took it to be an Epiklesis (q. v.), needed to complete the consecration, but not the substance of it. An ancient form tersely states the substance of "verba Dei . . . salicet, Hoc est corpus meum," being the "substantia sacramenti." In the Gallican books there are several of these prayers with some sort of Invocation of the Holy Spirit, some quite unmistakable, others quite vague. The majority have no sign of any Epiklesis, and this is the case with the Mozarabic, perhaps fourteen or fifteen Masses have either a definite Epiklesis or what with some ingenuity and emendation can be made to look like one, while in the rest it is generally the Great Oblation, often with allusions to the day. It is followed by a fixed prayer resembling the clause Per quem haec omnia in the Roman Canon, and a second elevation preceded by "Domine, et triumphus corde cœrdum meorum aut dicamus". On Sundays and most feasts sex caparum and quattuor caparum in the Creed is recited; it has this several verbal differences from the Roman form, among others, cedimus, confitemur and expectamus, visificatorem, adorandum et con- glorificandum, Omousion Patris, hoc est spondatum sum Patris Dei. St. Isidore (De Eccl. Off., I, xvi) mentions the recitation of the Creed "tempore sacrificii," but with him sacrificium sometimes means the offertory, sometimes the whole Mass. On certain days, chiefly in Lent and in votive Masses, there is an Antiphona ad Confractorem Pannis (cf. the Confractotum of the Ambrosian Rite), said instead of the "Fideum quam cordem cœrdum cœrdum." During it or the Creed the Fraction takes place. The Host is first divided into two halves, then one half is divided into five and the other into four parts. Seven of these particles are arranged in the form of a cross, five, named Corporatio (Incarination), Nativitas, Circumciscotio, Ap- pearition, and Ascension; and on the other part, and two, named Mors and Resurrection, the arms. These last are arranged on either side of the Particle Nativitas with the Gloria and Regina, placed together on one side. (For instances of complicated Fractions, see CELTIC RITE; GALLICAN RITE) Then the priest washes his fingers, "purget bene digitos," and, the chalice being covered, says aloud "Memento pro vivis!"

(20) The Ad Orationem Dominicum, St. Isidore's seventh and last prayer, varies with the day, and, like the Agos after the Ad Missam Oratio is preceded by Oremus. It ends introducing the Pater Noster, sung by the priest, the choir responding Amen to each clause except "Panem nostrum quotidiam da nobis hodie" when the response is "Quia Deus es!". The invariable Embolismus is a long intercessory prayer followed by the Commixture. The particle Regina is held over the chalice, during Paschal time and on Corpus Christi, with the words "Vicit Leo ex tribu Judæ, radix David, Alleluia, Qui sedes super cherubim, radix David," and, on Palm Sunday, with the words "Sancta Sanctis et conjunctio Corporis D. N. J. C. sit aumenitis et potantibus nobis ad veniam et defunctis fideliibus praestetur ad requiem."

(21) The Benediction.—The deacon proclaims "Humilisite vos ad Benedictiorem," and the priest pronounces a Blessing in three, four, or five clauses, vari- able according to the day, with a response of Amen to each clause. In the Gallican Rite the long Benediction was reserved for bishops only, a short form (Pax et caritas D. N. J. C. et communicatio sanctorum omnium sit semper nobiscum) being said by priests. The Benedictions continued in France long after the extinction of the Gallican Rite (see GALIICAN RITE) and in England. In the Sarum Missal of 545 the directions are given for Episcopal Benediction, with the same preliminary proclamation as in the Mozarabic.

(22) The Communion.—The choir sing a fixed re- sponse of Ad Accidentes, beginning "Gustate et videte," composed of Fs. xxxiii, 8, 1, 22, with Alle- luia after each verse. There are varieties in Lent and Eastertide (cf. CANTERBURY; GALLICAN). The same verses are used in the specification of St. Cyril of Jerusalem and occur in some Eastern liturgies. Then follows the antiphon which answers to the Roman Communio which is usually "Refecti Christi Corpora et Sanguine, te laudamus, Domine. Alleluia (3)," with a variant in Lent "Replebunt est gaudio os nostrum, etc." This is followed by the Post-Communion, a prayer or a Building Prayer variable with the day, but with a rather small selection, only a few days having separate proper Post-Communions of their own, four or five being used over and over again, one for Feasts of our Lord and another for saints' days, varied only in the name of the feast. During the singing of the Ad Acci- dentes and Communion the priest continues his communi- cation, with private devotions not unlike those of the Roman Rite, but including the two "Ave in evum, etc.", passages which are found also in the Sarum and other local Missals. Just before his communion the priest holds the particle Regina over the chalice saying aloud "Memento pro mortuis" (or "pro defunctis", for both forms are used). The Communion and Post-Communion are very elaborate.

(23) The Dismissal.—Of this there are two forms, that for ordinary days being "Missae acta est in nomine D. N. J. C. periculum cum pace. R. Deo gratias," and that for greater feasts, "Solemnia completa sunt in nomine D. N. J. C. votum nostrum at accet- tum cum pace. R. Deo gratias." Then follows "Salve Regina" with verses and responses and the col- lect, "Concede nos famulos tuoe etc.", which of course is not Mozarabic, and after that the Blessing "In unitate Sancti Spiritus benedictus vos Pater et Filius."

It will be seen that the fixed elements of this Mass are very few. These are: the Preparations; generally the Gloria; the Prayers etc. of the Offertory; the collect; the Sanctus; the Recital of the Institution with its preliminary prayer; a prayer following the Post- Pridie; the Creed; the priest's part of the Fraction, Commixture, and Communion; the Lord's Prayer and Embolismus, but not its introduction; and the Salee Regina and Blessing. The variables, which in point of time and written space, not far the larger proportion of the Mass, are: The Officium (Introit); the Oratio after the Gloria, the Prophecy, the Psallemo; the Epistle; the Gospel; the Laude; the Sacrificium; Ad Missam Oratio; Aita Oratio; Post Nomina; Ad Pa- cem; Ilatio; Post-Sanctus; Post-Pridie; Antiphona ad Confractorem Pannis; Ad Orationem Dominicum, the Benediction; Ad Accidentes; Communio; Post-Com- munion; the Dismissal. To these may be added the additional Canticles on certain days.

VI. THE OCCASIONAL SERVICES.—At the present day those who belong to the Mozarabic Rite use the Roman Ritual, and, as their bishop is the Archbishop of Toledo, who is head of the Roman Pontificate, it is used for the Liturgy of the Missal which is changed, and used is not used. The four existing MSS. of the Liber Ordinum, which contains these servers, are all of the eleventh century, and belonged either to Silos or to San Millan de la Cogolla. There are none at all, and when Cardinal
Ximenes had the Missal and Breviary printed, there was evidently no need to print a Ritual and Pontifical, as they were probably no longer used. Of the eleventh century MSS. of the Liber Ordinum published by Dom Férrotin, one (the Silos MSS. of 1052) contains a very complete set of occasional services. They consist of: (1) The Blessing of Oil, Salt, and Water; (2) Baptism, Confirmation, and the Institution of the Sick; (3) The Blessing of Virgins, Brides, Widows, and Convers; (4) The Order of Penance and Reconciliation of heretics and schismatics and for the conversion of Jews; (5) The Order of Death and Burial; (6) Ritus pro Rege observandus; (7) Various Blessings; (8) Orders for Holy Week and Easter; (9) Certain Masses. These are followed by a large number of Masses chiefly votive. Of these services the following may be noted:

(1) Baptism.—The order is—(a) Insufflation. The priest breathes thrice, with the words "Exorcizo te immunde spiritus hostia humana generis". (b) Insig- niation. The sign of the Cross on the forehead, and exorcism towards the west. (c) Unction with oil on mouth and ears, with "Effeta, effeta cum sancto spiritu in odorem suavitatis. Bene omnia fecit et surdo fecit audire et mutos loqui". (d) Imposition of hands. (e) Traditio symboli. (f) Blessing of the font preceded by exorcism. (g) Interrogations and Renunciations. (h) Baptism, with "Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti". (i) Confirmation on forehead, with "Signum vitæ æternæ quod dedit Deus Pater Omnipotens per Jesum Christum Filium suum credentibus in salutem". (k) Imposition of hands, with prayer. (l) "Post haec velatur a sacerdote infantes ipsi qui baptizati sunt caput; quo peracto communicat ece" (i.e. the Vesting and Communion). (m) Three days the children are brought to the priest, who says over them the "Benedictio de Alba". Except in the case of converts from Arianism, no separate order of Confirmation is given. The Chrismation and Imposition of hands after Baptism, followed as it was by Communion, was evidently the only normal form of Confirmation. In the case of Arians, the words are: "Et ego te chrismo in nomine Patris etc., in remissionem omnium peccatorum ut hæc vitæ estamnem", followed by the imposition of hands and a prayer. The ceremony of feet-washing, retained in the Celtic and Gallican Bpatismcs, does not appear in the Spanish Liber Ordinum, though mentioned by the council of Elvira in 305 (see Gallican Rite).

(2) Oratio super eum qui capillos in sola fronte tondere vult—"which looks like a relic of the Celtic tonsure (see CELTIC RITE), but, as Dom Férrotin conjectures, is probably of the nature of an offering "des prémisses de la chevelure" (cf. the Tyssecaula, seven days of hair, in the Byzan- tine Rite)—by "Oratio super parvulum quem parentes ad doctrinam offerent" and "Benedictio super parvulum qui in ecclesia ad ministerium Dei detondituri". The "clericus" of the next section is evidently also "parvulus". The sacrata has a ring given to him with the words: "Ego ianitor aditum et prepositus pestierungarum". The custos librorum receives "anulum de scrinii", and is also appointed "senior scrinariam". Then follows a curious "Ordo super eum qui barbarum tangere cupit". The priest takes wax from a taper and puts a crumb of it on the right, left, and middle of the chin. Prayers are said alluding to the anointing of Aaron's beard. Then the priest intonally in meditamentum of the words: "Ego cum eis et caputulat qui barbam tangit dicens, In Nomine etc. et acspit in limine nittido. Peracta ista omnia absolvit donecias, Missa acta est. Et poeta hic est monachus radiat barbam". The ordinations of subdeacon, deacon, archdeacon, priest, archpriest, and abbob are very simple. "To the subdeacon is given by the archdeacon the "ministerium ads manus lavandos" and a chalice and paten. The bishop gives him the book of St. Paul's Epistles. The bishop puts the stole (orarium) on the left shoulder of a deacon, and delivers a "ferula" to an archdeacon and archpriest, a "manuale" (book of sacraments) to a priest, and a staff and book of the Rule to an abbot. In each case these are accompanied by prayers and a confused address addressed to the newly ordained, which is more or less a declaration of his duties and status. In the case of a priest the assistant priests are directed to lay their hands on him as, vested in stole and chasuble, he kneels before the altar, and, though there is no direction for the bishop to do so, it is evident from the wording of his "Benedic- tio" that he lays his hands on the head. There is no order given for the consecration of a bishop. The blessings of nuns and other religious are quite simple, veiling with prayer and benediction, and for an abbas the delivery of a staff and the putting on of a mitre.

(3) The Function of the Sick is given together with an order for the blessing of the unguent. This was done on the Feast of St. Cosmas and Damian, the physician martyrs (27 Sept.), not, as elsewhere in the West, on Maundy Thursday. The bishop makes a cross (a cross pâtié with a pendant and the A and G is figured in the book) with a prophylaxis (style), saying an antiphon "Sicut unguentum in capite etc.", and a prayer and benediction, both referring to the healing of the sick. The Unction of the Sick follows only, with the sign of the Cross and the words "In nomine Patris etc.". Antiphons referring to sickness and its healing are then said. There is provision for anointing many sick persons at the same time.

The rest of the occasional services do not call for much remark. They are for the most part very similar to those of present-day practice in those found in the Roman Ritual. They include, however, the omission of a type found also in the Greek Euchologion for the cleansing of any polluted person, place, or thing, e.g. "super his qui morticinum comedunt vel suffocatum, super ves in quo etc. aliquid immunem eccidenti", etc., and the Orders when the king goes out to battle with his army, and when he returns, have a considerable historical interest.
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HENRY JENNER.

Mozart, JOHANN CHRYSOSTOMUS WOLFGANG AMADEUS, one of the greatest musical geniuses in history, b. at Salzburg, Austria, 27 Jan., 1756; d. at Vienna, 5 Dec., 1791. His father, Leopold Mozart, assistant choirmaster and court musician to the Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg, was one of the most distinguished musicians of his time. He was the author of the best method for violin-playing written up to that period, and was a man of thorough education and sterling character. Realising his son's extraordinary endowments, and also the great musical gifts of his daughter Maria Anna, five years Wolfgang's senior, he devoted all his energy and knowledge to their education. Wolfgang at the age of three was wont to spend whole hours at the piano, discovering, to his great joy, consonant intervals, and was not yet four when he began to receive from his father systematic training in piano-playing and in the theory of music improvising even before he could write notes. Violin-playing came to him practically by intuition, a fact which he demonstrated to the astonishment of his father and a company of artists, by performing at first sight the second violin part in a trio for stringed instruments. He was not yet five when his father wrote for him a theme for the piano with variations, which he had himself composed. So correct was the child's ear that he would remember the tone pitch of a violin which he had heard even weeks before. His sensitiveness was such that harsh sounds were distressing to him, a blast of a trumpet almost causing him to faint away.

Wolfgang was not yet eight years old when his father undertook a concert tour with his two children, visiting Munich, Vienna, and Passau. Everywhere their performances, especially the boy's, created great astonishment. In 1763 Leopold Mozart visited Paris with his progeny, and the following April London, where they remained until July, 1764. Received and feted by royalty and people of high station, the Mozart children, but particularly Wolfgang, were considered the musical wonders of the world. On their way back to Salzburg they visited The Hague and the principal cities of France and Switzerland. During all these travels, and the distraction and excitement incident thereto, Wolfgang made progress in all branches of musical and other knowledge. He composed constantly and in almost every known instrumental form. Returned home, he devoted himself to the mastery of counterpoint, and the perfecting of his technique in piano, violin, and organ-playing. His parents too, regarding the boy's reported achievements as a composer, invited Wolfgang to his palace, forbidding communication of any kind with him, and giving him the text of the first part of an oratorio, prepared by the archbishop, to set to music. The second and third parts of this work were composed by Michael Haydn and Anton Cajetan Adlgasser respectively. It was published at Salzburg in 1767, and performed during Lent of the same year. A year later, at the age of twelve, Wolfgang visited Vienna anew, and was commissioned to write an opera buffa, "La Finta Semplice", for which Marco Coltellini furnished the libretto. Intrigues of all kinds, especially on the part of the members of the theatre orchestra, who objected to playing under the direction of a twelve-year-old boy, prevented its performance.

Returning to Salzburg, Wolfgang was appointed concert-master, at first without compensation, but later was allowed a monthly stipend of twelve florins. Leopold Mozart, chafing under Wolfgang's lack of recognition, made every effort to secure for him a suitable appointment in the larger field of Munich and Vienna, and also Florence, but not succeeding, he finally decided to visit Italy, with a view to gaining there the prestige which success in that country then carried with it. In Bologna they became acquainted with Padre Giambattista Martini (1706-1784), the most learned musician of his time. This master put Wolfgang through tests in contrapuntal writing, which the latter withstood with ease and consummate skill. In Rome young Mozart performed his famous feat of scoring Allegri's "Miserere" for double chorus, after listening to its performance on Wednesday of Holy Week. Hearing the work repeated on the following Friday, he had but a few minor corrections to make in his manuscript. After being created Knight of the Golden Spur, feted, and acclaimed throughout Italy by the artistic and aristocratic world as the greatest living musical genius, Wolfgang returned to his modest position in Salzburg. Again and again he tried to find a more congenial atmosphere in Munich, Mannheim, Paris, and elsewhere, but without success.

He continued, except for occasional visits to other cities for the purpose of conducting new works, to reside in Salzburg until his twenty-first year, when he took up his permanent abode in Vienna.

An offer from Frederick William II of Prussia to become court conductor at Berlin at a salary of three thousand thalers he refused on patriotic grounds. Mozart was now in full maturity of his powers, creating with astonishing rapidity works which will remain classic for all time: operas, symphonies, quartets, concertos, etc., all of which increased his fame, but did not ameliorate his material condition. Not only was due recognition denied him, but his life was one continuous battle for existence. His application for the assistant conductorship of the imperial opera house failed. He applied for a similar position at the cathedral of St. Stephen, in the hope of ultimate promotion to the post of choir-master. Only on his deathbed did he receive the news of his appointment. The great master died at the age of thirty-four and was buried, with the least possible expense, in extreme poverty, in a painter's grave; his exact resting-place being now unknown. Only a few persons followed his remains to the cemetery.

Mozart's individuality was of an exquisitely delicate, tender, and noble character. His operas, "Don Juan", "The Magic Flute", "The Marriage of Figaro", "Così fan tutte", "La Clemenza di Tito", on so-
count of their melodic beauty and truth of expression, have as strong a hold upon the affections of the musical public as they did upon that of the nineteeenth century. His instrumental works continue to delight musicians the world over. As a composer for the Church, however, he does not, even artistically, reach the high level he maintained in other fields. In his day the music of the Church, Gregorian chant, was practically ignored in Germany, and sadly neglected in other countries. Mozart had but little knowledge of the masters of the sixteenth century, and consequently his style of writing for the Church could not have been influenced by them. The proper of the Mass, which brings singers and congregation in intimate touch with the liturgy of the particular day, was rarely sung. The fifteen masses, litanies, offertories, has great "Requiem," as well as many smaller settings, most of them written for soli, chorus, and orchestra, in the identical style of his secular works, do not reflect the spirit of the universal Church, but rather the subjective conception and mood of the composer and the Josephinist spirit of the age. What Mozart, with his Raphaelesque imagination and tender sympathies, had been for church, he had lived at a different time and in different surroundings, or risen above his own, can easily be imagined.

Jahn, W. A., Mozart, ed. Towndens (London, 1882); NOEL, M., Mozart (London, 1883); NOTTENLEBEN, K., Verlag der Musikalien (1880); KÖCHEL, Chronologisch-thematisches Verzeichnis sämtlicher Tonwerke W. A. Mozart's (Leipzig, 1863-1869); MEYERDURG, Mozart ein Kunstleben (Leipzig, 1882).

JOSPEH OTTEN.

Mostena Indians.—A group of some half dozen tribes constituting a distinct linguistic stock upon the headwaters of the Beni river, Department of Beni, in north-western Bolivia. Among their peculiar customs is the "cowade." In the early part of the eighteenth century, through the efforts of the Jesuits, a part of the missionary "cowade" was reduced to Christianity, and 1,300, are living in three mission towns, viz., Mochanes (founded 1725), Santa Ana, and Magdalena, all on the Beni river, near the confluence of the Mapisai.

BLOOM, American Race (New York, 1891); HEATH in Kansas City Review of Science, VI (Kansas City, 1882); WEBBELL, Voyage dans le Nord de la Bolivie (Paris, 1853).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mosetta, a short, cape-shaped garment, covering the shoulders and reaching only to the elbow, with an open front, which may be fastened by means of a small number of buttons; at the neck it has a very small and purely ornamental hood. The privilege of wearing the mosetta belonged properly to cardinals, but the pope, cardinals, exempt abbots, abbots general, and the four prelates of diocesani; only a special privilege may be worn by other ecclesiastics, abbots, canons, etc. Cardinals wear the mosetta over the mantelletta, but bishops wear it without the mantelletta; the latter, however, may wear the mosetta only within their own jurisdiction, outside of which the mantelletta must be worn instead of the mosetta. Canons who have the privilege of wearing the mosetta may not use it outside of the church, save when the chapter appears in corpo (as a corporate body). The pope's mosetta is always red, except that, in Easter week, he wears a white one. As regards material, his mosetta during the winter half-year, that is, from the feast of St. Catherine to Ascension Day, is made of velvet or of cloth according to the character of the day or ceremony; in the summer half-year it is made of satin or fine woollen material (merino). It is edged with ermine only in the winter half-year. A cardinal's mosetta is generally red; the colour is pink on Gaudeole and Lactare Sundays, and violet in penitential seasons and for mourning. According to the time of year, it is made of silk or wool. When worn by bishops, prelates, canons, etc., the mosetta is violet or black in colour; the material for these dignitaries is properly not silk but wool (camel). Cardinals and bishops have the privilege of wearing the mosetta as a habit (e.g. the Benedictines, Dominicans, etc.) retain for the mosetta the colour of the outer garment of the habit of the respective order. This also applies to abbots and Reformed Augustinian canons who have the privilege of wearing the mosetta. The mosetta is not a liturgical vestment, Consequently, for example, it was not worn by priests and deacons. Sometimes it is traced back to the cappa, this making it merely a shortened cappa; sometimes to the almuita. From which of the two it is derived, is uncertain. The name mosetta permits both derivations. In all probability the garment did not come into use before the middle of the twelfth century, and certainly worn in the latter half of the sixteenth century, as is proved by the fresco of Melozzo da Forli painted in 1477: "Sixtus IV giving the Custody of the Vatican Library to Platina.

From the beginning the mosetta has been a garment distinctive of the higher ecclesiastical dignities, the pope, cardinals, and bishops. (See Hood.)

BRAUN, Die liturg. Gewandung im Occident u. Orient (Freiburg, 1907), 357 sq.; BARBIER DE MONTAULT, Traité pratique de la construction des églises, II (Paris, 1878), 508, 519, 541, 561; Ceremon. episc. I, i, n. 3; iii, nn. 1-4.

JOSEPH BRAUN.

Mosti, Luigi, controversialist, b. at Bergamo, 26 May, 1746; d. near Milan, 24 June, 1813. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1763, and on its suppression was received into the Diocese of Bergamo, where he was shortly made a canon, and appointed archdeacon and priest and examiner of candidates for the priesthood. The zeal and ability with which he opposed the progress of Jansenism in Italy gained him a well-merited reputation, and Pius VI called him to Rome, where he became an Apostolic missionary. He was elected a member of the Academy degli Arcadi (see Academ. Ital., vol. viii), and held the chair of ecclesiastical history in the University of Bergamo, which had been restored in Naples. Born out at length by his charitable labours and penitential practices, he retired to the residence of Marquis Scotti near Milan, where he died. Among his important writings are: "Vera idea del Gianesismo" (1781); "Storia compendiosa della scienza della nuova chiesa d'Utrecht" (Venice, 1785); "Storia della chiesa d'Utrecht" (Venice, 1787); "Compendio storico-cronologico . . . sopra il Baianismo, Gianesismo e Neo-ennelismo" (Foligno, 1792), all against Jansenism; "Il falso discepolo di S. Agostino e d. I. Tommaso" (Venice, 1779), a defence of Molinism. He translated from the English the Duke of Buckingham's "Fifty Points for Controversy; Answering the Roman Catholic Roman" (Basingstoke, 1789); and from the French, "Les projets des incrédules pour la ruine de la religion, dévoilés dans les œuvres de Frédéric, roi de Prusse" (Assisi, 1791).

HUNTER, Nomenclator, III, 540; Vita del P. L. Mosti (Novara, 1822).

A. A. MACERLE.

Mrk, Ignatius, second Bishop of Marquette, U. S. A., b. 16 October, 1818, in Hotove, in the Diocese of Laibach (Carinthia), Austria; d. at Marquette, 2 Jan., 1901. He made his classical studies in the gymnasium of Laibach and his theology in the local diocesan seminary. On 13 August, 1837, Prince-Bishop Anton Aloys Wolf raised him to the priesthood. To qualify for a tutorship in the house of Field-Marshall Baron Peter Pirquet, the young priest passed a rigorous state examination, and sojourned two years at Legnano near Verona, Italy, then an Austrian possession. In 1840 he returned to his native diocese and occupied several curacies as assistant before emigrating to the United States five years later. Bishop Lefebvre of Detroit received him cordially, and sent him immediately to Arbre Croche to assist the celebrated Indian missionary, Father Francis Piche. For two years the missionaries
worked fruitfully together, and, when in 1851 Piers removed to Minnesota, Mrak retained charge of the Indian mission. For his devotion to the red race Baraga appointed him his vicar-general, and upon the death of Baraga he was created second Bishop of Marquette. For a long time he refused to accept, but, finally yielding to the urgency of Archbishop Purcell, he was consecrated Bishop on 9 February, 1869. After ten years’ devotion to the administration of the diocese, although he was not unaccustomed to hardships, his health began to fail, and he was permitted to resign in 1879, and was made titular Bishop of Antioch. For some years he remained with his successor, Bishop Vertin, and, when necessity required, performed the duties of an ordinary. On the return of his health, his love for the Indians awoke, and he returned to the Indian missions, which he had left so reluctantly to accept the episcopate. Bishop Richter of Grand Rapids most cordially welcomed him, and at his own request gave him an Indian mission at Eagle Town, Leelan County. Here he lived a simple life sharing his small annuity of eight hundred dollars with the two Dominican Sisters whom he had induced to open a school for his charges. In his eighty-first year he retired to Marquette, and filled thenceforth a chaplaincy at St. Mary’s Hospital to the last day of his life. His charity was as proverbial as his humility. He outlived his successor in the episcopate, and saw the election of the fourth bishop, whom he himself had raised to the priesthood. His body rests in the vault under the cathedral by those of his predeccessors, Baraga and Vertin. For his labors, as Bishop of Marquette (Houghton, Michigan, 1900); Verwaltung, Life of Bishop Baraga (Milwaukee, 1900); Briefe der Leipziger Stiftung im Erzbistum Österreich (Vienna, 1832–85); Diocesan Archives (Marquette).

Antoine Ivan Rezek.

Mühlbacher, Engelbert, historian, b. at Gresten, Austria, 4 Oct., 1843; d. at Vienna, 17 July, 1903. He received his classical education at Vienna, his father’s native city. In 1862 he became a novice of the Recoletines of the Austrian Canons at St. Florian. After completing his theological studies there, he was ordained priest in 1867. As Arneth relates in his memoirs, historical studies had been successfully cultivated at St. Florian’s since Provoost Arneth’s time, and Mühlbacher was soon active in this domain. Among his writings are articles on St. Florian’s Chartulary, Reichersberg, and the literary productions of St. Florian’s. In 1872 we find Mühlbacher studying under Julius Ficker at Innsbruck, where after two years he received the degree of Doctor of Theology. He then hastened to Vienna to finish his historical training under Sickel’s guidance. When Ficker entrusted the youthful scholar with the revision of the Carolingian period of Böhmmer’s “Regesta”, he was directing him to a domain in which he was to do imperishable work. In 1878 he was formally received as academical lecturer into the philosophical faculty of the University of Innsbruck, and between 1880 and 1890 he published his masterly edition of the imperial “Regesta” of the Carolingian period. Sickel says, “the technique of compiling regesta received exemplary development at Mühlbacher’s hands, and his work served as a model for the entire new edition of the imperial “Regesta”. In 1892 Mühlbacher was entrusted with the editing of the Carolingian documents for the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, at the same time it was necessary to bring out a new edition of his Carolingian “Regesta”. The two works proved of mutual assistance, and Mühlbacher devoted the greatest care and diligence to his tasks. He was able to see only the first part of each work through the press, but left considerable material for the use of his successors. No other German scholar was so well qualified to write the “Deutsche Geschichte unter den Karolingern”, which appeared in 1896. Since 1879 Mühlbacher edited the “Mitteilungen des Institutes für österreiacher Geschichtsforschung”. In 1881 he was appointed extraordinary, and in 1896 ordinary professor at Vienna. In 1895 Ficker turned over to him the management of the “Regesta Imperii”. With the utmost energy he took in hand the arrangement of the Austrian State Archives, and the preparation of the more recent history of Austria. His learning and efforts did not fail to receive due recognition. He was chosen an active member of the
MULLER

Muller, Adam Heinrich, publicist and political economist, convert, b. at Berlin, 30 June, 1779; d. at Vienna, 17 Jan., 1829. It was intended that he should study Protestant theology, but from 1798 he devoted himself in Gottingen to the study of law, philosophy, and natural science. Returning to Berlin, he was persuaded by his friend Gents to take up political science rapidly. He was appointed referendary in the Kurbarkische Kammer in Berlin, he travelled in Sweden and Denmark, spent about two years in Poland, and then went to Vienna, where he was converted to the Catholic Faith on 30 April, 1805. From 1806 to 1809 he lived at Dresden as tutor of a prince of the Saxe-Weimar family and lecturer on German literature, dramatic art, and political science. In 1808 he edited with Heinrich von Kleist the periodical "Phobus." In 1809 he returned to Berlin, and in 1811 to Vienna, where he lived in the house of Archduke Maximilian of Austria-Este and became the friend of Clement Maria Hoffbauer. In 1813 he was appointed imperial commissioner and major of the auxiliaries in Tyrol, and took part in the war against France, and later on, as counsellor of the government, in the reorganization of the country. In 1815 he was
called to Vienna, and went to Paris with the imperial staff. On the conclusion of peace, he became Austrian consul-general for Saxony at Leipzig, and agent for Anhalt and Schwartburg. He edited the literary periodicals: "Deutscher Staatsanzeiger" (1816-18) and "Unparteiischer Literarischer und Kirchenkorrespondent," and attended the ministerial conferences at Carlsbad and Vienna (1819-20). In 1826, at the instance of Prince von Metternich, he was ennobled as Ritter von Nittersdorf, was recalled to Vienna (1827), appointed imperial counselor, and employed in the service of the chancellor.

Müller was a man of great and versatile talents, an excellent orator, and a suggestive writer. Several of his works were based upon his own lectures; the most important (besides the above-mentioned periodicals) are: "Die Lehre von Gegensatz" (Berlin, 1804); "Vorlesungen über die deutsche Wissenschaft u. Literatur" (Dresden, 1806; 2nd ed., 1807); "Von der Idee der Schönheit" (lectures; Berlin, 1809); "Die Elemente der Staatskunst" (lectures; 3 parts, Berlin, 1809); "Ueber König Friedrich II. u. die Natur Würde u. Bestimmung der preussischen Monarchie" (lectures; Berlin, 1810); "Die Theorie der Staatsausbahrung u. ihre Fortschritte in Deutschland u. England" (2 vols., Neuwien, 1811); "Verzeichnung der in Deutschland u. England erschienenen Theilnahmen an der Internationalen Schriftstellerkonferenz in England" (2 vols., Vienna, 1812); "Von der Notwendigkeit einer theologischen Grundlage der gesamten Staatswissenschaften u. der Staatswirtschaft insbesondere" (Leipzig, 1820; new ed., Vienna, 1898); "Die Gewerbe-Polizei in Beziehung auf den Landbau" (Leipzig, 1824); "Zwölf Reden über die Beredtsamkeit u. deren Verfall in Deutschland" (Leipzig, 1817); "Die Fortschritte der Staatswissenschaften in Deutschland" (2 vols., Neuwien, 1812; Leipzig, 1817); "Zwölf Reden über die Beredtsamkeit u. deren Verfall in Deutschland" (Leipzig, 1817); "Die Fortschritte der Staatswissenschaften in Deutschland" (2 vols., Neuwien, 1812; Leipzig, 1817); "Von der Notwendigkeit einer theologischen Grundlage der gesamten Staatswissenschaften u. der Staatswirtschaft insbesondere" (Leipzig, 1820; new ed., Vienna, 1898); "Die Gewerbe-Polizei in Beziehung auf den Landbau" (Leipzig, 1824); "Vorschlag zu einem historischen Ferien-Cursus" (Vienna, 1830). A book which was written by him in 1817 on the occasion of the Protestant jubilee of the Reformation and entitled, "Etwas das Goethe gesagt hat. Beleuchtet von Adam Müller. Leipzig den 31 Oktober, 1817," was printed but not published (reprinted in Vienna, 1910). Nevertheless, Traugott Krug's reply, entitled "Etwas, das Herr Adam Müller gesagt hat," was published under the title noch etwas, das Luther gesagt hat" (Leipzig, 1817), appeared in two editions.

In the field of literature and aesthetics, Müller belongs to the Romantic school. He is a Romanticist even in his specialty, politics and political economy. As Eichendorff says in his "Geschichte der poetischen Literatur Deutschlands" (new ed., by W. Koch, Kempten, 1906, p. 352), Müller "mapped out a domain of his own, the application of Romanticism to the social and political conditions of life." Müller himself declares: "The reconciliation of science and art and of their noblest ideas with serious political life was the purpose of my larger works" (Vermischte Schriften, 2d ed., 1817). He wrote the "Elemente der Staatskunst," originating in lectures delivered before Prince Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar and an assembly of politicians and diplomats at Dresden in the winter 1808-09. It treats in six books of the state, of right, of the spirit of legislation in antiquity and in the Middle Ages, of money and national wealth, of the economical factors of the state and the state of the relation between the state and religion. Müller endeavored to comprehend the connexion between political and social science, and, while using the historical method, to base them upon philosophy and religion. (Cf. the preface to the first volume of the "Elemente", where he treats exhaustively of the different laws of the "Code civil" and the "Code civil des prétre des lois"; cf. also the sixth book of this work, and the above-mentioned work of 1820.) With Edmund Burke, Friedrich von Gents, Joseph de Maistre, and Karl Ludwig von Haller, he must be reckoned among the chief opponents of revolutionary ideas in politics. In his work, "Von der Notwendigkeit einer theologischen Grundlage der gesamten Staatswissenschaften" (1820), Müller rejects, like Haller (Restauration der Staatswissenschaften, 1816), the distinction between constitutional and civil law, which rests entirely on the false idea of the state's omnipotence. His ideal is medieval feudalism, on which the reorganization of modern political institutions should be modelled. His position in political chauvinism is defined by his strong opposition to Adam Smith's system of materialistic-liberal (so-called classical) political economy, or the so-called industry system. He is thus also an adversary of free trade. In contrast with the economical individualism of Adam Smith, he emphasizes the ethical element in national economy, the duty of the state toward the individual, and the religious basis which is also necessary in this field. Müller's importance in the history of political economy is acknowledged even by the opponents of his religious and political point of view. His reaction against Adam Smith, says Roscher (Geschichte der National-Oekonomik, p. 763), "is not blind or hostile, but the colophon of the system. The reactionary and feudalistic thought in his writings, which agreed so little with the spirit of the times, prevented his political ideas from exerting a more notable and lasting influence on his age, while their religious character prevented them from being justly appreciated."


FRIEDRICH LAURITZ.

Müller, Johann, physiologist and comparative anatomist, b. at Coblenz, 14 July, 1801; d. at Berlin, 28 April, 1858. He was the son of a shoemaker, but his mother succeeded in obtaining for him a good education. A student at the collegium of his native city, he went to the University of Bonn in 1819. While a student he won a prize for an original work on "Respiration of the Fucus," a thesis that has been declared the best scientific work ever presented by a student in a prize competition. He received his degree of doctor for a thesis on animal movement. In 1822 he became Professor at Bonn, and in 1830 ordinary professor of medicine. Before teaching at Bonn he had studied for two years with Rudolph at Berlin, and in 1832 was appointed his successor in the professorship of anatomy there. In 1847 he was elected Rector of the University.

Müller is justly regarded as the founder of modern physiology. His claim to this title rests not only upon his personal contributions to science, but also upon his power of co-ordinating the results ob-
tained by his predecessors, and of directing into new fields of investigation the disciples who profited by his suggestive teaching. To accuracy of observation he added such a grasp of principles and so clear a comprehension of the bearing of other sciences upon physiology that his reasoning, based throughout upon facts, is philosophical in breadth and penetration.

His first monograph, an elaboration of his prior essays, appeared in Latin and was published in 1790 and was followed (1826) by two others on optical illusions and on the comparative physiology of vision. The last-named abounds in observations upon the structure and functions of the eye in lower animals, especially in insects. Among the other subjects to which Müller devoted careful and successful research may be mentioned: reflex action, the chemical composition of blood plasma, the presence of chondrin in cartilage, hermaphroditism in human beings, the minute structure and origin of glands in man and animals, the lymph hearts of amphibians, and those ducts of the preliminary kidney in the fetus which have since been called by his name. His study of the lower animals resulted in the discovery of alternate generations and in his embryological account of the metamorphoses of echinodermata.

From 1834 to 1840 he edited the "Archives of Anatomy and Physiology" (Müller's Archives) and contributed articles to various scientific reviews. His own contributions to medical literature number over two hundred, most of them of great significance. His edition of the "Handbuch der gesammten Medizin, Menschen", which was published in 1833 and has appeared in numerous editions and translations. But the benefit which he rendered to science as an original investigator and medical editor is surpassed by his work as a teacher. Among his pupils were most of the men who made Germany the Mecca for scientific students in the latter half of the eighteenth century. They included Virchow, Helmholtz, Schwann, Du Bois-Reymond, Lieberkühn, Max Schultz, Brücke, Claparède, Haeeckel, Henle, Guido Wagener, Reichert, Ludwig, Vierordt, and Kölliker. All of these men agreed in proclaiming him the foremost physiologist of his time. Most of the important scientific societies of the world honoured him. Throughout his life he was loyal in his adherence to the Catholic Church, and his fellow-Catholics of the Rhine land have erected a noble monument to his memory at Coblenz.

VIRCHOW, Johann Müller (Berlin, 1858); BROCKE, Medical Texts (London, 1850); DE BOIS-REYMOND, Götterwürdiger aus Johanns Müller (Berlin, 1860); WALSH, Makers of Modern Medicine (New York, 1910).

JAMES J. WALSH.

MÜLLER (REGIOMONTANUS), Johann, German astronomer, b. in or near Königsberg, a small town in lower Franconia (Dukedom of Coburg), 6 June, 1436; d. in Rome, 6 July, 1476. The name of the family agreed with the trade of the father who operated a mill. Regiomontanus signed himself Johannes de Montenegro, while in foreign countries he was known as Joannes Germanus or Francus. His calendars were published under various names, like Meister Hans von Kungberg. About the age of twelve he was sent to Leipzig to study dialectics. In the university matriculations (published by Erler, 1895) his name is not registered. Hearing of the celebrated astronomer Peurbach (George of Peurbach in Upper Austria, 1423-61), Müller left Leipzig for Vienna, where he was matriculated in 1450 as Johannes Moilitor de Kunispeorg. In 1452 he received the bacca laureate and in 1457 the title Magister. Lectures of heliocentric theory are recorded as early as 1469; his work on perspective, in 1460 on Euclid, in 1461 on Virgil's Bucolics. His master and friend Peurbach showed him how incorrect were the Alphonsine Tables and how false the Latin translations of the Greek astronomers from intermediate Arabic translations. To-
Müller, Karl, professor at Düsseldorf, b. at Darmstadt, 29 Oct., 1818; d. at Neuhausen, 15 Aug., 1893, belongs to the more recent members of a school of German art painters who have succeeded felicitously in popular but beautiful representation of religious devotion, and gave new renown to the Düsseldorf school even in foreign lands. His style, delicate even to softness, exhibits, however, as much naturalness, freshness, simple piety and spiritual peace as the subjects demand. Schadow, director of the Düsseldorfl academy, had selected in 1827 the nineteen-year-old student, along with his brother Andreas, and Deger (who were later joined by Ittenbach), for the contemplated fresco paintings in the Fürstenburg church on the Apollinarisberg at Remagen. They had first to study carefully in Italy the technique of fresco painting, then little known. Karl Müller arrived in Rome at the end of 1829. The study and imitation of the art treasures of the Eternal City, as later of those of Florence, Pisa, Assisi, and other places, brought to maturity his great natural talent. His taste for landscape, which he brought with him from Düsseldorf, now found the greatest encouragement; he regarded moreover the study of models as indispensable in the practice of art. He later fell into the love for the Italian friends mutually helped each other by artistic excursions. His evenings he spent in composition and the like. At the end of four years the master brought home his characteristic German religious style, lightly mingled with some Southern elements. In his principal paintings of the "Crowning" and the "Birth of Mary" he set himself, according to the judgment of connoisseurs, the equal of the elder Deger. The former painting unfortunately is in a bad light the greater part of the year. The lower part, the Apostles by the grave, out of which spring lilies and roses, is widely known. The leading scene in the upper part presents the Virgin kneeling bowed before the child, with the brightness of the beauty of colour. The painter worked so long over the "Birth of Mary" that he hoped to succeed in some degree in satisfying the spirit at once of Raphael and of Dürer. In this work the eight typical women especially deserve to be noticed. Besides these there belong to Müller in the same church the "Annunciation", "The Virgin" and "The Lamb of God", "The Immaculate Conception", "Jesus and the Samaritan Woman", "Wonder of Roses", "Immaculate Conception", "Joseph with the Boy Jesus", "The Disciples in Emmaus", the popular round pictures; "Mary and Elizabeth", the "Holy Family at Work", also "The Holy Family", "The Holy Night", and so on. Of the highest value in art are the altar painting, "Christ with the Disciples at Emmaus," which he undertook for the church of St. Remigius at Bonn, and his last cartoon for the same church, completed by his nephew Franz Müller.

Karl Müller, Ausstellung (Frankfort, 1890); FISCHER, KARL MÜLLER, Leben u. Schaffen (Cologne, 1898); SCHLEICHMANN, Geschichte der Düsseldorfer Kunst (Düsseldorf, 1902).

G. GIETMANN.

Mullock, John T., Bishop of St. John's, Newfoundland, b. in 1807 at Limerick, Ireland; d. at St. John's, Newfoundland, 26 March, 1869. He became
a Franciscan and was educated at St. Bonaventure's College, Seville, and at St. Isidore's, Rome, where in 1830 he was ordained priest. After long service in Ireland, he was recalled to Rome and appointed in 1847 coadjutor to Bishop Fleming of St. John's, Newfoundland, with the right of succession, and was consecrated by Cardinal Fransen on 27 December, 1847, at St. Isidore's, Rome. In July, 1850, he succeeded Bishop Fleming. The church made great progress in Newfoundland during the episcopate of Dr. Mullock, a new diocese—bishops of Grace—being erected. The splendid cathedral of St. John's, begun in 1841, was consecrated on 9 September, 1855. Dr. Mullock always took a keen interest in the commercial development of Newfoundland, and was most enthusiastic about its natural resources. He was frequently consulted by the governor on matters relating to the welfare of the colony, and many of his suggestions relating to the fisheries and other matters were adopted. Before leaving Ireland he was a frequent contributor to the periodical literature of the day, and took an active part in the Irish literary movement of the forties. Long before the first attempts to lay a submarine cable across the Atlantic was made (1857), Dr. Mullock had on several occasions published publicised the feasibility of connecting Europe with America by means of submarine telegraph. He was the first to bring before the English-speaking world the life and works of the great Saint Alphonse Maria Liguori, publishing his "Life" at Dublin in 1846, and in the following year a translation of the saint's "History of Their Life and Consecration." He appeared at Dublin his "Short History of the Irish Franciscan Province", translated from the Latin work of Francis Ward; he also wrote "The Cathedral of St. John's, Newfoundland and its consecration" (Dublin, 1856).

Gregory Cleary.

Münch-Bellinghausen, Baron Eligius Franz Joseph von (pseudonym: Friedrich Halm), an Austrian dramatist, b. at Cracow, 2 April, 1806; d. at Vienna, 22 May, 1871. He was educated at the seminary of Melk and later at Vienna, where he studied philosophy and jurisprudence, and where he began his official career in 1826. Even as a boy he took a keen interest in the theatre and since 1833 enjoyed the friendship of his former teacher, the Benedictine Most Rev. Efan von der Burg, who himself was a strong bent for the drama and encouraged the poet to offer his drama "Griselidis" to the Hofburg theatre. Its successful production in 1835 established Halm's reputation as a playwright and henceforth he continued to write for the stage with varying success. In the meantime he advanced in his official career, becoming Government councillor in 1840 and Klatus (chief keeper) of the Court Library in 1844, a position that Grillparzer had sought in vain. He was elected member of the Academy of Sciences in 1852 and life member of the Upper House of Parliament in 1861. In 1867 he was appointed superintendent of the two court-theatres, but three years later resigned this position which disputes had made distasteful to him. His health also had been failing. Of his many dramatic works the best known are "Griselidis" (1837); "Der Sohn der Wildnis" (1842); and "Der Fechter von Ravenna" (1857). "Griselidis" is based on the well-known story of the faithful wife whose loyalty and devotion are put to the severest tests. In this drama, which was a triumph in the end, "Der Sohn der Wildnis" (The Son of the Wilderness) is a romantic drama depicting the power of womanly love and virtue over rude barbarian strength. It was presented on the English stage under the title of "Ingomar the Barbarian". "Der Fechter von Ravenna" (The Gladiator of Ravenna), regarded as Halm's best work, is a tragedy having for its hero Thumelicus, a follower of Don Juan, from the Roman rule. Theatrically these plays are very effective, but the characters are improbable and the situations are often strained. Their popularity, which they owe largely to their smooth, polished diction and skilfully interspersed lyrics, has not been lasting. Of Halm's numerous other dramas we may mention "Phlegor in Darmstadt" (1843); "Wildfeuer" (1884); and a German version of Shakespeare's "Cymbeline" that appeared on the stage in 1842. Halm is also the author of lyrics, short stories, and of a narrative poem "Charfreitag" (Good Friday) (1884). A complete edition of his works, arranged in chronological order, appeared at Vienna (1893–94). There are also translations posthumously by Faust Pachler and Emil Kuhl (Vienna, 1872); selections were edited by Anton Schlosser (Leipzig, —).

See the introduction to Schlegel's edition: Sei 92 in Alben der literarischen Dichter (Vienna, 1830) 139 sq.; Rudolf Gottschall, Porträt und Studien, V (Leipzig, 1876), 83–92; Hans Hoppé, Strophen und Erinnerungen (Stuttgart, 1876).

Arthur F. J. Remt.

Munden, John, Venerable. See Haydock, George, Venerable.

Mun-dwiler, Fintan, abbott of the Benedictine monastery of St. Meinrad, Indiana, b. at Dietikon in Switzerland, 12 July, 1835; d. at St. Meinrad's Abbey, 2 February, 1875. He studied at the monastery school of Einsiedeln in Switzerland where he took the Benedictine habit in 1854, made profession on 14 Oct., 1855, and was raised to the priesthood on 11 Sept., 1859. A year later he accompanied his confère, Martin Marty, afterwards Bishop of St. Cloud, to the newly founded monastery of St. Meinrad in Indiana. Having arrived there in September, 1860, he taught in the monastery and attended the usual monastic duties. While stationed at Terre Haute, Indiana (1864), he organized the German Catholic Congregation of St. Benedict, for which he built a church in 1865. In 1869, when St. Meinrad was raised to an abbey and Father Marty became its first abbot, Father Fintan was appointed prior and master of novices. While Abbot Marty was in the Indiana in Dakota (1876–80), Prior Fintan was admistrator of the abbey, and, upon the resignation of the former, who had meanwhile been appointed Vicar Apostolic of Dakota, Fintan was elected abbott of St. Meinrad on 3 February, 1890, and received abbatial consecration from Bishop Chatard of Vincennes on 16 May, 1890. Though spared the cares of the dispensations of monastic discipline, he in no way neglected the secular interests of his abbey. He enlarged the college, founded the Priory (now Abbey) of Subiaco in Arkansas and the Priory (now Abbey) of St. Joseph in Louisiana, and obtained from Rome the permission to erect the Helveticco-American Congregation of the Benedictines, of which he was the first president. When St. Meinrad's Abbey was destroyed by fire on 2 Sept., 1887, the undaunted abbot rebuilt the monastery on even a greater scale, founded a commercial college at Jasper, Indiana, and assisted in the foundation of the Priory of St. Gall in North Dakota. But, in the midst of temporal cares, he remained a man of prayer. He laboured at the spread of the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament and was a fervent promoter of the Priest's Eucharistic League. In 1893 he took part in the Eucharistic Congress held at Jerusalem.

Munster, School of. See Limerick, Diocese of.
Munich-Freising, Archdiocese of (Monacensis et Freisingensis), in Bavaria.—This archdiocese originated in the ancient Diocese of Freising. The Church of St. Peter was built in 704 by St. Curbianus, who, after his consecration, came in 716 to organize the Church in Bavaria. On a mountain near Freising the saint erected a Benedictine monastery and a school. He was succeeded in the government of the abbey by his brother Erembert. When St. Boniface in 738 regulated ecclesiastical affairs in Bavaria he transferred the government of four dioceses to Erembert, who chose the first Bishop of Freising, which see was made suffragan to Mainz. The sanctuary of Our Lady, which existed on the mountain near Freising before the coming of St. Curbianus, became the cathedral, and was served by the Benedictine monks. At the time the diocese embraced the country of the Upper Issar from the Inn to the water sheds of the Inn and the Isar. The third bishop, Joseph of Verona (747-64), established a collegiate church in Iasn, and shared in the founding of the convents of Schäftlarn and Scharnitz, placing the government of the latter in the hands of Abbot Atto. The last-named foundation was particularly significant, in view of the later activities of the abbey of Pustertal.

Other important convents of the diocese were Tegetmes, Moosburg, Immlington, Altomünster, Schliersee, and Rot-on-the-Inn. The learned Arbo, or Arbo (764-81), the biographer of St. Curbianus, translated the remains of this saint from Mainz to Freising and interred them in the church of St. Michael in the city of Freising. It was not until 785-86 that a church was built (765-68) in the church of Our Lady. During his episcopate, Duke Tassilo II presented Innichen to the Abbot of Scharnitz. With the newly acquired territory, Freising gained a port of entry into Carinthia, and the diocese soon acquired possessions also in Styria and Carniola. Atto, Abbot of Scharnitz, also Archbishop of Salzburg (775-810), secured for Freising the bishopric of Christianstadt and Slavonic lands of the Pustertal. On the summit of the mountain upon which Freising cathedral stood he erected a second Benedictine monastery under the same government as the first. During his time the diocese was made suffragan to Salzburg. Hitto (811-34) made a visitation of his diocese; he installed a provost and six priests in the church on the mountain Weihenstephan near Freising.

During the episcopate of his successor Erchambert (855-84), a deed of gift for the first time mentions cathedral canons, who were not monks (842 and 845), the cathedral chapter being thereafter composed of monks and lay canons. Under Ottobald (875-83) and Waldo (883-903), bishops of the house of Constance, the monastic element in the cathedral chapter gradually withdrew; the Benedictines of the cathedral mountain seem to have abandoned it and to have established themselves at the foot of the Weihenstephan. Waldo rebuilt the cathedral, which had been burned down; he was given juridical and financial rights during Abbots of Monastery and received from Louis the Child in 906 the right of free choice of bishops for the cathedral chapter.

The Hungarians gained an entry into Bavaria and destroyed almost entirely the spiritual life of the country. Bishop Otto fell in a battle against them in 908. Under St. Lambert (908-57), Freising was set on fire by the Hungarians and many people were slain. After the victory of Otto I at Lechfeld, peace came again to the city, and the Church of Freising, under the guidance of competent rulers, rose from its ruins, and acquired new possessions. Abraham, of the race of the counts of Gossa (930-94), obtained for his diocese from Emperor Otto I extensive possessions in Carinthia, Gottschalk, Knight of Hanburg (994-1006), obtained for Freising a coinage, the privilege of holding fairs, and civic rights; and Egilbert of Moosburg (1000-39), the founder of the Benedictine Abbey of Weihenstephan, which replaced the old convent of the canons, was the recipient of additional possessions. In the 12th century the diocese or those foundations which the colonies founded from the diocese were remarkably successful in development and stability. During the disturbances resulting from the conflict of investitures, Ellenhard, Count of Meran (1052-78), was ever to be found on the side of Henry IV, who repeatedly visited the bishop in Freising; Meginhard, Count of Scheuern (1078-88) distinguished himself in spreading the Christian doctrine in Bohemia, was more favourable to the pope; Heinrich I, of Ebersdorf (1098-1137), was in his turn an adherent of the emperor. Heinrich I lived to see the destruction of Freising by Duke Welf, and, when dying, bequeathed his possessions to the diocese.

Adalbert, a most distinguished bishop, was consecrated successor by Otto I (1137-58), the historian and philosopher. He saved the see from the ruin which threatened it, re-established many monasteries, and delivered the diocese from the oppressive jurisdiction of the counts of Scheyern. A Cistercian himself, he once more established monastic discipline and austerity. In the last years of his administration occurred the destruction of the episcopal bridge over the Danube, which works near Oberfohring by Duke Henry the Lion, who transferred the custom houses and bridge site to the upper part of Oberfohring, placing them in the village of Munich on the Isar. Albert I (1158-84) brought the diocese safely through the conflicts of Barbarossa with the pope; he restored the cathedral, which had been burned down in 1119, making it greater and more magnificent; his successor Otto II (1184-1220) completed the work, the cathedral being consecrated in 1205. The troubled period of the thirteenth century was generally unfavourable to the spiritual life of the diocese; in addition, the acquisition of property through donations ceased, and, in particular, the Kingdom of Wurttemberg (1258-1278) and Emicho of Wittelsbach (1263-1311), organized and brought together their scattered possessions by purchase, sale, and exchange. By inheriting Wurdenfels (1294), the diocese became an immediate principality of the empire.

The schism which occurred under Louis the Bavarian, who divided the Church of Freising. In opposition to the bishops chosen by the cathedral chapter, which was favourable to the emperor, three others were named in succession by the pope, and for a century and a half the popes appointed the bishops of this diocese, ignoring the privilege of free choice possessed by the chapter. In 1359, Bishop Albert of Hohenburg (1349-50), chancellor of Charles IV, the diocese recovered from the evil effects produced by the schism. His successors were in great part lords from Austrian territory. In opposition to Bishop Nicodemus of Scula (1421-43), named by Martin V, who proved himself an excellent regent and promoter of ecclesiastical reform, the cathedral chapter selected the vicar-general Johann Grünwalder, recognized by the antipope, Felix V, and by Duke Albert of Bavaria; but after the resignation of Heinrich II of Schlick (1443-48), appointed by the pope, he obtained general recognition as bishop, and showed himself to be eminently fitted for the office (1448-52). His successor, Johann IV of Tuelbeck (1453-73), was the first bishop in many years to receive his election to the cathedral chapter. He resigned in favour of his chancellor, the pious Sixtus of Tannberg, who worked zealously for reform and for the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline. During his time, Veit Armepe wrote his history of Bavaria and of Freising.

After the death of Sixtus, the chapter elected in succession three bishops of Wittelsbach: Ruprecht (1495-98), Philipp (1499-1541), and Heinrich (1541-1551); of these, however, only Philipp received consecration. Given up to field sports, Philip
nevertheless steadfastly opposed the ecclesiastical innovations which seemed about to gain a footing in his diocese. Philipp was also administrator of the Diocese of Naumburg. Under Bishop Leo (1352–39), a visitation of the bishopric took place. Morita of Sandell (1599–96), an ardent councilor in favour of Duke Ernest of Bavaria (1556–1612). The latter was at the same time Bishop of Hildesheim, of Liège, Elector of Cologne, and Bishop of Münster. On account of his zealous activity in the North German sees, he was unable to remain long at Freising. Nevertheless he introduced many reforms, established a ducal and ecclesiastical council in Munich, and promulgated the first Bavarian concordat (1583). Under the pious Vitus Adam von Gebeck (1818–51), the bishopric was shockingly devastated by the Thirty Years' War. Emperor Ferdinand II conferred upon him and his successors the dignity of Prince-bishops.

Once more two princes of the house of Bavaria were elected to the See of Freising: Albert Sigismund (1652–85), at the same time Bishop of Ratisbon and Provost of Ellwangen, an art-loving prince, who adorned the cathedral with a magnificent portal; and Joseph Klemens (1685–94), brother of the Elector Max Emanuel, an ostentatious and extravagant prince, also Bishop of Ratisbon, Elector of Cologne, and Bishop of Liège. Particularly much esteemed was his election by the professors being the learned Benedictine Meichelbeck, who wrote the history of the bishoprics of Freising. Johann Theodor, Duke of Bavaria (1727–63), in whose hands were united the Dioceses of Ratisbon, Liège, and Freising, built an ecclesiastical seminary at Munich (1735). Klemens Wenceslaus of Saxony (1765–88), who from 1769 was also Bishop of Ratisbon and coadjutor of Augsburg, resigned the See of Freising when, in 1768, he was chosen Elector of Trier. Ludwig Joseph von Welden (1769–88) was specially distinguished for his erection of schools for the people. During his episcopate, a papal nuncius was sent for to the See of Freising. Karl Theodor was established in Munich (1786), which was the immediate cause of the convoking of the Congress of Ems. Maximilian Prokop, Count of Törting-Jettenbach (1788–89), was succeeded by the last Prince-Bishop of Freising, Joseph Konrad von Schroffenberg (1780–1803), the dissolution of the diocese taking place during his lifetime (d. 4 April, 1803, at Berchtesgaden).

At the time of the secularization of church property, the prince-bishopric fell to Bavaria, the parts lying in Austria and the Tyrol being turned over to Salzburg. The reformers undertook the destruction of monasteries and diocese, numerous churches were sold for the material they contained, graves were desecrated, the sacred vessels were sold at auction or melted down, and the libraries were plundered or spoiled of their treasures. Owing to the dissolution of the cathedral chapter by the Bavarian Government, the election of a vicar capitular was impossible, and the spiritual guidance of the diocese was entrusted to the vicar-general, Heckenstaller, appointed from Salzburg, who, in 1819, was named vicar Apostolic of the Diocese of Freising. The most important of the temporal functions were performed by the coadjutor Bishop of Ratisbon, Johann Nepomuk von Wolf. After the concordat between Pius VII and King Max Joseph I (5 June, 1817), an orderly condition of affairs was again finally inaugurated. From the territory of the dissolved Sees of Freising and Chiemsee, and the former Provostship of Berchtesgaden was created the Archdiocese of Munich-Freising, with the seat of the archbishop and the cathedral chapter in Munich. The new archdiocese was also to comprise those portions of the former Prince-Bishopric of Salzburg which lay on the left bank of the Inn. On the other hand, those parishes in the Tyrol, Carinthia, Carniola, etc., which were formerly under the bishops of Freising and Chiemsee, were subjected to the Ordinaries of Salzburg and Brixen. The church of Our Lady in Munich was made the cathedral. The Bishops of Augsburg, Passau, and Ratisbon became the suffragans of the new ecclesiastical province. The papal Bull of circumcision, "Dei ac Domini nostri", bears the date of 1 April, 1818.

Lothar Anselm, Freiherr von Gebsattel, dean of the cathedral of Würzburg and a personal friend of the king, was named the first archbishop (1817). As, at the same time as the publication of the concordat, a religious edict had been promulgated as part of the constitution, which again unfairly abrogated many of the stipulations of the concordat, Gebsattel refused to take the oath to abide by the constitution; and it was only after the Tegernsee proclamation of the king, 15 Sept., 1821, that he was consecrated in the cathedral of Munich (1821). He attained great distinction by his regulation of ecclesiastical affairs. Under his rule, a large number of monasteries were re-established, in the interests of the arts and charitable institutions were erected. In Freising, on the site of the old episcopal residence, which Louis had restored to the bishop in 1826, an ecclesiastical seminary was established, to which were added later a lesser seminary, a gymnasium, and a lyceum.

His successor was Karl August, Count of Reissach, previously Bishop of Ellwangen, who became Bishop of Munich. He became unpopular under Maximilian II because of his efforts to uphold the rights of the Church. The king finally used his influence to have him withdrawn, and Pius IX in 1855 raised him to the cardinalate and called him to Rome. Gregor von Scherr (1856–77), former Archbishop of Metten, endeavoured to preserve the Catholic character of the schools. For the maintenance of the lesser seminaries of the diocese which had been obliged to receive an exceptionally large number of candidates to the priesthood, he founded St. Corbinian's Association, and erected a lesser seminary in Freising. He introduced into his diocese the devotion of the perpetual Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, and instituted pastoral conferences of the clergy. At the Vatican Council, he voted with the minority, but submitted at once to the decision of the council. The last years of his episcopate were emblazoned by the support which the Bavarian Government, under the leadership of Lutz, minister of war, gave to the Old Catholic movement, whose founder (Döllinger) and most zealous champions were resident in Munich.

His successor, Anton von Steichchele (1878–89), the learned church historian and historiographer of the Diocese of Augsburg, by the foundation of Church Building Associations kept pace with the ever-growing City of Munich by the erection of churches and chapels, and enlarged the seminary at Freising. In January, 1887, he summoned the bishops of Bavaria to a conference at Freising, which resulted in a resolution to send to the Government a joint memorandum in regard to the status of the Catholic Church in Bavaria, which when carried into effect brought about a better arrangement of the relations between Church and State and granted to the Church a greater influence upon the intermediate and higher schools. Under Archbishop Antonius von Thoma (1889–97), the Old Catholic question was finally settled in a manner favourable to the Catholic Church and to justice. Franz Joseph von Stein (1897–1909) fearlessly espoused in the Bavarian Court the cause of the Catholic Church regarding instruction, upholding Catholic
knowledge as opposed to the unchecked freedom of university teaching. In accordance with the requirements of the times, he bestowed special care upon the encouragement of Catholic orders and associations, the fostering of Christian charity, the education of the clergy, and the awakening and conservation of the spirit of the Church in the hearts of the people. The present archbishop is Franz Bettinger, appointed on 23 May, 1909, and consecrated, 15 Aug.

Statistics.—The archdiocese comprises the Bavarian districts of Upper Bavaria, excepting those portions lying west and north of the Danube, 48 communes in the domains of Landshut, and Vilshburg in the district of Lower Bavaria. The suffragan dioceses are Augsburg, Passau, and Ratibon. The diocese is divided into 16 deaneries, 3 town commissariats (Munich, Landshut, and Freising), 417 parishes, 20 expositures (parishes in all but the name) and vicarates. The diocese has 460 benefices and manual benefices (i.e., benefices the incumbents of which may be removed at the will of a superior), 400 curacies, and 100 other places where church services are held. The clergy numbers (1910) 412 priests, 162 invested beneficiaries, 677 other priests, 210 regular priests (in 1861), about 461 religious men, and 1,069,300. In addition to the cathedral chapter, there are three collegiate churches: in Munich (St. Cajetan's), Laufen, and Tittmoning.

For the education of the clergy there are lesser seminaries in Scheeßen (conducted by the Benedictines) and in Freising, having respectively 173 and 215 students, as well as a seminary of the diocesan seminary fund, viz., the archiepiscopal seminary in Freising, with 117 students, and the Georgianum, founded in 1894 by Duke Georg the Rich at Ingolstadt, now transferred to Munich and administered by the State, with 103 students, of which, however, only 23 belong to the Diocese of Munich-Freising. The students attend the University of Munich or the Technische Hochschule at Munich, the University of Munich and at the state lyceum at Freising.

The following orders are represented in the archdiocese:—The Benedictines possess the two Abbeys of Scheeritten and St. Boniface in Munich, founded by King Louis I, as well as the Abbeys of Ettal and Schlehdorf, 244 seminarians, 413 students, and 23 seminarians of the so-called "Welsches Kappen" (Romanesque cape), are the town's most famous landmarks. Other churches are St. Peter's, the oldest parish church of the city, dating from the year 1180, built in the Gothic and later restored in the Baroque style; St. Jacob am Anger, the oldest church in Munich, still retaining its original structure from the eleventh century; the court church of St. Michael, built 1583-97, the most distinguished ecclesiastical production of the German Renaissance; the court church of St. Cajetan, built (1663-75) for the Theatines, in the Baroque style; the church of St. Louis, built (1530-44), mainly through the generosity of King Louis I, in the form of the famous fresco of the "Last Judgment" by Corinthiaco; the court of All Saints, built in 1827-37 in the Romanesque-Byzantine style; and the Basilica of St. Boniface, built (1835-50) for the Benedictines, in the form of an early Christian basilica, containing frescoes taken from the life of St. Boniface. The numerous churches of the" city: and the churches which were erected in Munich during the last ten years, and constitute one of the beauties of the city, e.g., those of St. Anna, St. Paul, St. Joseph, St. Rupert, bear witness to the people's devotion.

Of the other churches of the archdiocese, the following are worthy of mention: the cathedral of Freising, built 1161-1315, one of the most celebrated and altered, in which is to be found the shrine containing the relics of St. Corbinian; the Gothic church of St. Martin, in the city of Landshut, dating from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, surmounted by the highest tower in Bavaria; in the same city the church of St. Jodok, also in the Gothic style, built in 1335-88; the Romanesque church of Moosburg, erected 1180; the collegiate churches of Tegernsee, Isen, Berchtesgaden, Illmünster, Dietramszell, and others. The places of pilgrimage include the church of the Ducal Hospital in Munich, Maria-Eich, Maria-Rammersdorf, Maria-Blutenburg in Munich, Maria-Eich at Traunstein, Tuntenhausen, Ettal, Scheyern, Mariadorf, Birkenau, and Heiligenthum at Erding.

University of Munich.—It was first established (1472) at Ingolstadt (q. v. for its history up to 1800).
In 1800 it was transferred to Landshut, and, later, by decree of Ludwig I (3 Oct., 1826) to Munich, where it has developed in peace. Its earliest location was the former cloister of the Jesuits, but in 1840 it removed to a building which has since (1896) been considerably enlarged. Through the munificence of the Wittelsbach dynasty, abundant provision has been made for its organization and equipment, and it now ranks as the second largest among the German universities. The revised statutes were published in 1835, and new regulations for the student body in 1849. The fourth centenary of the university was celebrated in August, 1872. The faculty of theology at Munich has a long list of distinguished names: Allioto, Dollinger, Haneberg, Hergenröther, Klee, Möhler, Phillips, Permaneder, Reischl, Schegg, Thalhofer. The Collegium Georgianum, founded in 1494 by George the Rich for the special benefit of theological students, was transferred to Munich with the rest of the university, and still serves its original purpose. The faculty numbers (1910) twelve professors and nine Dozenten; there are 150 theological students. Among illustrious representatives of the other sciences may be mentioned: in philosophy, Schelling; in chemistry, Liebig; in surgery, Thiersch (1848–95), and Nussbaum (1860–90); in medicine, Ringseis (1817–80); in history, Giesbrecht (1862–89); in Germanic philology, Schmoller (1827–29); in Celtic philology, Zeuss (1847–56). In 1910 the total number of instructors was 252; of students, 6896.

Münster, Geschichte Freisingens: 2 vol. (Augsburg, 1724); Väus Armpitschi Liber de gestis Episcoporum Freisingensium (new edition, Munich, 1852); DUETTINGE, Die ältesten Mitglieder des Bistums Freising (5 vols., Munich, 1834–50); IDEM, Briefe, Geschafte, Topographie und Statistik des Erzbistums München und Freising (6 vols., Munich, 1850–54), continued by SCHWERT, vols. VII to X (Munich, 1901–10); BAUMGARTNER, Geschichte der Stadt Freising und ihrer Bischöfe (Freising, 1854); von HUND, Urbundprognostik der Stadt München (Munich, 1859); ZACH, Codex Cistercianus austriaco-Freisingensis (3 vols., Vienna, 1870–71); MATER and WESTERMAYER, Statistische Beschreibung des Bistums Mün chen (2 vols., Munich, 1879–84); Urania der Bayerns Kirchenprovinzen (Munich, 1902); BITTERHAU, Die Traditionen des Hochstifts Freising (Munich, 1903); Generalansammlung der Erzbistümer München und Freising, 1–V (Munich, 1821–98): Pastoralblatt [Anzeigeblatt ab 1800] für die Erzbistümer München-Freising (Munich, 1860–); Geschichtsquellen der Geschichte des Erzbistums München-Freising (Munich, 1821–); Oberbayrisches Archiv für vorländische Geschichte (Munich, 1839–); Vollständiger Geschichtshandbuch des bayerischen Landes (Munich, 1855); Riebeck, Geschichte der Erblassung Mu nchens 1105–1855; Over, Kunstschäden Bayerns, 1; Rügardsbericht Oberbayern (Munich, 1892–).

JOSEPH LINS.

Münkác, Diocese of, in Hungary, of Greek Catholic Rite, suffragan of Gran. It dates from the fifteenth century. Until then the Greek Ruthenians who had emigrated to Hungary a generation before, 1254, were subject to the See of Przemysł. In 1458 the Diocese of Münkác is mentioned for the first time in a document of King Mathias as a parish with episcopal jurisdiction. It was probably established before 1455, as its creation was apparently that Lucas, the occupant of the see, had already exercised the usual jurisdiction for a considerable period. Its history is connected with that of the Basilian monastery at Csernekehgy near Münkác, established supposedly in 1390 by Duke Theodore Koriakovics, but demonstrably as late as 1418. The bishopric probably falls within the sixteenth century. Until 1641, when union with Rome took place, Mün kác endeavoured to extend its episcopal jurisdiction over the thirteen districts (Komitate) of Hungary, later its territory. The second period lasts from 1641 to 1771, when the see was canonically established. A third period brings its history down to the present. Of its history for the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries we know very little, especially in regard to the mode of episcopal appointment, although it was probably by election until 1561, with the exception of the nomination in 1458. In King Wladislav II’s documents a certain John is mentioned as bishop in 1491 and 1498; thence until 1551 we hear nothing more about the bishoprics of Münkác, at least in the see was occupied. The first document recording the actual appointment of a bishop dates from 1623. In 1641, under Bishop Theodore Tharasovics (1639–48), union with Rome was facilitated by the wish to have done with dependence on the lords of Münkác, but George Rákóczi I of Transylvania, Lord of Münkác, being unfavourably disposed towards union, took Tharasovics prisoner, and, although the latter obtained his freedom in 1642, he did not regain possession of the see. In 1649 the union with Rome was again proclaimed by the clergy of Münkác influenced by Bishop George Jakusich of Eger; henceforth, especially from 1689, date the efforts of the bishops of Eger to bring Münkác into close relation.

After the union of 1649, Peter Parthenius was appointed Bishop of Münkác, and was confirmed both by King Leopold and the Pope. His death was followed by a period of decadence: the diocese was divided into several parts, administered more or less independently of one another, and conflicts arose between the prince and both the Church and the Rákóczi family, concerning the right of nomination to the see. Appointed bishop in 1689 through the efforts of Archbishop Kolonics, Joseph de Camélis, a Greek, devoted his chief energy towards fostering the religious life of the people and extirpating incontinence among the clergy. To promote these objects he held twice synods within the diocese, the first of which being of special importance. After Camélis’s death the right of appointment was again disputed. King Joseph I appointed Joseph Hodemarsky bishop in 1705; Francis Rákóczi II, as Lord of Münkác, filled the episcopal office independently; the Holy See, on its part, appointed an administrator, not regarding the bishop as elected. Finally, in 1715, the Holy See had to resign the see in 1715, and the endeavours of the bishops of Eger to treat Münkác as a suffragan thus triumphed. Hodemarsky’s successor, Gennadius Bisancioi (1716–33), had already acted as vicar Apostolic. Both he and still more his successor, Michael Olaszvaky, contested the authority of the Bishopric of Eger. In 1758 Bishop Bradács, continued the conflict, and finally triumphed. In 1771 the see of Münkacs was established canonically by Clement XIV, Bradács becoming first canonical bishop. Under him the chapter, with seven canons, was also established. In 1816 the See of Eperjes was separated from Münkacs, and in 1856 the four parishes of the vicariate on the opposite side of the See of Szamsoeyváz. Basil Popovics (1837–64) made a lasting impression on the religious life of the diocese; Stephen Pankovics (1866–74) displayed great activity in the domain of diocesan administration, and John Pásztélyi-Kovács (1879–94) performed especially prominent service in the cause of public education.

HODINKA, Hist. of the Greek Catholic See of Münkacs (Budapest, 1910), with literature; Catholic Hungary (Budapest, 1903), both in Hungarian.

A. ALDÁSY.

Münster, Diocese of (Monasteriensis), in the Prussian Province of Westphalia, suffragan of Cologne.

I. Secular History.—The earliest name of Münster was Mignegeforn, the later form being Mignardeford, while from 1076 it was called by the Latin
name Monasterium. It is first mentioned in 795, when St. Ludger founded a monastery here, and the place importance later rose. Even at this early date it must have been a place of some importance. Among the earliest possessions of the Church at Münster were three large landed estates, apparently the gift of Charlemagne. These lands, at least in part, lay within the area of the later city. They were called the Brochhof, the Kampwördehof, and the Biepinghof. The Kampwördehof belonged to the bishop and, probably for this reason, bore his name. The Brochhof was owned by the cathedral chapter, the Kampwördehof belonged later to the collegiate church of St. Moritz, to which it was apparently assigned when the church was founded. The fourth great estate, and one that is mentioned from the earliest days, the Judehof. The Judehof also belonged to the bishop and, as the land was originally given to the Church, by which it was given in fief to a family called Jüdefeld. In 1386 the cathedral chapter obtained it by purchase. Near these four estates were quite a number of farms owned independently by free peasants; many of these in the course of time came into the possession of the Church. The monasteries maintained the vast extent of the land and properties on the ground now surrounding the cathedral. From the beginning the monastery was independent of the jurisdiction of the count. How large a district enjoyed this immunity cannot now be ascertained. Neither, for lack of original authorities, can the extent of the guild in which the free peasants were included. The latter were not part of the property and the jurisdiction of the community and the legal jurisdiction exercised in it. In regard to the public administration of justice, Münster was from the earliest times under the authority of the Counts of Dretingau until, on account of the privileges granted by Otto I, the rights of the count were transferred to the bishop, who exercised them, especially in that part of the region which was later to be the city government up to the fourteenth century. The representatives of the city were the burgomasters, first mentioned in 1253, and the assessors, mentioned in 1221. Besides its judicial authority, the body of assessors performed the duties of a city council. It was presided over by the burgomasters, who, from the beginning, were elected by the citizens (guden luden) who had the right of voting. Taking advantage of the bishop's pecuniary needs, the municipality gradually obtained large rights and privileges. Thus, besides its own autonomy, it acquired the military authority, the administration of a number of church prebends, and supreme jurisdiction in certain cases. By the end of the fourteenth century it had a court formed from its own council. After 1309 it was represented in the diet of the diocese along with the cathedral chapter and the lower nobility.

Nevertheless, the bishop always appointed the judges and reserved to himself the confirmation of sentence in important cases. He levied the crown-taxes which, however, he generally mortgaged; he owned the mint, and claimed certain rights at the death of every citizen. The guilds formed by the leading trades in the fourteenth century (in the sixteenth century seventeen guilds are mentioned) originally exercised no control over the city government; by the second half of that century they had become a city federation. Thus federated, the guilds were able to influence both the internal and external affairs of the city, working apparently in amicable agreement with the Council. In 1447 the federated guilds were regarded as a ruling corporation co-ordinate and acting in union with the Council. Their veto could stop any proceedings of the Council which was still chosen from the patrician body. On the other hand, the Council retained a certain right of supervision over the internal affairs of the guilds. A good understanding between Council and guilds was, therefore, the primary condition for a prosperous development of the city. As a matter of fact the two bodies worked harmoniously together until the outbreak of the diocesan feud which split the city into two armed camps (see below, under 11). In 1454, after the close of this feud, it was decided to choose the burgomasters and members of the Council henceforward from both the patricians and mass of the citizens. This arrangement was maintained until the Anabaptist outbreak. Internal peace promised a great increase in commerce, learning flourished greatly. Münster was regarded as the leading commercial city between the Rhine and the Weser, and the school conducted by the Canon Rudolf of Langen had a great reputation.
In 1533–35, however, Münster was the scene of the wild excesses of the Anabaptists. During the episcopate of Bishop Frederick III, brother of Hermann of Wied, Archbishop of Cologne, the doctrines of Luther spread widely in the Diocese of Münster. In his agreement (14 March, 1533) Bishop Francke of Waldeck ceded to it full religious liberty and granted the six parish churches to the adherents of the new doctrine, in return for which the city promised him obedience and support against the cathedral chapter. From 1533 the city undertook the preparation of new church ordinances. The drawing up of a form of worship was assigned to Bernt Rothmann, a preacher of Anabaptist proclivities. Supported by some preachers from Wassenberg in Jülich and by the Melchiorites (followers of Melchior Hoffman), he began to spread his views. The strength of the Anabaptist party was steadily increased by accessions from Holland, until, in February, 1534, their leaders, John of Leyden, a tailor, and Jan Matthias, a baker, came to Münster from Haarlem, when the sect gained complete control of the city, and the peaceable minority either left the city voluntarily or were expelled. The Anabaptists now indulged in the wildest orgies in "the New Jerusalem," as they called Münster, introducing polygamy and communism, plundering and murder. The ancient monasteries were destroyed.

Notwithstanding his inclination to Protestantism, the bishop was now obliged to go to war with the city in order to maintain his secular authority. In alliance with Philipp of Hesse, he began (28 February, 1534) a siege of the city in which John of Leyden, as king of the New Zion, had established a reign of terror. After 27 days' stubborn fighting (24 March, 1535) the leaders of the insurrection were executed with horrible tortures and their bodies were exposed in three cages hung on the tower of St. Lambert's Church. The return of the expelled citizens and the restoration of the Catholic Church proceeded slowly. A small Protestant community was still maintained. In 1553 the city regained its old privileges and rights. Trade, commerce, and learning once more flourished. Although disputes now arose between the guilds and the town council, and these two combined against the growing importance of the bishop, Münster enjoyed general peace and prosperity until the Thirty Years' War. Whether the city was to pay heavy contributions, but it was not utterly impoverished like so many other cities.

The peace negotations carried on at Münster by the Catholic Powers, beginning in 1643, led to the neutralisation of the city and its substantial benefit. Thus encouraged, the Council, a few years after a new agreement of Westphalia, persuaded the citizens to make a bold attempt to throw off the sovereignty of the bishop and raise Münster to the rank of a free city of the empire. In the struggle with the Prince-Bishop Christopher Bernhard of Galen, Münster was defeated in March, 1661. It lost its privileges, and an episcopal citadel, the Paulsburg, was erected in the western part of the city. But, the prince-bishops, who had ruled, did Münster regain its full civic liberty. After the Seven Years' War, during which Münster was not able to hold out against a second siege, in 1759, the fortifications were turned into promenades, and the citadel razed. In place of the latter a castle was built in 1768 as a residence for the prince-bishop. In 1790 a part of the city was destroyed by a fire, which the city at that moment suppressed Jesuita and of the Abbey of Überwasser. A circle of learned men gathered at Münster around the Princess Galitzin, amongst them being Frederick Leopold Count zu Stolberg and Overbeck.

By the Imperial delegate's enactment, the city of Münster and a part of the diocese fell to Prussia, which had already (23 May, 1802) made an agreement concerning it with the Consul Bonaparte. The Prussian troops under Blücher entered the city, 3 August. A commission accompanied the army to shape the constitution and administration of the newly-acquired district conformably with the Prussian model. Although the president of the commission, Freiherr von Stein, in 1810 to 1811 to France, as the old city-government was dissolved and replaced by the French municipal organisation. Many good measures of administration were introduced, but the enthusiasm for them was rapidly chilled by the extensive billeting of soldiers upon the citizens, and by arbitrary action, especially in ecclesiastical matters. When, therefore, after the overthrow of the Napoleonic power at the battle of Leipzig, the Prussians again entered Münster, they, in turn, were greeted with great joy. The Prussian Government was wise enough to retain many improvements made by the French, which they further developed, so that the city quickly reached an unprecedented prosperity. In 1813 a new city ordinance was applied to Münster. The population, 13,000 at the beginning of the nineteenth century, rapidly increased with the growth of commerce and traffic, and, as capital of the Province of Westphalia, the quiet cathedral city developed into an important centre of traffic for North-Western Germany.

By the cession of 1806, Münster had 81,468 inhabitants, of whom 67,221 were Catholics, 13,612 Protestants, and 555 Jews; in 1910 the population was about 87,000, including 72,800 Catholics. The city has 25 Catholic churches and chapels, including 12 parish churches. Catholic institutions of learning are: the theological faculty of the university with (in the summer of 1910) 316 students; the seminary for priests; 2 preparatory seminaries, namely, the Collegium Borromæum and the Collegium Ludgerianum; a Catholic state gymnasium; a seminary for teachers; a high school for girls.

II. Dioecesan History.—Towards the end of the Saxon War, Charlemagne founded, about 795, several small dioceses. The city was the seat of a bishop in 818. There was an archbishopric of Münster, or Mimirgerinseif. The first bishop was Ludger, who, since the year 787, had been a zealous missionary in five Frisian "hundreds", or districts. The territory of the Diocese of Münster was bounded on the west, south, and north-west by the Dioceses of Utrecht, on the east and north-east by Osnabrück. The diocese also included districts remote from the bulk of its territory, namely, the five Frisian hundreds on the lower Ems (Hugmerki, Hunsau, Vifelga, Federigtau, and Emgaau), also the island of Bant, which has disappeared, leaving behind it the islands of Borkum, Juist, and Norderney. Münster has already been mentioned in possession of the island estates of the sea. Most of the territory over which the bishop eventually exercised sovereign rights lay north of the river Lippe, extending as far as the upper Ems and the Teutoburg Forest. The most important accession was in 1252, when the see purchased the Countship of Vechta and the district of the Ems with the town of Meppen. The country between the new dioceses was acquired later: in 1403 the district about Cloppenburg and Cotte was gained. In 1406 the manorial domain of Ahaus and the castle of Stromberg with its jurisdiction; and in 1429 Wiedehausen in pledge from the Archdiocese of Bremen. This last addition made the new territory, which was entirely separate from the southern part, a compact body subsequently known as "the lower diocese"; it remained an integral part of the Diocese of
Münster until the Reformation, which somewhat reduced its size; what was left was retained until the secularization.

St. Ludger established his see as Mimgernoford and founded there a monastery, following the rule of Bishop Chrodegang of Metz, bishop and clergy living in community. But the most important monastery founded by St. Ludger was the Benedictine Abbey of Werden, which became a nursery for the clergy of the diocese. He also assisted in founding the convent of Nottuln, under his sister Heriburg. He was succeeded in the administration of the diocese by two nephews, Gerfrid (809–89) and Allfrid (829–49), both of whom were important prelates. The special concession of Werden with the diocese ceased on the appointment of the next bishop, Luitbert (840–71), who was not related to the family of the founder. There were even disputes between the bishop and the monastery, which the Synod of Mainz settled in favour of the latter, awarding it the right of freely electing its abbot. Bishop Wulflheim (875–95) changed the collegiate body founded by Ludger into a cathedral chapter, with which he divided the property till then held in common, the bishop having thenceforth his special residence. Among the religious foundations of the diocese in the ninth century should be mentioned the monasteries for women at Liesborn (810) and Herford (817). But the most important monastery, Hermann I (1032–42) founded the Abbey of Our Lady of Ueberwasser; Bishop Frederick I, Count of Wettin (1084–84), established the collegiate church of St. Moritz at Münster; Bishop Erpfo (1085–97) built the church of St. Lambert. Both the two just named and Bishop Durchad of Holte (1085–1118) were partisans of the emperor in the investiture conflict. During the episcopate of Dietrich II, Count of Zutphen (1118–27), several Premonstratensian and Cistercian abbeys arose. Hermann II (1174–1203) founded collegiate churches for the canons of St. Ludger and St. Martin.

The twelfth century was marked by a considerable growth of the bishops' secular power. Bishop Ludwig I, Count of Tecklenburg (1169–73), restored to the see the temporal jurisdiction over its domains previously exercised by the Counts of Tecklenburg. Hermann II, like his immediate predecessors, Frederick II, Count of Are (1152–58), and Ludwig I, was a partisan of Frederick Barbarossa. With the overthrow of Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony, the last obstacle in the way of the complete sovereignty of the bishops was removed, and Hermann appears as a great feudal lord of the empire. During the episcopate of his second successor, Dietrich III of Isenberg (1218–26), the position of the bishop as a prince of the empire was formally acknowledged in 1220 by Frederick II. Hermann II was the last bishop directly appointed by the emperor. Dissensions arose about the election of his successor, Otto I, Count of Oldenburg (1204–18), and Emperor Otto IV decreed that thenceforward the cathedral chapter alone should elect the bishop. The See of Cologne retained the right of confirmation, and the empyrean in the investiture. The bishop's temporal authority was limited in its exercise to the right to appoint or dismiss canons, an early taxation, the consent of representative bodies of his subjects was necessary. Among these, the cathedral chapter appears early in the thirteenth century; later, the lower nobility, and, lastly, the city of Münster. In course of time the cathedral chapter extended its rights by agreements made with bishops before election.

The temporal power of the see increased greatly during the episcopate of Bishop Otto II, Count of Lippe (1247–59). The city, at the same time, struggled to become independent of the bishop, not, however, with complete success, notwithstanding its alliance with the cathedral chapter. Even as early as the fourteenth century the bishops were frequently engaged in disputes with the great nobility, particularly with the prelates of the diocese, generally to those possessing lands in the neighbourhood; only too often the diocese was administered for the benefit rather of the bishop's family than of the Church. The bishops were, in consequence, frequently involved in the quarrels of the nobility; ecclesiastical affairs were neglected and the see suffered. Conditions were at their worst during what is known as the Münster Diocesan Feud (1450–57). The arbitrary conduct of Bishop Henry II of Mör (1424–50) had aroused a very bitter feeling in the city. After his death the majority of the cathedral chapter elected Wulfram of Mör, brother of Henry and also of the Archbishop of Cologne, while the city and a minority of the chapter demanded the election of Eric of Hoja, brother of Count John of Hoja. Although the election of Wulfram was confirmed by the pope, open war for the possession of the see broke out, and Wulfram was unable to gain possession of the city of Münster. In 1457, after his death, a compact was made by which both parties divided the city, and the privileges of the city were confirmed, while both parties recognized the new bishop appointed by the pope, John II, Count Palatine of Simmern (1457–66). After order had been re-established, the ecclesiastical reform of the diocese was taken seriously in hand. Bishop Henry III of Schwarzburg (1466–96), Count John of Simmern, and Bishop Engelbert of Lauenburg (1506–22) produced excellent results by holding synods and reforming religious foundations. Rudolf of Langen and John Mummellui made the cathedral school a nursery of humanism.

Under the indulgent and thoroughly worldly Frederick III (1522–52), brother of the Archbishop of Cologne, Hermann of Wied, Lutheranism spread rapidly after 1524, especially in the city. Scarcely any opposition to the innovation was made by the next bishop, Franz of Waldeck (1532–53), who from the first planned to aid the Reformation in his three dioceses of Münster, Minden, and Osnabrück, in order to form out of these three a secular principality for himself. He enjoyed the support of his endangered authority, to proceed against the Anabaptists in the city of Münster; but he did little for the restoration of the Faith, and at last joined the Smalkaldic League. William of Ketteler (1553–57) was more Protestant than Catholic: although he regarded himself as an administrator of the old Church, and took the Tridentine oath, he refused to comply with the demands of Rome, and resigned in 1557. Bernhard of Raesfeld (1557–66) was genuinely devoted to the Catholic Faith, but he, too, finding himself unequal to the difficulties of his position, resigned. John of Hoja (1566–74), a faithful Catholic, in order to reorganize ecclesiastical affairs, undertook a general visitation of the diocese, which occupied him from 1567 to 1573. The visitation revealed shocking conditions among clergy and people, and showed to what extent the Reformation had spread in the diocese under previous bishops. Not only were Protestant ideas predominant in the northern part of the country, or "lower diocese", but the western part as well had been almost entirely lost to the Church. In the diocesan affairs of the diocese, too, the Faith had suffered greatly.

The good this bishop accomplished was almost undone after his death. His successor, John William of Cleves (1574–85), inherited the Duchy of Cleves in 1575, married, and gave up the administration of the diocese. A long diplomatic battle as to his successor arose between the Catholic and Protestant powers,
during which the diocese was administered by Cleves. The maintenance of Catholicism in the diocese was assured by the victory of Ernst of Bavaria (1585–1590). After his death, Bishop Ferdinand of Bavaria, the newly-founded Bishoprics of Groningen and Liège, and Archbishop of Cologne. He zealously undertook the Counter-Reformation, invited the Jesuits to aid him, and encouraged the founding of monasteries of the old orders, although he could not repair all the losses. The western part of the Frisian district under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Münster was transferred, in 1580, to the newly-founded Bishoprics of Groningen and Deventer, and with them fell into Protestantism. In the same way the possessions of the Counts of Bentheim-Steinfurt and some other fortified towns passed from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishop. The two immediate successors of Bishop Ernst laboured in the same spirit. Ferdinand of Bavaria (1612–30) was at the same time Elector of Cologne and Bishop of Paderborn, Hildesheim, and Liège. He founded a seminary, which he placed under the direction of Jesuits. Christopher Bernhard of Galen (1650–78) was equally efficient both as bishop and as secular ruler: he forced the refractory city of Münster, after a long siege, to acknowledge his sovereignty, and, by leading in foreign troops, gained parts of the Archdiocese of Bremen and of the Diocese of Werden in a war with Sweden, restored church discipline, and established a school system for his territory.

The immediate successors of the three distinguished rulers just mentioned were: Ferdinand II of Münster, by marriage Maximilian Henry of Bavaria (1683–88), Frederick Christian of Plettenberg (1688–1712), and Francis Arnold of Wolf-Metternich (1708–18). Unfortunatley, under these men church discipline declined, and much that was excellent decayed for lack of proper care, or, like the seminary for priests, ceased to exist. Nevertheless, the bishop, Bishop, a zealous, and church-loving Clement Augustus of Bavaria (1719–61), who was also Elector of Cologne, and Bishop of Paderborn, Hildesheim, and Osnabrück. During his episcopate the diocese suffered terribly, in 1734–35 and during the Seven Years War, being almost ruined financially. The succeeding bishop, Maximilian Frederick of Königsegg-Rothenfels (1761–84), who was also Elector of Cologne, was a weak, though well-meaning, man. Happily, he left the administration of the Diocese of Münster to a young cathedral canon, Franz Friedrich Wilhelm von Fürstenberg (q. v.), during whose administration the diocese attained unexpected prosperity. At the election of an auxiliary bishop, the Fürstenbergian institution was helped by Monsignor Karl Joseph of Austria, who became the last Prince-Bishop of Münster and Elector of Cologne (1774–1801). Upon the death of Maximilian Franz, his nephew, the Archbishop Anthony Victor, was elected, but could not enter upon the administration on account of the opposition of Prussia, which had long coveted the domain of the Church in Northern Germany.

In 1803 the diocese was secularized by the Imperial Delegates Enactment and broken up into numerous parts. The larger share was assigned to Prussia, which took possession in March, 1803. The rich treasury of the cathedral was transferred to Magdeburg and has never been returned. Freiherr von Fürstenberg administered as vicar-general the ecclesiastical affairs of the diocese even during the short supremacy of the French (1806–13). After his death, in 1810, the administrator was his former coadjutor, Clement Augustus von Droste-Vischering, later Archbishop of Cologne. In the years 1813–15 the diocese was administered, without the authorization of the pope, by Father Theodor, and the Marquis appointed by Napoleon, and to whom von Droste-Vischering had given his faculties by subdelegation. In 1813 the principality was again ceded to Prussia.

Upon the ecclesiastical reorganization of Prussia, completed by the Bull of 16 July, 1821, "De salute anarchum", the diocese was given its present boundaries (see below). The see had been vacant for two years when, in 1823, the new bishop, Caspar Max, Freiherr von Droste-Vischering (1824–46), who, having been auxiliary bishop of the diocese since 1826, had confirmed many hundreds of thousands and ordained over 2200 priests. His administration was greatly hampered by the petty and far-reaching supervision of the Government. In place of the university, suppressed in 1818, he was able to open, in 1832, an academy with philosophical and theological faculties; in 1902 this academy became a university. Ecclesiastical life in the diocese was in a somewhat unsatisfactory condition, the clergy being largely inclined to Rationalistic and Hermeneutics opinions.

An intellectual and religious revival throughout Germany followed the events at Cologne in 1837 (see Cologne). This revival and the larger freedom granted the Catholic Church of Prussia under King John Charles Frederick (1815–1840) began the struggle for freedom of conscience and for the organization of the diocese. During the episcopate of John Gregory Müller (1847–70), fruitful popular missions were held in many places, many churches were rebuilt, and a large number of religious houses and benevolent institutions were founded with the active assistance of the bishop. After the death of John Bernhard Brinkmann (1870–89), laboured in the service of the Church, during the Kulturkampf he suffered fines, imprisonment, and, from 1875 to 1884, banishment. He was obliged to witness the destruction of much that had been established by his predecessors and by himself. The present bishop is Hermann Dingelstad, born 2 March, 1872, was elected 15 August, 1899, consecrated 24 February, 1890.

Statistics.—The Diocese of Münster includes: the Prussian Department of Münster in Westphalia; the parish of Lette, in the Department of Minden; three enclaves in the Department of Aremberg; the city district of Duisberg; the districts of Dinslaken, Rees, Cleves, Gildern, Kempen, and Mörs in Rhein Prussia; the city of Wilhelmshaven in the Province of Hanover; the Duchy of Oldenburg. The 406 parishes of the diocese are distributed in 22 deaneries, of which 12 are in Westphalia, 8 in Rhein Prussia, and 2 in Oldenburg. In 1910 there were in the diocese 1,427, 203 Catholics, 664,737 Protestants, 8,758 Jews. The Catholic population at the last census (1909) was engaged in parochial work, teaching, or ecclesiastical administration; 74 were absent on leave or were retired; there were 133 regulars. In addition, 38 seculars not belonging to the diocese were domiciled in it. There has been an unbroken succession of auxiliary bishops since 1218. The cathedral chapter consists of 8 canons, and 6 honorary canons. The vicariate-general is composed of the vicar-general, 6 ecclesiastical councillors, a notary Apostolic for the diocese, a justiciary, 3 secretaries, and 7 other officials. Besides the officialstät at Münster, there is also one at Vechta for the Oldenburg section of the diocese. The diocesan institutions are: the seminary for priests (36 students who were already deacons in 1910), the Colledge Borromæum for theological students (182 students), the Collegium Ludgerianum (111 pupils), the institute for Church music— all at Münster; at Godesdœck, near Goch, an episcopal seminary for assistant priests, and the Collegium Augustinianum; 4 episcopal institutions for poor priests, and the Maristes. There are 9 hospitals. In them are 1600 epileptic women and girls. There are 13 ecclesiastical professors in the theological faculty and one in the philosophical faculty at Münster. Among the state-aided Catholic higher schools are 11 Gymnasien, one
Realschule, 6 seminaries for male and 2 for female teachers. There are also a large number of high schools for girls, generally carried on by nunns and lay religious, with 27 houses of religious orders and congregations. The members conduct most of the 25 Catholic institutions for public benefit and charity in the municipality. The male orders and congregations represented in the diocese are: Franciscans, 5 monasteries, 40 fathers, 13 clerical novices, 11 lay brothers; Capuchins, 4 monasteries, 34 fathers, 9 clerics, 23 brothers; Dominicans, 2 monasteries, 12 fathers, 7 lay brothers; Benedictines, an abbey and a priory, 15 fathers, 28 brothers; Dominicanes, 2 monasteries, 12 fathers, 7 lay brothers; Society of Missionaries of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, 1 house, 19 missionaries; Alexian Brothers, 1 institution for the care of insane men, 46 brothers; Brothers of Mercy, 2 houses, 41 brothers; Brothers of St. Francis, 3 houses, 19 brothers. Female religious orders and congregations: Benedictine nuns of the Perpetual Adoration, 3 houses, 151 sisters; Sisters of the Visitation of Mary, 1 house, 35 sisters; Poor Clares, 3 houses, 92 sisters; Ursulines at Dorsten, where they have a higher school for girls, a boarding-school for girls and a school for younger children; 66 sisters; Sisters of Mercy, mother-house at Münster, 81 branches in the diocese, 240 sisters; Sisters of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, mother-house and branch house, 125 sisters; Sisters of the Divine Providence, a mother-house, 63 filial houses, and 640 sisters who conduct a large number of schools for girls, homes for the sick, and for the needy and for the aged; and 140 nurses. Nursing Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, a mother-house, 83 branch houses, 894 sisters; Sisters of Our Lady, a mother-house, 41 branch-houses, which carry on boarding schools, day-schools, homes for girls etc., 590 sisters; Sisters of the Christian Schools of Mercy, who conduct higher schools for girls, day-schools, seminariums, etc., 245 sisters; Good Shepherd, 146 sisters; Poor Serving Maids of Jesus Christ, 4 houses, 47 sisters; Poor Franciscans of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary, a hospital with 7 sisters; Sisters of Penitence and Christian Charity of the Third Order of St. Francis, 3 houses, 152 sisters; Sisters of St. Charles Borromeo at Cleves, 15 sisters; Grey Sisters of St. Elizabeth, 5 sisters; Salesians of the Holy Cross, 4 houses, 99 sisters; Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, a mother-house, 78 sisters; Dominican Nuns from the mother-house at Aremberg in the Diocese of Trier, 3 houses, 10 sisters. Among the religious associations are: the association of priests, young men's associations (84), Marian societies (266), jocund societies in 81 towns, merchants' associations (30), workmen's unions (134), miners' unions (47), sodalities for men (77), congregations of Catholic young women (250), societies of Christian mothers (2325), the Bonifaciusverein, the Societies of St. Vincent, of Blessed Albertus Magnus, etc.

The most important church on this part is the cathedral (built for the most part between 1225 and 1365, in the transition period from Romanesque to Gothic architecture, while the great doorway, built in 1516, is later Gothic in style); the Gothic church of St. Lambert, built on the site of an old parish church, in the second half of the fourteenth century, with a new Gothic tower, about 112 feet high, added in 1857–90, to replace the tower which had hung the iron caskets that held the bodies of the executed Anabaptists; the church of Our Lady, a fine fourteenth-century Gothic building erected on the site of the chapel of the Virgin, built by St. Ludger; the church of St. Ludger, built about 1170, enlarged 1383; the collegiate church of St. Morris, founded 1070, and enlarged, 1502, in Renaissance style; the church of St. Michael in the old town, and the church of St. Peter and Paul in the new town, both in Gothic style. From this period, Münster is divided into five parishes, one in the old town, three in the new town, and one in the rural district. The most important church in the city is the cathedral, which was the seat of the bishop of Münster, who had jurisdiction over the diocese of Soest and the bishoprics of Coesfeld, 1826–37; Erbach, bishop of Münster (1637); Trier, bishop of Münster (1652); von Detten, bishop of Münster in Westfalen, with his diocese, and the cathedral of the now vanished bishopric of Münster (1516); Dom zu Münster (1804); Bremen, Diocesan Church in Münster; Eichholz and the Evangelical Church in Münster (1900); Hünfte, Münster in the 7-year war (1908). On the Diocese: Westfälisches Urkundenbuch, I–VIII (Münster, 1808) (especially 1812 and 1903); Eichholz; Die Geschichte des Bistums Münster, I–IV (Münster, 1851–1900); Code X. Rodt, Die Abthes von Münster (Münster, 1896); Kühnlen, Die die Gedenkteilen und die Geschichte des Bistums Münster (Münster, 1893); Dahm, Die Abthes von Münster (Münster, 1893); Dr. W. Meurer, Die älteste Geschichte des Bistums Münster, I–IV (Münster, 1893).—On the Cathedral, see also the Annalisten, Westphalen, Münster, 1910. See also ANABAPTISME, WESTFALEN, J. L. T. H. LINS.

University of Münster.—The town of Münster in Westphalia obtained its university in 1771 through the initiative of the prince-bishop's vicar-general, Freiherr von Fürstenberg.

The foundation for the university was the cathedral school at Münster, which dated from the Middle Ages. This school, about the end of the thirteenth century, had reached such a high standard of instruction through the efforts of the famous humanist Rudolph von Langen (1438–1519). The disturbances caused by the Anabaptists (1533–35) had a depressing influence, but Dean Gottfried von Raesfeld succeeded in restoring it to its former position by turning its supervision over to the Jesuits in 1588. The school, now called Gymnaisum Paulinum, was enlarged by the addition of new buildings in spite of its purely ecclesiastical education of priests, and was raised by Pope Urban VIII to the rank of an academy, 9 Sept., 1629. The latter action was taken at the urgent request of Prince-Bishop Ferdinand I (1612–31), who also obtained from the Emperor Ferdinand II the document of 21 May, 1631, with which the latter granted permission to found a complete university with faculties. The death of the bishop, the disturbances of the Thirty Years' War and the want of funds prevented the execution of this plan during the next century and a half. The clever work of Vicar-General Franz Friedrich von Fürstenberg finally accomplished the desired end: on 4 May, 1771, Maximilian Friedrich von Königseig-Rotenhof signed the document making Münster a university. Pope Clement XIV granted the university, in a bull dated 28 May, 1773, all the privileges, indulgs and liberties which other universities enjoyed. The charter, signed by Emperor Joseph II in Vienna, is dated at the same time. Very soon, more than the town of Fürstenberg, as a university, laboured earnestly for the development of the university. He filled it with the spirit of positive Christianity, so that it had a beneficent influence at a time when rationalistic philosophy and false enlightenment appeared everywhere. In 1803 Münster was ceded to Prussia by the imperial deputation assembled at Ratisbon. The Prussian administration was particularly interested in the university, but endeavoured to do away with its Catholic character. His successor,
President von Vincke, accomplished this purpose and dismissed Fürstenberg, the founder of the university, in 1805. In the autumn of 1806 the French took possession of the town. During the seven years' sway of the foreigners no remarkable progress was made in the university. After Münster had again become Prussian, Münster's law professors and other professors had to decide whether the university should be reorganized or removed to another town. No decision was reached until King Frederick William III in 1815 promised his new subjects on the left bank of the Rhine that a university would be established on the Rhine. His promise led to the founding of the University of Bonn in 1818. The founding of the University of Bonn finally led to the issue of a royal decree, dated 1 July, 1902, restoring to the academy a faculty of law and the title "University" (since 1907 "Westphälische Wilhelms-Universität", in honour of the Emperor William II). In 1906 there followed the establishment of the chairs and institutions required for the teaching of law in Bonn, the further extension of which may be expected in the next few years.

Noteworthy among the teachers of the old episcopal university were: Clemens Becker, S.J., professor of canon law and moral theology (d. 1790); Joh. Hyac. Kistemaker, philologist and theologian, who taught the classical languages from 1786 to 1854, and, later on, exegesis. A. M. Spriekmann laboured as a jurist in Münster from 1778 to 1814, when he was called to the University of Breslau and later, in 1817, to Berlin. Anton Bruchhausen, S.J., professor of physics (1773-82), gained a great reputation among German scientists through his "Institutiones physicae" (1775); and the philosopher H. H. O. Dittrich (1773-83) and many others.

George Hermes was professor of dogmatic theology in Münster from 1807-20; he founded the so-called Hermesianism, a rationalistic tendency in theology, and d. in 1831 at Bonn, where he taught from 1820; his teachings were condemned at Rome in 1836. J. Th. H. Katerkamp, who was counted among the friends of Princess Galitzin, was professor of theology. Of the teachers in the academy there deserve to be mentioned the neo-scholastic Stöckl, professor of philosophy (1862-71); furthermore, Wilhelm Störcke, interpreter of Portuguese poems (Camoens) and professor of German literature (1839-1905); and especially Johann Wilhelm Hittorff, since 1852 professor of physics and chemistry, who discovered the cathode rays, and made valuable investigations concerning electric phenomena in vacuum tubes and contributions to the theory of ions. Mention should also be made of Professors Berlage (dogmatists), Reineck (Old Testament exegetics), and Bisping (New Test. exegesis), Schwane (dogmatists).

The number of students has increased from 68 in 1813 to 127 in 1840, and to 480 in 1890, with 47 lecturers in the faculty of medicine, 12 professors, 2 dozenten, and 1 reader; in the law faculty, 7 ordinary and 3 extraordinary professors, 4 dozenten, and 1 lecturer; in the life sciences, 8 dozenten, 2 lecturers, and 1 reader; in the philosophical faculty, 28 ordinary and 6 extraordinary professors, 14 dozenten, and 4 lecturers; in the medical faculty, 1 extraordinary and 2 ordinary professors, 2 lecturers, 1 dozent.

Piper, "Die allgemeine Universität Münster" (Münster, 1892); Ram- man, "Die Universität Münster" (Münster, 1890); 3. Jahrgang (1905), pp. 187-201, 241-260; 10, 268-270, 275-277; 11, 270-272; 12, 270-272; 13, 270-272. See also the official annual reports, two Senate resolutions (1826, 1830), on the development and present condition of the university and another on the same subject by the Magistrate of the City of Münster (1810).

W. ENGELKEMPER.

Münster, Eugène.—French savant and historian; b. at Soulz-sous-Forêts, near Mülhausen, Alsace, 11 June, 1845; d. at Paris, 2 November, 1902. He took up the study of law, but turned aside from the legal profession to contribute to the "Revue Alsacienne" and the "Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des sciences de l'Empire". His most important works were the inaugurations of the two "Revue de l'Années"—one at the time that—following upon the great efflorescence of learned criticism in Germany—attention was being directed to France to the organized study of history. Albert Dumont founded at Rome the École Française, in the Farnese Palace, and Eugène Münster became one of the first pupils. Among his fellow-students was Louis Duchêne, who afterwards became director of the school. Münster explored the Vatican Archives and Library, and began to amass that vast fund of erudition which he revealed in later years. From that time he devoted himself to the task of unravelling the history of art in Italy. About the year 1858, he, together with such scholars as Morelli and Milanesi, contributed to the immensity of the program undertaken, by which he was to accomplish his studies of art, engraving, its tapestry-weaving, its pottery, its cabinet-making—contribute, as so many expressions of contemporary thought, to form the genius of its painters, sculptors, and architects. Captivated by Rome where the fairest years of his life had been spent in studious research, he never ceased to regard the Rome of Julius II and Leo X., of Bramante, Michelangelo, and Raphael, as the highest expression of human civilization. This attitude of mind at times hindered his doing justice to other schools—for instance, to those of Venice and Siena.

The earliest works of Münster at once won for him a high place among the historians of art. In "Les Alpes et les Grisons dans le XVIe et XVIIe siècles" (6 vols., 1875-98) he has collected evidence to show the splendid part played by the papacy as leader of the Renaissance. When two volumes of this work had appeared, his author issued "Précurseurs de la Renaissance" (1881), and followed this with "Raphael", to which it is a sort of introduction. The "Précurseurs" and "Raphael" are still classics (1st ed. 1851; 2nd ed. 1886); to them must be added a small but important volume "Les Historiens et les critiques de Raphael" (1884), in which Münster defends traditional against modern criticism, especially against Morelli. He afterwards developed his cherished ideas in a work which became the most important work in France on Italian art, "Histoire de l'art à l'Italie, au temps de la Renaissance" (I, "Les Primitifs", 1888; II, "L'Age d'Or", 1891; III, "La Fin de la Renaissance", 1895). His views are not very original, his taste is somewhat academic, with a bourgeois tinge; but this history is nevertheless a most valuable popular treatment of this glorious period. His picture of the Renaissance is completed by an entire study, "Léonard de Vinci," which appeared in 1898. These books form a group by themselves; Münster published many others, some of them works of sheer erudite research, but most of them bearing on the main work of his life, and forming supplements or additions to it. Among the former are: "Notes sur les mosaiques d'Italie" (1874-
appointed him archivist and librarian in Modena, which position he held until his death. In 1716 Muratori became, in addition, provost of St. Maria della Pomposa, and conducted this parish with great zeal until 1733. He continued publishing unedited writings, first among which was a volume, "Anecdota graeca" (Padua, 1709). At the same time he cultivated literature, as is shown by his works, "Della perfetta poesia italiana" (Modena, 1706) and "Riflessioni sopra il buon gusto nelle scienze e nelle arti" (Venice, 1708). He even intended to establish something like a general socity of Italian literature, and as early as 1763 published for this purpose, under the pseudonym "Lamindo Pritiano", a plan "Primi disegni della republica letteraria d'Italia". In 1708 a quarrel broke out between the Holy See (aided by the emperor) and the Dukes of Este, over the possession of Comacchio, which involved the sovereignty of the district of Ferrara. M uratori supported the claims of his sovereign and of the house of Este against the pope by means of numerous historical and archaeological researches, which he later on utilized in the preparation of a great historical work, "Antichità Estensi ed Italiane" (2 vols., Modena: 1st vol., 1717; 2nd vol., 1740). He continued studying the sources for a history of Italy, and as a fruit of his untiring researches there appeared the monumental work, "Rerum italicarum Scriptores ab anno zero christianum 500 ad annum 1500". It was published in twenty-eight volumes with the assistance of the "Società Palatina" of Milan (Milan, 1723-51). A new critical edition is now (since 1900) appearing in serial form under the direction of Giuseppe Carducci and Vittorio Fiorini in "Città di Castello", J. Calligaris, J. Filippi, and C. Merkel published "Indices chronologici" (Turin, 1885) for the same. At the same time Muratori edited a collection of seventy-five essays on different historical themes, entitled "Antiquitates italicæ medii ævi" (6 vols., Milan, 1737-42), as an elucidation and supplement to his work on the sources. In the third volume of this collection there is found the Muratorian canon (q. v.) which is of the greatest importance for the history of the New Testament canon. In order to render these researches accessible to greater masses of his countrymen, he himself published a new edition of "Anecdota graeca" (3 vols., Milan, 1751). Other important publications of sources are his collections of ancient inscriptions ("Novus thesaurus veterum inscriptionum", 4 vols., Milan, 1739-42), the fourth volume containing also the ancient Christian inscriptions; and the edition of the Roman Sacramentaries ("Liturgia romana vetus" 2 vols., Venice, 1748), of value to this day. He wrote a great chronological representation of Italian history ("Annali d'Italia" 12 vols. quarto, Milan, 1744-49), based upon the numerous sources which he published or which otherwise were known. After his death this work was re-edited and continued (Milan, 1753-56 in 17 vols.; new edition in 18 vols., 1815-21).

The great mind of this learned man was not limited to the wide province of history; he was also interested in religious questions and he published...
a work, which attracted considerable attention, on the question as to how far freedom of thinking might go 'in religious matters.' De inquisitorum moderatione in religionis negotiis' (Paris, 1714). Many of his views and opinions were openly challenged; for instance those concerning the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin and the manner of worshiping the saints. Another work, which touches upon religious questions, 'Della regolare divisione de' Cristiani' (Venice, 1723), also called out (Mazzella, 1723). He still continued his literary activities, as is shown by his works on Petrarch ('Vita e rime di F. Petrarca.' Modena, 1711) and Castelvetro ('Vita ed opere di L. Castelvetro,' Milan, 1727). On philosophy he wrote, 'Filosofia morale esposta' (Venice, 1735), 'Delle forze dell'intendimento umano' (Venice, 1733); and 'Della vita' (Venice, 1745). Law and politics are treated in 'Governo della Peste politico, medico ed eclesiastico' (Modena, 1714; frequently reprinted), 'Defetti della Giurisprudenza' (1741), 'Della pubblica felicità' (1749). Muratori really proved himself to be a universal genius of rare calibre, at home in all fields. As a churchman and statesman he showed equal ability as a literary man; he was zealous in the ministry, charitable to the poor, and diligent in visiting the abandoned and imprisoned. He corresponded with a large circle of acquaintances. A collection of his letters by Selmi appeared in Venice (2 vols., 1789); another by Ceruti in Modena (1885). A complete collection has been published by M. Campari ('Epistolario di L. A. Muratori,' Modena, 1901 sq.). In spite of many attacks which he had to suffer for his religious views, and notwithstanding many of his opinions regarding ecclesiastical politics were not approved of in Rome, he was highly esteemed in the most exalted ecclesiastical circles, as is shown in the letter which Benedict XIV., on 15 Sept., 1748, wrote to him with the intention of easing his troubled mind. Cardinal Ganganelli, later on Clement XIV, also sent him a letter in 1748, in which he assured him of his highest esteem and respect.

Muratori, Vite della vita dei L. A. Muratori (Venice, 1750); 8th ed. (1770); I. A. Muratori (Modena, 1818); I. A. Muratori in Annali d'Italia, I (Milan, 1818); R. Bonn, Historiographia italica, IV (1840), 19-391; Historische-politische Blätter (1874), 353, 524; Gay, L. A. Muratori, padre della storia italiana (Asti, 1885).

J. P. Kirsch.

Muratorian Canon, of Muratorian Fragment, after the name of the discoverer and first editor, L. A. Muratori (in the 'Antiquitates italicae,' III, Milan, 1740, 551 sq.), the oldest known canon or list of books of the New Testament. The MS. containing the canon originally belonged to Bobbio and is now in the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana at Milan (Cod. J 101 sup.). Written in the eighth century, it plainly shows the uncultured Latin of that time. The fragment is of the highest importance for the history of the Biblical canon. It was written in Rome itself or in its environs about 180-200; probably the original was in Greek, from which it was translated into Latin. This Latin text is preserved solely in the MS. of the Ambrosiana. A few sentences of the Muratorian Canon are preserved in some other MSS., especially in codices of the eighth and ninth centuries in Munich, Venice, and other libraries; no mere list of the Scriptures, but of a survey, which supplies at the same time historical and other information regarding each book. The beginning is missing; the preserved text begins with the last line concerning the second Gospel and the notices, preserved entire, concerning the third and fourth Gospel. Then there are mentioned: The Acts, St. Paul's Epistles (including those to the Galatians and the Hebrews); the two Epistles to the Laodiceans and Alexander; the Apocalypse; the Epistles of St. Jude and two Epistles of St. John; among the Scriptures which "in catholica habentur" are cited the "Sapietia ab amicis Solomonis in bonorum ipsius scriptus", as well as the Apocalypses of St. John and St. Peter, but with the reason that some will not allow the latter to be read in the church. Then mention is made of the Pastor of Hermas, which may be read anywhere but not in the divine service; and, finally, there are rejected false Scriptures, which were used by heretics. In consequence of the barbarous Latin there is no complete understanding of the corrigendum of the sentence. The author, many conjectures were made (Papias, Hippolytus, Caius of Rome, Hippolytus of Rome, Rhodon, Melito of Sardis were proposed); but no well founded hypothesis has been adduced up to the present. The Muratorian Canon was newly edited by Tregelles, 'Canon Muratorianus' (Oxford, 1867); Westcott, "A general survey of the history of the canon" (6th ed., 1889); Buchanan, in "Journal of Theol. Stud." VIII (1907), 540-42; Harack in "Zeitschr.f. Kirchengesch.," III, 595-99; Prefeuchten in "Analecta, kürzere Texte zur Geschichte der alten Kirche und des Kanons"(2nd ed., Tübingen, 1910), 27-35; Rauschen, "Florilegium patristicum," I (Bonn, 1903). The value of the Canon as a historical source is very great, and it was employed by J. K S. Kuen, Das Muratorische Fragment (1892); Chapman in "Revue Benedictine" (1904), 240 sq., 359 sq.; Robinson, "The Authorship of the Muratorian Canon in The Expositor, 1 (1890), 401 sq.; Harnack, II (1906), 210 sq.

J. P. Kirsch.

Mureta. See Cartagena, Diocese of.

Murer. See Homicide.

Muret, Marc-Antoine, French humanist, b. at Muret, near Limoges, in 1526; d. at Rome, in 1585. He studied at Poiets and was greatly influenced by Scaliger, whom he twice visited at Agen. He taught successively at Poiets (1546), Bordeaux (1547), and Paris. Becoming intimate with Doria, Joseph du Bellay, and the poets of the Pleiad, he published in French a commentary on the "Amours" of Ronsard (1553) and a collection of Latin verses, the "Juvenilia." His prosperity seemed unclouded, when accusations of heresy and immorality drove him from Paris to Toulouse, and thence to Lombardy. At last he settled at Venice, where he taught for four years (1555-58).

To the Venetian period of Muret's life belong his editions for Paulus Manitius, of Horace, Terence (1555), Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (1558), to which must be added the three orations "De studiis litterarum" (1555). It was at Venice that he became connected with Laminus. In 1558 Muret published the first eight books of his "Variae lectiones", which occasioned Laminus to accuse him of plagiarism and brought their friendship to an end. With the year 1559 began the insecure period of Muret's life, when he devoted himself to private tuition. He next entered the service of Ippolito d'Este, Cardinal of Ferrara, in whose suite he went to Paris, and thence to Rome, where he spent the remainder of his life (1563-85) expounding Aristotle, Cicero, Plato, Juvenal, and Tacitus, and teaching jurisprudence. In 1572 he received Holy orders.

Muret's editions of Latin authors and translations of Plato and Aristotle, while they hardly entitled him to a place with the Humanists, show a good taste, acumen, and care. As a stylist, he was long esteemed one of the modern masters of Latin. He succeeded in imitating Cicero rather by a felicitous resemblance between his own temperament and that of his model than by any painfully laborious
search for Ciceronian locutions, and he felt compelled to protest against the exaggerations of contemporary Ciceronians. He himself tells of an amusing incident, when he purposely employed, in speaking Latin, a word not to be found in Nisichius's Ciceronian Lexicon: some of his hearers exclaimed in horror at the apparent slip, and then, when he showed them the word in question on the first leaf of that same lexicon, they explained that the scholars were actually in their plaudits. His most interesting work, "Variae lectiones" (1559, 1580, 1585), contains not only observations on ancient authors, but notes of real value in relation to the history of his own times. Such, for instance, is his account of a conversation with his patron, the Cardinal of Ferrara, about St. Peter's. His election had put an end to the cardinal's ambitions (XVI, 4). Muret's works were edited by Ruhnken (Leyden, 4 vols., 1789), and another edition appeared at Verona (5 vols., 1727-30). Besides the editions of authors above mentioned, we are indebted to him for Cicero's Catalan Orations (Paris, 1581), the first book of his Tuscanian Disputations, his "Philosophies" (Paris, 1592), Seneca's "De providentia", and some notes on Sallust and Tacitus.

Franois, Marc-Antoine Muret (Paris, 1581); Sandys, A History of Classical Scholarship, II (Cambridge, 1903), 148.

Paul Lejay.

**Muri (Muri-Gries),** an abbey of monks of the Order of St. Benedict, which flourished for over eight centuries at Muri near Basle in Switzerland, and which is the subject of a work published under Austrian rule at Gries near Bozen in Tyrol.

The monastery of St. Martin at Muri in the Canton of Aargau, in the Diocese of Basle (but originally in that of Constance), was founded in 1027 by the illustrious house of Hapsburg. Rha, a daughter of Frederick the Great, who was the lord of Hapsburg, and Werner, Bishop of Strasburg, with one accord gave the lands, which each possessed, to a monastery which they established in that place. To people the new foundation a colony of monks was drawn from the Abbey of St. Meinrad at Einsiedeln, under the leadership of Prior Regimbold, on whose death in 1055 the first abbot was chosen in the person of Burwald. During his rule the abbey church was consecrated in 1064; it was for many years the burial place of the Hapsburg dynasty. About this time the community was reinforced by the accession of a new colony of monks from the Abbey of St. Blaise in the Black Forest, one of whom, the blessed Ludger of Gries, was the eloquent and enthusiastic apostle of the Gospel to the Savoyards till his holy death 31 December, 1066.

During the Middle Ages the monastery, like so many hundreds of similar institutions of the Benedictine Order, pursued its quiet work of religion and civilisation, and enjoyed the advantage of being governed by a remarkable succession of able men. Among the names of its most distinguished abbots are those of Rachelin; Cuno, founder of its school, and a generous benefactor to the library of the monastery; Henry Scheuk who greatly increased its landed property; and Henry de Schoenwerd. The history of the last named presents a curious instance, almost without parallel, of a whole family embracing the religious life. The father with his sons entered the abbey of the monks, whilst his wife and daughters betook themselves to the adjoining convent of nuns, a community which later on was transferred to Hermetschwil, a mile or two distant from Muri. The good reputation enjoyed by the Abbey of Muri procured it many friends. In 1114 the Emperor Henry V took it under his special protection; and the pope on the whole was glad to attach it to his See for its welfare; it would seem, however, that the use of pontificalia was not granted to the abbeys of Muri until the time of Pope Julius II (1503-1513).

Like all other institutions the place had its vicissitudes of good and bad fortune. It was laid low by two disastrous configurations, in 1300 and in 1383; wars and risings checked for a time its prosperity. It recovered somewhat of its old life under Abbot Conrad II, only to suffer again under his successor George Russinger in the war between Austria and Switzerland. Russinger had taken part in the Council of Constance and had caught something of the reforming spirit of that assembly, and in the meantime he was aggregating his community to the newly formed Confraternity of Bursfeld, the first serious attempt to bring about among the continental monasteries of northern Europe a sane and much needed reform of the Black Monks of St. Benedict. It was owing to him too that the Helvetic Confederation took over, as it were, the duties of an Hapsburg friars. The abbeys of Muri, being among those by which, it strengthened both in its inner life and observation, and safe under the protection of the new political powers, was enabled to withstand the shock of the religious wars and ecclesiastical upheavals which marked the advent of the Protestant Reformation. When the first fury of that movement had abated Muri was fortunate in having a man of remarkable ability. Dom John Jodoc Singesin elected in 1596 proved himself a second founder of his monastery, and extending his care to the other Benedictine houses of Switzerland is rightly revered as one of the founders of the Swiss Congregation established in 1602. Largely through his efforts discipline was maintained, where reprobate monks had recently walked forth from Muri to ravage the half ruined cloisters; by his wisdom suitable constitutions were drawn up for such communities of nuns as had survived so many revolutions. His successor Dom Dominick Thuchdi was a man of like mould and a scholar whose works were held in great repute. He was born at Basle and died there in 1662. His "Opus, generale edificio, comitia de Hasburg" is his best known work.

With the eighteenth century fresh hopes came to Muri. The Emperor Leopold I created Abbot Placid Zurlauben and his successors Princes of the Holy Roman Empire, and spent a vast sum of money in rebuilding and embellishing the monastery and church, the ancient mausoleum of the imperial family. The abbey continued to flourish and was a great and at times a most reverend house. The order of the Passion of Christ and the Confessio of the monks, who held together and were soon a force to be reckoned with, invited them to undertake the management of the cantonal college at Sarnen. The kindly offer was accepted, and there the main body of the monks resided, the Lord Abbot himself taking his share in the school work. In 1838, until the Austrian Emperor, Ferdinand I, offered them a residence of their own, they moved to an old priory of Augustinian Canons of the Lateran which had been unoccupied since 1807. The Holy See concurred in the grant, and confirmed the transfer of the community of Muri to Gries by a Brief of Gregory XVI, dated 16 September, 1844.

In order
to avoid complications the house of Gries was continued in its former status as a priory and incorporated with the Swiss Abbey of Muri, which is regarded as temporarily located in its Austrian dependency, the Abbey of Muri being at the same time Prior of Gries.

The persecution which drove the community from its state at home to Muri seems in no way to have lessened the numbers and good works of the monks; indeed there has been an notable increase in the personnel of the convent in recent years and fresh demands are ever being made on their manifold activities. At Gries itself, the centre of this fraternity of nearly a hundred monks (over seventy priests and clerics, the rest who constitute the monastic family of St. Martin of Muri, the monks conduct a college of 158 boys, and also a training college for schoolmasters attended by nearly sixty students; while at Sarnen in Switzerland their college educates about two hundred and forty boys, and at the technical school in the same place, carried on by the monks, the classes number usually between seventy and eighty scholars. The Abbey of Muri has under its care live "incorporated" parishes with two chapels of ease serving for the spiritual needs of about nine thousand souls; another parish, not incorporated with the abbey, ministers to about 418 people; and the oversight of the convent long established at Hermetschwil-Ilbatal near Muri is also included in the work of the monks of Muri-Gries.

**John Gilbert Dolan.**

**Murillo, Bartolomé Esteban, Spanish painter:** b. at Seville, 31 December, 1617; d. there 5 April, 1682. His family surname was Esteban; that of Murillo, which he assumed in accordance with an Andalusian custom, was his mother's. His father was an artisan. An orphan at the age of ten, Bartolomé was brought up by his uncle, J. A. Lagares, a barber. He became the pupil, probably while still very young, of Juan del Castillo, a mediocre painter, but good teacher, whose atelier was at that time much frequented. It is said that, to gain a living, the young man in those days made argus—cheap paintings on rough canvas sold at country fairs (fairs), and shipped to America by traders. The Museum of Cadiz claims, but without proof, that one of these Murillos is painted by him in 1641. Velasquez, Bartolomé's painter and the friend of Olivares, was himself a native of Seville; he welcomed his young compatriot and gave him the entree to all the royal galleries, where Murillo saw the masterpieces of Titian, Veronese, Tintoretto, and Rubens, not to mention Velasquez himself. He spent three years here, and this was all his travel. He returned to Seville in 1644, to live in Cadiz in 1661, but once, in 1661, when he went to Cadiz to paint an altar for the Capuchins which he never had the time to finish. A full from his sedentary or else a serious illness—accounts differ—forced him to let himself be taken back, hurriedly, to Seville, where he died after a brief period of suffering.

This period of a very pure life, and perfectly happy, is spent within that one Sevillian horizon which the artist never wished to change for any other. His paintings in the porteria of the Minims made a celebrity of him at the age of twenty-eight (1646). From that time he devoted himself to work on a large scale for the convents of his native Seville, work which, in some respects, recalls the Giottesque paintings of the fourteenth century. In contrast with Velasquez and the Madrid school, Murillo is wholly a religious painter. With the exception of a few portraits and some genre pieces, not one profane picture of his is known to exist. The product of his life's work is summed up in the great cycles of the Franciscan (1670-74), of the Caridad Hospital (1670-74), of the Capuchins (1676), of the Venerables Sacerdotes (1678), of the Augustinians (1680), and, lastly, of the Cadiz Capuchins, together with a large number of pictures made at different times for the cathedral of Seville or other churches and many devotional works for private individuals. Murillo was the local painter of a country where all sentiment was still merged in the one sentiment of religion. The critics have distinguished three periods, or manners, in his work: the cold, the hot, and the "vaporous". The classification is foolish and pedantic. It is enough to look at his "Angels' Kitchen" (1646), his "Birth of the Virgin" (1655), and his "Holy Family" (1670), all in the Louvre. Here we can see nothing but the natural evolution of a talent which from first to last pursued but one ideal—the poetical transfiguration of facts and ideas.

This ideal is already fully perceivable in the first of the examples cited, or in the "Death of St. Clare" (Dresden Museum), which also belongs to the porteria series. In the "Angels' Kitchen", as in many others of his paintings, the artist's problem is to combine the supernatural with the real and familiar. Here we have a holy Franciscan in ecstasy, lifted from the ground, while angels with shining wings attend to the service of the rectorcy and wash the pans; and lastly, some spectators are peeping through a half-open door. The whole scene is cast into a field of light, displayed with admirable clearness, without a suggestion of hiatus between the three parts which are so diverse in character.

From this period date those few genre paintings which may be regarded as exceptional works of Murillo, the most famous example being the "Pouillox" of the Louvre. Like every great Spanish painter, Murillo is a realist, and goes as far as any other in the pathetic painting of suffering. But he refuses to paint those horrors with the frightful didtantism, the cold, cruel detachment, of other Spanish artists. For him, pain and misery are objects of pity, not of curiosity or pleasure. Alone of the great painters of his race, his genius is tender, compassionate. Murillo's work is always exact and sound, is never altogether impersonal or objective. In spite of himself, he communicates, together with the record of the reality, the emotions which it produces in himself; he does not alter its form, but he adds to it something of his own. In Spain, the classic land of brutal observation, of the "shore taken from life" served up raw and bleeding, Murillo invents, combines, achieves compositions. He has an imagination, and he does not make a point of honour of ignoring it. With more than average gifts for portraiture—as witness his portrait of Padre Cabanillas, at Madrid, or the admirable figure in the Museum of the Hispanic Society in New York—he made very few portraits. On the other hand, he has the gift and the instinct for story-telling. The Italian...
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sense of fine arrangement, of a happy symmetry and harmonious balance of grouping, as in his Holy Family with two Beggars, a painting upon which he alone seems to have possessed in his age.

Murrillo was a great painter of sentiment. Like Rembrandt, he understood that the true language of the Gospel was the language of the people. Like him, he especially delighted in the merciful and tender aspects of the Gospel. Nothing can be more touching than the 'Piedad,' the sorrow of the Hercules; not even Rembrandt's treatment of that subject—or his sketches on the same parable in the Prado. Like Rembrandt, he loves to bring the sacred truths near to us, to make us see them as intimate and familiar realities, to show us the Divine all about us in our lives. Murrillo, no doubt, has the defects of these qualities. But he is unerring in his power of expressing himself. His Homilies, his sermons, reflect the solemn seriousness of the painting. In his 'Apostles,' his grace, lack the seriousness that trials should have imparted. His serene smile lacks that intangible quality of having been through sorrow. Failing this experience, the soul tends somewhat to levity and to preciosity. This pre-eminence as, superlatively, the painter of the Immaculate Conception seems to have been overshadowed in the circumstances of his birth. At Seville, in 1617, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was solemnly promulgated for Spain; and this splendid celebration took place in Murillo's native city only a few months before his birth. The pictorial treatment of the Assumption has its main outlines, by a vision said to have been vouchsafed to a Franciscan of the sixteenth century, and a hundred examples of it are found among earlier painters. The mere theological dogma of the Immaculate Conception — exemption from the original sin—necessarily eluded all material representation; the effects of its influence are seen in the mystic visions. The body is seen exempt from all the laws of gravitation. Murrillo has treated this theme more than twenty times, without repeating himself or ever wearying: six versions at Madrid, six others at Seville; the famous Louvre picture (dated 1678), and still others scattered over Europe—all these did not exhaust the painter's enthusiasm or his power of expressing apothecary.

It is a remarkable fact that these pictures, which represent the most transcendentally spiritual action, are the most thoroughly feminine paintings in Spain. But for religious representations of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, indeed, woman is almost absent from Spanish painting. When we select from the romantic women, the infantas or meninas of Velasquez, retain nothing of feminine charm: they are simulacra and phantoms without verisimilitude. Side by side with these apparitions, Murillo's Virgins produce a comforting effect of relief. Here are women, true and vital, with the most thoroughly external charms of their sex. In them the impulse of love rises to ecstasy, and without Murillo Spanish painting would be deprived of its most beautiful love poems. Many persons, it is true, see in this style of painting the symptoms of decadence in Spanish religious sentiment. This question of the soundness or unsoundness of his devotional tendencies cannot be treated here, but it may at least be claimed for Murillo that his art—notably in these Immaculate Conceptions—is no less genuinely religious than the dry productions of, say, a Philippe de Champaigne.

PALOMINO, Noticias, Pintores y Vidas de los Pintores (Madrid, 1716-24); CENAR BECOURT, Dictionnaire historique des maitres peintres et sculpteurs dans le royaume de France, 3 vol. (Paris, 1837); PASSAYANT, Die christliche Kunst in Spanien (Leipzig, 1863); TURINO, Murillo, sua opere poetiche (Seville, 1864); CURTIS, Velasquez and Murillo (London, 1883); JUSTI, Murillo (Leipzig, 1882); KNACKEFUS, Murillo (Leipzig, 1887); CALVARY, Murillo (London, 1889).

LOUIS GILLET.

Murner, Thomas, greatest German satirist of the sixteenth century, b. at Oberheinheim, Alsace, 24 Dec., 1475; d. there, 1537. During the epoch immediately preceding and during the early years of the Reformation, these three figures are among the most prominent among the loyal champions of the Church in Germany, namely Johann Geiler von Kaysersberg, his friend Sebastian, the well-known satirist, and Thomas Murner, the ablest and most formidable of Luther's opponents. In 1481 Murner's parents, pious people in comfortable circumstances, settled in Strasbourg, where his father, practised as an advocate. Thomas, who was of delicate health, entered the Franciscan Order at the age of sixteen. After his ordination, he began his restless and unsettled life, visiting the most celebrated universities either as a student or as a teacher. He studied theology at Paris, philosophy and mathematics at Cracow, and law at Freiburg, where he obtained his degree of Bachelor of Theology in 1500. Six years later, when again at Freiburg, he was made Doctor of Theology. In 1518 he graduated Doctor of Laws at Basle. His impulse towards a roving life was due, not only to his love of learning, but also to his mission as a preacher and his zeal for the interests of his order. From 1519 he took part in the controversies which began with the appearance of Luther as a reformer. In 1523 he went to England and was cordially received by Henry VIII, whose book on the sacraments he had translated into German the previous year. On his return to Strasburg, he found himself compelled to fly before the rebellious peasants and seek refuge at Luzerne. Here he became the intimate friend of Zwingli. Together with Dr. Eck, he took part in the religious discussion at Baden in 1528. When Zwingli was taken in the first War of Kappel (1529), Murner was to have been given up. He managed, however, to escape, and, after many wanderings, was appointed pastor in his birth-place, where he spent the rest of his days.

As an author, Murner was at first an enthusiastic friend of Humanism. In Cracow he lectured on literature and aesthetics, and in Freiburg on Vergil, whose 'Enide' he had translated. In token of gratitude for his appointment as poet-laureate in 1505, he dedicated this translation to Emperor Maximilian. In his 'Ludus studentum Friburgensium' (1511), Murner explains the rules of prosody and quantity after the fashion of a game of chess and backgammon. This method he had already employed four years before in Cracow in his 'Chartiludum logicae', but his application of it to jurisprudence provoked the derision of the lawyers. His sympathy with Humanism did not save him from the censure of his superiors when he attacked Wimpeling's 'Germania', which aimed at proving that Alsace had never belonged to France. Murner's defence of his position, the 'Germania nova', was suppressed by the Strasbourg authorities: a further attempt at justifying himself against the attacks of the partisans of Wimpeling also proved unsuccessful, and did not prevent his opponents from distorting his name into Murnar (growing fool).

Even, in this early controversy, Murner had shown a sharp eye for his opponents' weaknesses, and a marked gift for exposing them to ridicule: in his subsequent writings, he is revealed as a master of satire. Just as Geiler illustrated his popular sermons with comparisons drawn from everyday life, Murner compares, in his "Andächtige geistliche Badefahrt" (1511), the forgiveness of sins to a hydropathic treatment. In "Narrenschöpfung" and "Schelmenzunft" he deals with the same subject as Brant's "Narrenschiff", but his work is entirely original in treatment and far surpasses the earlier work in its popular appeal, its wit, and its infinite wisdom-degenerate as it is in theological soundness. His subsequent satires, "Gäuchmann" ('Fools' Meadow) and "Die Mühle von Schwindelach und Gretmüllerin Jahrzeit", in which he severely criticizes a special kind of fools, the "fools of love", form a kind of sequel to the "Schelmenzunft". There is no
station, either clerical or lay, that is spared from his castigation.

The appearance of Luther diverted Murner's satire into a new course. Regarding the Wittenberg monk at first as a well-intentioned ally in the battle against the evils afflicting the Church, Murner addressed to him in 1520 an appeal entitled "Christliche und brüderliche Ermahnung an den hochgelehrten Doctor Martin Luther", which was followed soon after by other pamphlets refuting and warning him and beseeching him to abandon his ruinous undertaking. In his "Neues Lied vom Untergang des christlichen Glaubens" (1521), Murner gives feeling expression to his sorrow over the destructive tendencies of the religious innovation. But, when the sole effect of his attempts at conciliation was to bring upon him a shower of death threats and pamphlets, Murner dealt Luther a crushing blow in his work, "Von dem grossen Lutherischen Narren wie ihn Doctor Murner beschworhen hat". Here Murner rises to heights of satire elsewhere unattained during this whole epoch. All the reformatory endeavours are embodied in the "Great Fool", and the newly-founded Church with its "Great Fool" as its chief is depicted in a more sinister light than Murner's daughter Adelheid, who "has a shocking scald-head." Murner wrote many other satires against the reformers, but none which in energy and wit equals this work. This work, so full of fight and honest zeal for the old Faith, was subjected to much calumnry and derision during his lifetime, but was never vanquished in print or in pamphlets. Later generations did him justice. Lessing intended to write a "defence" of Murner, and literary historiographers (especially Kurtz, Vilmar, and Godeke) have recognized his great importance in the history of literature. Critics have pointed out in his works a peculiar and original metrical and rhythmical system which distinguished him from all poets of his time. His "Great Fool" had in it something peculiar, something degenerate. As the only Catholic writings of Jansen-Pastor, Gesch. des deutschen Volkes, VI (15th ed., 1901): SALEER, Illustrate Gesch. der deutschen Litt. (in course of publication), pp. 525-24.

N. SCHEID.

MURO-LUCANO, DIOCESE OF (MURANENESIS), in the province of Potenza, in Basilicata, southern Italy. The town is situated on the site of the ancient Numistri, at the foot of the Apennines, the scene of a battle between Hannibal and Marcellus in the second Punic war. The town has a beautiful cathedral; and it was in its castle that Queen Joan of Naples was killed by order of her adopted son, Charles of Durazzo. The first Bishop of Muro of whom there is mention was Leo (1049). His bishop Antonio (1376) became a partisan of the antipope Clement VII; he was therefore driven by Carlo di Durazzo to seek refuge at Polson, whereupon Clement VII suppressed the Diocese of Muro. In 1418, however, Guiduccio de Forta was appointed to a vacant diocesan see, and learned the cardinals as well as in canon law; among his successors were Flavio Orsini (1560), who became a cardinal; the poet Gian Carlo Coppola (1643), who later became Bishop of Gallipoli, his native town; Alfonso Pacello (1674), founder of a congregation of priests for the care of the sick of the diocese. The see is suffragan of Conza; it has 12 parishes with 40,290 inhabitants, 100 secular priests, 2 religious houses of women, and an educational establishment for girls.

CAPPELLUTI, La Chiesa d'Italia, XX (Venice, 1857).

U. BENIGNI.

MURRAY, DANIEL, Archbishop of Dublin, b. 1768, at Sheephawk, near Arklow, Ireland; d. 1852 at Dublin. He was educated at Dr. Betagh's school in Dublin and at Salamanca and ordained priest in 1790. After some years as curate in Dublin he was transferred to Arklow, and was there in 1798 when the rebellion broke out. The soldiers shot the parish priest in bed, and Murray, to escape a similar fate, fled to the city, where for several years after he ministered as curate. In 1809 at the request of Archbishop Troy he was appointed coadjutor-bishop, and in 1813, on Dr. Troy's death, he became Archbishop of Dublin. While coadjutor he filled for one year the position of president of Maynooth College. Dr. Murray was an uncompromising opponent of the "veto" and a strong supporter of the Catholic Association. On other questions he was less advanced, and was in such favor at Dublin Castle that he was placed on the Privy Council, which he declined. He supported Stanley's National Education scheme and was among the first Education Commissioners; he also wished to tolerate the Queen's Colleges, in opposition to the views of Archbishop MacHale. He had no hesitation, however, in accepting the adverse decision of Rome, and was present at the Synod of Thures where the Queen's Colleges were formally condemned. He was a charitable, kindly man, respected even by his opponents.

D'ALTON, Archbishops of Dublin (Dublin, 1838); HEALY, Conciliatory Council of Maynooth. Life of Archbishop Murray (Dublin, 1853); FITZPATRICK, Life of Dr. Doyle (Dublin, 1880); O'REILLY, Life of Archbishop MacHale (New York, 1860).

E. A. D'ALTON.

MURRAY, JAMES D. See COOKTOWN, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.

MURRAY, PATRICK, theologian, b. in Clones, County Monaghan, Ireland, 18 November, 1811; d. 15 Nov., 1852, in Maynooth College. He received his early education at Clones, and was sent to Maynooth College 25 August, 1829, the year of Catholic emancipation, among the first class of emancipated entrants, went through the ordinary course with great distinction and was elected a Dunboyne, or senior student in June, 1835. Towards the end of the Dunboyne course he accepted a curacy in Francis Street, Dublin, where in a short time he acquired the reputation of a zealous worker and an eloquent preacher. He was appointed professor of English and French in Maynooth, on 7 Sept., 1838, after the usual concursus, or examination, and after three years in this position he was appointed professor of theology, and another brilliant concursus, on 27 August, 1841. The remainder of his life was devoted to theological science. In 1879 he was appointed prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, which position he retained until his death in 1882. His principal works are: "Essays, Chiefly Theological" (4 vols., Dublin, 1850-53); "De Ecclesia Christi" (5 vols., Dublin, 1856-57); "De Ecclesiae Christianae compendium" (Dublin, 1874); "De Gratia" (Dublin, 1877); "De Veneratione et Invocazione Sacerdotii", etc.; "De Impedimentis Matrimonii Dirimentibus" (Dublin, 1881); "Prose and Verse" (Dublin, 1867); "Lectures (on Moore's poetry) before Cork Young Men's Society" (Cork, 1856).

Dr. Murray was a man of high intellectual power, of big projects, and of great activity and perseverance. He would certainly have risen to great eminence in the world of literature, had he remained professor of English, as he was possessed of literary and poetical gifts of a high order. But he chose the domain of theology. He wrote for the Dublin Review and for magazines. In 1850 he undertook the intention of publishing a series of volumes on subjects chiefly theological, to supply the Catholic laity with exact and reliable information on the debated religious questions of the day. He published four volumes under the title: "Essays, Chiefly Theological". But though he intended at the beginning to extend the work to seven or
MUSEUMS

eight volumes, he discontinued the Essays after the fourth volume, to devote himself to the great work of his life, his "De Ecclesiae Christi". This work involved immense labour. It is a work of great learning, a masterpiece in positive and controversial theology, which at one time saved the Church from the ascendancy of dogmatic theologians. While not neglecting the views of the continental reformers, the author made a special study of the works of all the leading Anglican divines; and hence his work became the standard authority for the exposition and refutation of the then-current Anglican views about the Church. Though written in 1800, ten years before the Vatican definition, the author with great power establishes the doctrine of papal infallibility. The treatise, "De Gratia", excellent in itself, was intended as a textbook for students; as was also the less perfect work, "De Veneratione et Invocatione Sanctorum". Dr. Murray was ever kind and considerate for his students, by whom he was always respected and loved. He was of a retiring disposition, of a deeply religious nature, and of great saintliness of life.

HEALY, Maynooth College; Its Centenary History, 1796–1885 (Dublin, 1885). DANIEL COGHLAN.

Museums, Christian.—Though applicable to collections composed of Christian objects representative of the Middle Ages, archaeologists use the term for museums which abound chiefly in Christian objects antedating the Middle Ages, namely, sarcophagi, inscriptions and products of the minor arts. These objects, as also those peculiar to the Middle Ages, are found in a large number of museums, but not many of these institutions are exclusively or even primarily devoted to the study of pre-reformation Christian objects. The first collections that were formed (by humanists, by the Medici in Florence, etc.) occasionally included the earlier types or works of medieval art, but more on account of their artistic merit than because of their character. Collections of inscriptions had been made from the time of the Renaissance, but Christian inscriptions found no place among them. It was not until after the discovery of the Roman catacombs by Antonio Bosio that these inscriptions were visited by collectors from Rome and other cities. The first Christian museum, properly so called, was that of the Vatican, and its origin dates from Benedict XIV, who founded it under the name of "Museum Christianum". Thanks to Marchi and De Rossi, the collections were taken over and form the Lateran Museum, founded by a decree of Pius IX in 1854. For Christian antiquities no other museums equal the latter in point of importance. During the pontificate of Benedict XIV (1740–60) a taste for Christian antiquities was developed by other distinguished men, e.g., Cardinal Pasquini and Cardinal Quirini, Borgia and Carafa, whose diligent searches were prolific of important results.

Italy is particularly rich in valuable collections of antique Christian relics. In Rome, besides the Christian Museums of the Vatican and the Lateran, the Museo Kircheriano and the San Paolo, Propaganda, and Campo Santo collections are all noteworthy. The atrium of the main churches, e.g., St. Mark, Santa Maria in Trastevere, and St. Agnes, also the Grotte Vaticane, have Christian inscriptions or sculptures, and collections of inscriptions have been made in the vicinity of several Roman catacombs, e.g., St. Domitilla and St. Agnes; mention should be made also of private collections. Moreover, almost all the large museums of Italy and the treasuries of some churches have objects belonging to the early Christians, e.g., the Museum and Library of Brescia and those of the Uffizi at Florence, the municipal Museum of Florence, the Trivulzi collection, the treasuries of the cathedrals of Milan and Monza, the Museo Nazionale al Palermo, the Museum of the Villa Cassia at Syracuse, etc. Outside of Italy, important collections of Christian antiquities are less numerous, although those of Cairo, Alexandria, Athens, of St. Louis of Carthage (the Lavigerie Museum), of Arles, Autun, Trier, etc., deserve mention. The museums of the great capitals, London, Paris, Berlin, where the treasures of some churches, e.g., the cathedral of Sens, have ivories and various works of art dating from the early Christian epoch. Such works, chiefly of Coptic origin, and very ancient, have lately been introduced into many collections.

Church treasuries, especially the richer ones of some German churches (cathedrals of Cologne, Trier, Hildesheim, Bamburg and the abbatial church of Eisen, etc.), are noted for their reliquaries and may pass for the oldest Christian museums.

In addition to the large museums of all countries, many museums of industrial art, provincial museums, private collections and archaeological societies, also episcopal museums, e.g., the rich ones of Cologne and Utrecht, contain many valuable and ancient Christian relics of an artistic kind. As a Christian museum of the Middle Ages, the Schnütgen collection at Cologne deserves special notice. It contains many religious objects, chalices, crosses, ecclesiastical vestments, etc., and offers a better opportunity than any other collection for studying the changing forms of these objects from age to age. A word is due to the museums that have been organized as an auxiliary to the collections of higher education. The most remarkable Christian museum of this kind is that of the University of Berlin, founded 1849–1855 by Ferdinand Piper. Although largely representative of the Middle Ages, it is unparalleled for its facsimiles of Christian antiquities. More recently M. G. Millet founded at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, in Paris, a special museum, rich in copies and stereotypes gathered during the explorations and study tours made by French scholars. (See LATERAN, CHRISTIAN MUSEUM OF; VATICAN.)

RAUMANN, Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie (Paderborn, 1905), 67 ff.; DACRE, Manuel d’Archéologie chrétienne (Paris, 1897), I, 429; KRUS, Realschulzyklus (Freiburg, 1888), s. v. Topographie; FORREN AND FISCHER, Adresbuch der Museen, Bibliotheken, Sammler und Antiquare (Strasburg, 1889).

R. MAERE.

Mush, an Armenian Catholic see, comprising the sanjak of Mush and Seert, in the vilayet of Bitlis. It was created by Leo XIII in 1883, and numbers about 5000 faithful, 7 secular priests, 7 churches or chapels, 5 schools, and an establishment of the Venetian Mechitarists. The chief stations outside of Mush are some neighbouring villages such as Bitlis or Tarsus. The town is built on a hill at the foot of a ruined citadel and in the midst of vineyards; below stretches a well-cultivated plain, about fifty miles long by eighteen miles wide. The climate is healthy and the country tolerably rich, but exposed to constant invasions of the Kurds and other nomads, who terrorize the inhabitants, especially the Christians. Burned by an Armenian party in 1909, the town of Mush has about 27,000 inhabitants, of whom 3,000 are Armenian Catholics, 10,000 Armenian schismatics, and 700 Protestants, the rest being Musulmans. Besides the Catholic bishop there is an Armenian Gregorian bishop; also a Protestant missionary. The celebrated Moses of Shoren was born in the neighbouring village of Choren Mixed. (See VAILLÉE, La Turquie d'Asie (Paris, 1851–1854), 571–72; MISSIONES CATHOLICAE (Rome, 1907), 757.)

S. VAILLÉE.

Mush (alias Ratcliffe). JOHN, priest, b. in Yorkshire, 1551 or 1552; d. at Wenge, Co. Bucks, 1612 or 1613, not as Bishop Challoner thought, in 1617. Having spent six months in the English College at Douai he went to Rome (1576) where he studied for seven years. Ordained priest, he returned to England (1583) and laboured at York, being confessed...
to Venerable Margaret Clitherow who suffered for harbouring him, and Venerable Francis Ingeley. Arrested 28 Oct., 1588, and condemned to die, he escaped with the help of a servant. For his part in the North becoming a recognized leader among his brother priests. When the dissensions among the imprisoned priests at Wisbech broke out in 1595, he with Dr. Dudley went there to arbitrate. Failing in this, together with John Colleton he set himself to devise some organization of a voluntary character among the clergy which might supply the want of episcopal government much felt after the death of Cardinal Allen in 1594. Opposed by Persons, it was rendered superfuous by the appointment of an archpriest (1599). In the ensuing controversy Musch was one of the appellant clergy who appealed to Rome against the archpriest. In connexion with this he wrote "Declaratio Motu" in 1602, with Champney Bluct and Cecil, went as a deputation to Rome where for eight months they fought for their petition. Their petition, first for six bishops and then for six archpriests, was refused; but though the archpriest succeeded in maintaining his position, the appellants were acquitted of the charges of rebellion and schism. One of the leaders in the early religious revival in England, Musch of the group of fifteen priests who signed the protestation of allegiance to Queen Elizabeth (1603). In his later years he acted as assistant to two successive archpriests, Blackwell and Birkhead, in Yorkshire, but he seems to have been acting as chaplain to Lady Dormer in Buckinghamshire at the time of his death. He is remembered as one of "The Sixty One Lamentations" and as editor of "Songs of Virtue" (1629). Mentioned in Ex., xv, and in Judges, v. Often the prophets are elated by sacred music. David beautified religious ceremonies by hymns and the use of instruments (Amos, vi, 5; 11 Esd., xii, 35; II Par., xxix, 25 sqq.). With him appears Asaph in the role of poet and singer, and the names of Asaph and other familiar names from the days of David, Elisha, and Isaiah are to be found in the Inner Temple, London. Dodd also says he wrote against the apostate priest Thomas Bell, and Pitts quotes his English translation of "Lectiones Panagotarli Turini", but these latter works are not now known to exist.


EDWIN BURTON.

Music, Ecclesiastical.—By this term is meant the music which, by order or with the approbation of ecclesiastical authority, is employed in connexion with Divine service to promote the glorification of God and the edification of the faithful.

Nature and Significance.—Just as St. Philip Neri spontaneously sang the prayers of the last Mass which he celebrated, so is all true religious music but an exalted prayer—an exultant expression of religious feeling. Prayer, song, the playing upon instruments, and action, when arranged by authority, constitute the elements of public worship, especially of an official liturgy. Thus was the case with the pagans, the Jews, and also in the Church from time immortal. These elements constitute, when combined, an organic unity, in which, however, music forms a part only on solemn occasions, and then only in accordance with the regulations of proper authority. As man owes to God that which is highest and most beautiful, music may employ on these occasions her noblest and most effective means. Church music has in common with secular music the combination of tones in melody and harmony, rhythm, tempo, dynamics, or distribution of power, tone-colour in voice and instruments, the simpler and more complicated styles of composition. All these, however, must be adapted to the liturgical action, if there be such, to the words uttered in prayer, to the devotion of the heart; they must be calculated to edify the faithful, and in short must serve the purpose for which Divine service is ordained. For assuming a character of independence and mere ornament, acts as an auxiliary to the other means of promoting the worship of God and as an incentive to good, it not only does not interfere with the religious ceremony, but, on the contrary, imparts to it the greatest splendour and effectiveness. Only those who are not responsive to its influence, or stubbornly cultivate other ways of devotion, can imagine that they are distracted in their worship by music. Appropriate music, on the contrary, raises man above commonplace everyday thoughts into an ideal and joyous mood, rivets mind and heart on the sacred words and actions, and introduces him into the proper devotional and festive atmosphere. This appropriateness takes into account persons and circumstances, variations being introduced according to the nature and use of the texts, according to the character of the liturgical action, according to the ecclesiastical season, and even according to the various needs of the contemplative orders and the rest of the faithful.

In order to honour God by means of music as well as by the other arts, and to heighten his religious exaltation by joyous singing. This significance of singing in connexion with Divine service has never been lost sight of. Under the Old Law the music of the Temple filled, in compliance with the commands of God Himself, a very elaborate and significant part. In Ps, xcvii, the people of God are exhorted to "sing praises to our God with a psalm, and to make melody in your hearts to the Lord" (Eph., v, 19). Tertullian relates that during Divine service Holy Scripture was read and psalms sung, and that even Pliny had ascertained that the Christians honoured their Lord before dawn by singing a hymn (Apol., ii). Thus, in confirmation of the regulations herefore followed by the Church", quotes the testimony of Philo, who relates that the Therapeutes, during their festive repasts, sang psalms from Holy Writ and other hymns of various kinds in solemn rhythm in monodic style with choroi rhapsodians (Hist. eccl., i, xviii). Whatever may have been the nature of the singing of the Therapeutes, Eusebius bears testimony to the traditional custom of the Church. While St. Augustine restricted the singing of the psalms to a kind of recitation, St. Ambrose introduced in Milan (and the greater part of the Western world) with great success antiphonal singing of the psalms "after the manner of the East". St. Augustine asks himself whether it is not better to sing passages of scripture derived from singing, but concludes his reflection by concurring with existing practices, and frequently testifies to the customs of his time (cf. Conf., ix, 7; x, 33; in Ps. xxi and xlvi; Retr., ii, 11). St. Jerome, refer-
ring to Eph. v. 19, exalts as follows the young whose duty it is to sing in Church: "Let the servant of God sing in such a manner that the words of the text rather than the voice of the singer cause delight, and that St. Paul's spirit may depart from those who are under its dominion, and may not enter into those who make a theatre out of the house of the Lord". A certain class of liturgical singers are also mentioned in the "Canones aposterorum". The above-mentioned antiphonal and responsorial chant intended for the people shows that the singing was not confined to the choir. St. Paul's spirit may depart from those who are under its dominion, and may not enter into those who make a theatre out of the house of the Lord. A certain class of liturgical singers are also mentioned in the "Canones aposterorum". The above-mentioned antiphonal and responsorial chant intended for the people shows that the singing was not confined to the choir. St. Paul's spirit may depart from those who are under its dominion, and may not enter into those who make a theatre out of the house of the Lord.

The Church Regulations.—The interest taken by the Church in music is also shown by her numerous enactionary permissions. Anything that is not expressly prohibited by the Church is worthy of Divine service. The right of the Church to determine the matter and manner of what shall be sung in connexion with her liturgy is incontestable. Narrow-minded musical partisans seem disposed to fear that music as an art does not receive due consideration, if it be not permitted to go its own way unconstrained. This is a misunderstanding, not only in the theory that art is an end in itself, and should not serve, except indirectly, any end outside of and other than itself. This principle could only have a certain justification, if the external dependency were to hinder the full development of music. But this is not the case. In point of fact, the history of its development shows that ecclesiastical music need not compare between its achievements and those of secular music. Many competent musicians have frankly admitted this in the case of the simple Gregorian chant—not only men like Witt and Gevaert, but also Halévy, Mozart, and Berlioz. Halévy considers the chant "the most beautiful religious song by that exactitude". Mozart's treatment of "Gloria" would gladly exchange all his music for the fame of having composed the Gregorian Preface", sounds almost hyperbolic. Berlioz, who himself wrote a grandiose Requiem, declared that "nothing in music could be compared with the effect of the Gregorian Dies irae". "It is not the antithesis of music, but an affirmation of music, as far as the cost of music is concerned. All that song is nothing compared with these chants". "The fundamental power, animating all music which is not made but which grew (as is the case with the folk-music), belongs pre-eminently to Gregorian chant." For this reason Gevaert considers the most characteristic quality of the chant to be the fact that it never grows stale, "as though time had no power over it". "In Beethoven, Liszt, and other modern composers, simple artistic means produce the deepest and most lasting impression, when skilfully employed. The first requisite is that the sentiments contained in the text be given true expression, and be not obscured by obtrusive external forms. It must be acknowledged that pieces like the Te Deum, Lauda Sion, the Lamentations, the Requiem Mass, as well as many an introit, gradual, and tract, afford a never-failing pleasure, that they employ only the simplest means to express the desired mood, that they are admirably adapted to promote devotion.

The Church, however, does not despise artistic means of a more elaborate nature, as is shown by the longrettents and the Requiem Mass (in the Vatican edition) and still more by ecclesiastical polyphonic music (Palestrina style). Upon this style modern musicians of the first rank have pronounced favourable judgment. Wagner was an enthusiastic admirer of Palestrina; Mendelssohn made every effort to collect masses, "improperia, psalms, motets of the old masters, which he preferred to all ecclesiastical music by modern composers. Also there are, indeed, many works by Orlandus de Lassus, Allegri, Vittoria, wherein the most elaborate means of expression are used, but which, nevertheless, conform to every liturgical requirement and are, as it were, spontaneous outpourings of adoring hearts (cf. contrapuntal or polyphonic music). Besides plain chant and the polyphonic style, the Church also admits to her service homophonic or figured compositions with or without instrumental accompaniment, written, not in the old ecclesiastical modes, but in one of the modern major or minor keys. Gregorian chant the Church most warmly recommends, the polyphonic style she expressly praises, and the modern she at least tolerates. According to the "Motu proprio" of Pius X (22 Nov., 1903), the following are the general guiding principles of the Church: "Sacred music should possess, in the highest degree, the qualities proper to the liturgy, or more precisely, sanctity and purity of form from which its other character of universality spontaneously springs. It must be holy, and must therefore exclude all vanity, not only in the composer, but in all who execute it. It must be true art, for otherwise it cannot exercise on the minds of the hearers that influence which the Church meditates when she receives into her liturgy the art of music. But it must also be universal, in the sense that, while every nation is permitted to adapt the ecclesiastical words to its own language, music which may be said to constitute its native music, still these forms must be subordinated in such a manner to the general characteristics of sacred music, that no one of any nation may receive an impression other than good on hearing them.

Regarding modern music, the "Motu proprio" says: "The Church has always recognized and honoured progress in the arts, admitting to the service of religion everything good and beautiful discovered by genius in the course of ages—always, however, with due regard to the liturgical laws. Consequently, modern music is also admitted in the Church, since it, too, furnishes compositions of such excellence, solid construction, and a certain kind of gravity, that they may influence the performance of the liturgical functions. Still, since modern music has mainly served profane uses, care must be taken that musical compositions in this style admitted to the Church may contain nothing profane, be free from reminiscences of theatrical motives, and be not fashioned, even in their external forms, after the fashion of profane pieces." It is very much to be regretted that the greatest masters of modern times, Mozart, Joseph Haydn, and Beethoven, devoted their wonderful gifts mainly to secular uses, and that their masses are entirely unsuitable for liturgical purposes—an unsuitability freely acknowledged by Mendelssohn. The inadmissibility lies in their treatment of the sacred text, the instrumentation, in the fact that they do not conform to the liturgical action, and often in an undue elaboration of form which seriously interferes with the devotion of the faithful. A few compositions by these masters (such as Mozart's Ave verum) do not deserve this reproach. The mere fact that a Gloria or Credo by Haydn, for instance, delays the progress of the service twenty minutes, while the other parts of these masses are of equal length, is sufficient to render them unsuitable for liturgical use. The following words from the "Motu proprio" are applicable to numberless compositions: "Among the different forms of modern music, those which are suitable for accompanying the functions of public worship is the theatrical style, which was in the greatest vogue, especially in Italy, during the last century. This, of
its very nature, is diametrically opposed to the Gregorian chant and classic polyphony, and therefore to the modern practice of divinity music. With the intrinsic structure, the rhythm and what is known as the conventionalism of this style adapt themselves but ill to the requirements of true liturgical music."

This wish of the Church, so frequently reiterated, should never be ignored by composer or performer. As the sacredness of the liturgy has caused the Church to direct that the priest, to the utmost of his powers, should employ in the fulfilment of his duties—which regulations he may not disregard without sinning—so also the regulations concerning church music are binding on the singers, whether the reasons for these regulations be understood by the individuals or not. It is indeed true, as a source of inestimable value, owing to special circumstances, sometimes excusable. The regulations are contained in the Missal, the "Ceremoniale episcoporum", and the decrees of councils and of the popes. The universally binding decrees of the Congregation of Rites are collected in "Decreta authentica", and have been, since 1908, published in "Acta Apostolicae Sedis". For local directions need no special publication for those immediately concerned. It is in some cases legitimate to assume that, in unessential matters, a given rule has rather a directive than a prescriptive character, provided the wording does not declare the contrary. Decree binding by plan or general conditions, binding only in the place to which they have been directed. In some cases it is legitimate to inquire about and remonstrate against a regulation before it becomes binding. Whenever exceptionally serious difficulties stand in the way, positive laws are not binding, unless the lawgiver explicitly insists on their fulfilment. Ordinary breaches in local conditions, which may, in the application of a given law, sometimes use their own discretion. Customs of long standing are to be treated with some leniency, unless ecclesiastical authority explicitly determines the contrary. Answers to inquiries contained in the "Decreta Authentic" or "Acta Apostolicae Sedis" are usually considered as binding, if they are for general and not merely for local application. The degree of binding depends on the importance of the matter in question, and it may be gathered from the degree of firmness or emphasis with which the lawgiver inculcates a given law. The verbal and musical texts are equally subject to ecclesiastical control. The use of the Vesperal edition of the Gregorian chant has been binding since 25 Sept., 1905. However, bishops may, owing to local difficulties, defer the execution of the law. (The command is given in mild form: "It is our most keen desire that bishops", etc.) The "Motu proprio" directs that all other musical performances be watched over by a commission appointed by the ordinary, so that in all places compositions of the proper character and within the capacity of the singers may be performed.

Regulations, so wise as these, compel our obedience. Consequently, the Holy Father has a right to expect that "we obey from the conviction that by so doing we act from reasons which are clear, plain and beyond dispute." Consideration of the purpose for which music is employed in church, of its close connexion with the liturgy, and of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, is sufficient basis for this conviction. No one is bound to admire, as in every particular unsurpassed and unsurpassable, the prescribed chant. It is sufficient that the Gregorian chant be the supreme model for all Catholic church music and approve its use. We are not asked to abandon every personal scientific and aesthetic view, or to eschew research and theoretic discussion. If, however, the lawgiver does not urge the immediate execution of a law wherever, on account of the difficulties to be overcome, it is more likely to do more harm than good, it must not be understood that by these means the Church means to relax the requirements of the local existence of the Church. No, but the difference in our own taste be considered an obstacle. The regulations concerning church music are generally binding under pain of sin, and subtle distinctions to escape this responsibility are useless. For the composer of genius these prescriptions are not fetters, but rather serve to show him how to make his music a source of artistic inspiration. From the rules and traditions of the Church, as the performance of a sacred drama, the exposition of a battle scene, or even a statue representing a pagan deity. The performance of such music directs the attention not to the altar but to the organ loft. Musicians themselves have frequently failed to recognize clearly the difference between concert and church music, to deviate from religious compositions in secular cantatas and extracts from their operas for church purposes. A mass has also been compiled from some of Haydn's profane compositions. The "waxing of notes", the complete absorption of our consciousness by artistic melodic or harmonic conceptions and sensuous melodies, the display of instrumental virtuosity and dramatic effects of tonal masses put all devout recollection of the sacrificial act and all heartfelt prayer. March, dance, and other jerky rhythms, bravura arias, and the crash of instruments affect the senses and nerves, but do not touch the heart. Even a reminiscence of the concert hall is a distraction to those who wish to pray.

Not the least element in the effectiveness of such music is the sacred texts, which inspire composer, singer, and hearer, although in different ways. In the "Motu proprio" we read: "The liturgical text must be sung as it is in the books, without alteration or inversion of the words, without undue repetition, without breaking syllables and always in a manner intelligible to the faithful who listen." Only in this way are the sacredness of the text and the needs of the hearer safeguarded. For all official chants (Mass, Vespers, etc.) the texts are prescribed, and are in the Latin language. On this point the "Motu proprio" says: "It is not lawful to confuse the order or to change the prescribed text for other reasons, but it is lawful to change it entirely or in part. However, it is permissible according to the custom of the Roman Church, to sing a motet to the Blessed Sacrament after the Benedicium in a solemn mass. It is also permitted, after the Offertory of the mass has been sung, to execute during the time that remains a brief motet to words approved by the Church." On account of the diversity and changeableness of modern languages, the Church retains for her liturgical functions (even for the simple misa cantata) the Latin language, hallowed by ages of service. Nor does she permit that individual prayers and chants be translated into the vernacular for liturgical purposes. (The most important decision on this point will be found in the "Decreta authentic" under "Cantilena" and "Cantus"). The "Motu proprio" says: "It is forbidden to sing anything whatever in the vernacular in solemn liturgical functions; much more to sing in the vernacular the variable or common parts in the Mass and Office."

For the Church, as the monastic liturgy, the Church joins her own traditional musical form, which characterizes her chant and distinguishes it from the music of concert and opera. The "Motu proprio" says: "The different parts of the Mass and of the Office must remain, even musically, that particular concept and form which ecclesiastical tradition assigned to
them, and which is admirably expressed in the Gregorian chant.” By retaining her musical form for her various chants (e.g. for the Sanctus, the hymns, the psalms), or admitting of its modification only within certain limits, the Church protects her own music against the intrusion of music with the accompaniment of the organ is also permitted. In some special cases, within due limits and within the proper regards, other instruments may be allowed, but never without the special licence of the ordinary, according to the Ceremoniale episcoporum. As the chant should always have the principal place, the organ or instruments should merely sustain and never suppress it. It is not permitted to have the chant preceded by long preludes or to interrupt it with intermezzo pieces. The pianoforte and noisy and frivolous instruments (e.g. drums, cymbals, and bells) are absolutely excluded. Wind instruments, by their nature more turbulent and obtrusive, are admissible only as an exception to the rule that the sacred word belongs in the first place in the churches, and not to instrumental additions or the trivial scraping found in most of the churches pieces to-day. Catholic Church music can regain its former purity only by a return to the purely vocal style. If an accompaniment is considered absolutely necessary, the genius of Christianity has provided the instrument worthy of such function, the organ.” (Gesammelte Werke, II, 337). There is no doubt that those qualities absolutely necessary to church music, namely modesty, dignity, and soulfulness, are more inherent in the purely vocal style than in any other. Reserve and humble restraint befits the house of God. Sentimental and effeminate melodies are incompatible with the dignity of church music. In polyphonic a cappella style, and a composer's temptation to indulge in them is more easily counteracted by this style than any other. Like the external attitude of the worshipper in church, the vocally interpreted liturgical word and the organ-playing must be respectful and decorous. That vocal music is in general more impressive than the mechanically produced tones of instruments is undeniable. Religious feeling finds its most natural expression in vocal utterance, for the human heart is the source of both devotion and song.

From these considerations it follows that the tone quality, tempo, and rhythm of vocal music accompanied by the organ, are more in harmony with the religious mood than is the character of orchestral instruments. The organ can indeed be sweeping and powerful, but its tone volume is always more even, and is not so subject to the arbitrary will of the player as is the orchestra. Orchestral instruments permit of a wide range in the division and subdivision, retarding and accelerating in unison, which are not conducive to the calm necessary for prayer. The organ holds good with regard to rhythm. Just as the great flexibility, the frivolous or passionate character of irregular rhythm in general are expressive of a worldly, superficial, and restless mood, so is reposeful and symmetrical rhythm expressive of and conducive to a prayerful mood. A slow and orderly movement is more in keeping with the nature of the organ. It was not by accident that the measured rhythm of Gregorian chant was early abandoned, nor is it desirable to interpret in too mechanical a rhythm even the polyphonic works of the old masters. The more the purely mechanical element yields to the expression of the religious mood the more suitable the organ becomes for church. On the other hand, a delicately defined measure is aesthetically preferable to excessive freedom. Another element of the highest importance in church music, which is indeed generally suggested by the text, is the interrelation between the melodic phrases, the rhythmical proportion or symmetry between the various parts of the composition: these seem to conform externally to the breathing of the singers and internally to the emotions of the pious heart, while the measure is solely a means to regulate time.

Finally must be considered, as one of the distinctive attributes of church music, the character of the Gregorian modes. The modes, which have most in common with our modern modes, are based on the principle of the minor third, the symbol of moderation and restraint, greatly predominate in Gregorian chant.
Harmonic music has gradually narrowed down to the two modes or keys, major and minor: the major key has freer motion, greater brightness and decision, while the minor scale in its lower portion has a hesitating and mysterious character, and resembles the major key more closely in its upper portion. The major character, as we have it in our C major scale, occurs very seldom in Gregorian chant. The self-restraint so delicately conveyed in the church modes completely disappears in the apparently boundless freedom and stormy movement of concert music. The latter makes use of the chromatic element, modulation from one key into another, tone colour, the various forms of composition (sonata, etc.), and every other artistic means to carry the hearer from one mood to another and finally to heighten the impression to the degree of passion. As such purposes are foreign to church music, it makes of these means, whenever it employs them, a different use. It will be remembered that the contrapuntal vocal school, at one period in its history, also degenerated into artificiality and the cultivation of form for its own sake, the music was worship by the Church, but also remedied by repeated reforms since the Council of Trent.

VARIUS PARTS OF THE DIVINE SERVICE.—The Church has frequently legislated concerning even the smallest details of the liturgy. In connexion with the Mass, the centre of Catholic worship, the service of various offices—e.g. the recessional, the entrance into the sanctuary, the preparation of the altar, and the offering of the oblation—has been fixed in detail, and the prayers and responses prescribed. The Motu proprio of Pius X says: "The different parts of the Mass and Office must retain, even musically, that particular concept and form which ecclesiastical tradition has assigned to them, and which is admirably expressed in Gregorian chant. Different, therefore, must be the method of composing an introit, a gradual, an antiphon, a psalm, a hymn, a Gloria in excelsis..."

In particular the following rules are to be observed:

(a) The Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, etc. of the Mass must preserve the unity of composition proper to their text. It is not lawful, therefore, to compose them in separate pieces in such a way that each of such pieces may form a complete composition in itself, and be capable of being detached from the rest and substituted by another.

(b) In the office of Vespers it should be the rule to follow the 'Ceremoniale Episcoporum', which prescribes the Gregorian chant for the psalmody, and permits figured music for the verses of the Gloria Patri and the Iesu.
choir with the so-called falso-bordoni or with verses similarly composed in a proper manner.

"It may also be allowed sometimes to render the
group of the Gregorian chant., in their entirety in music, provided the
form proper to psalmody be preserved in such composi-
tion, that is to say, provided the singers seem to be
psalmody among themselves, either with new mot-
tifs or with those taken from the Gregorian chant
based upon it.

The parts known, as di concerto, are therefore for
ever excluded and prohibited.

"(c) In the hymns of the Church the traditional form
of the hymn is preserved. Thus, it is not lawful to
compose, for instance, a 'Tantum ergo' in such wise
that the first strophes present a romanza, a cavatina,
an adagio, and the 'Genitori' an allegro.

"(d) The antiphons of the Vespers must be, as a
rule, rendered with the Gregorian melody proper to
each. Should they, however, in some special case, be
sung in figured music they must never have either the
form of a concert melody or the fullness of a motet or a
cantata."

All this shows not only the great solicitude of the
Church to foster worthy ecclesiastical music, but also
the desirability of her regulations on the matter.
Greater latitude is given at benediction services. It
is lawful to sing hymns in the vernacular before the
Blessed Sacrament exposed, but, immediately before the
Benediction, the 'Tantum ergo' and 'Genitori'
must be sung in Latin, either to a Gregorian melody or
certain settings, as a liturgical close. During and after the removal of the Blessed Sacrament,
it is permitted to sing in the vernacular. An antiphon
or hymn in honour of the Blessed Virgin may also be
sung, but only after the reposition. If litanies (san-
tioned by the Church or the ordinary) be sung, there
must be no omissions, although the invocations may be
taken from the pilgrimage of three, four, five, or six
novis. As in the case of the 'Tantum ergo', all pre-
scribed liturgical chants, like the 'Te Deum', must be
sung in Latin: any text chosen on the choir's own ini-
tiative, however, may be sung in the vernacular.

SINGING BY THE PEOPLE.—Singing by the people, so
widely customary at different devotions (Benediction of
the Blessed Sacrament, low Mass, etc.), requires special
mention. The participation of the people in the
singing of the Gregorian chant has been discussed
under CONGREGATIONAL SINGING. Singing in the
vernacular may not be substituted for the latter.
This abuse crept in after the Reformation, and flour-
ished in the eighteenth century, particularly in Ger-
moving and even widely practised in Germany. It is
therefore necessary to advert briefly to the question of women's participation in choir.
As the injunction of the Apostle that women
keep silence in church was never made applicable in
the matter of her participation in the singing of the
congregation, and as in religious communities of
women the liturgical chant has to be performed by
women, we may take it for granted that in our ordi-
nary lay choirs, representing the congregation, the
participation of women is not forbidden. The follow-
ing words from the 'Motu proprio' have, however,
caused a great deal of uncertainty: "With the excep-
tion of the melodies proper to the celebrant at the altar
and to his ministers, which must always be sung only
in Gregorian chant and without the accompaniment
of the organ, all the rest of the liturgical chant belongs
to the choir of levites; therefore, singers in church,
even when they are laymen, are really taking the place
of the ecclesiastical choir."

On the same principle it follows that singers in church have a real liturgical
office, and that, therefore, women, as being incapable of
the chant, must be kept out of the choir of the church.
When, then, it is desired to employ the acute voices of
soprano and contralto, these parts must be taken by
boys, according to the ancient usage of the
But the Holy Father speaks here (as in the beginning) of the choir of levites, among whom laymen may be included, and declares soon after these qualifications: that it is for women ecclesiastical habit and surplice. But our ordinary lay choir represents not only the congregation, but also the official choir, without wishing to play the role of "levites"; for this reason it is not stationed in the sanctuary, and no one would think of proposing that its members, like acolytes, should wear the ecclesiastical habit. The lay choir is simply a substitute for the absent *chorus cantorum*, in the liturgical sense, as is the nun for the absent acolyte when she supplies from a distance the responses to the celebrant during the celebration of Mass.

Consequently, the presence of women in choirs is excusable under certain circumstances, although choirs composed of men and boys are for many reasons preferable. It is true that an inquiry about this point received an apparently negative answer on 18 Dec., 1908, but this was in regard to the conditions described in the inquiry (*prout exponitur*), and it is added that the Decree is to be understood in the sense that the women must be kept entirely separate from the men, in such a way that no occasion is given for all conduct unbecoming to the sacred edifice. From these clauses it appears that, in principle, choirs composed of men and women are not inadmissible; however, the desirability of banishing every possible occasion of indecency from the church renders it preferable to employ boys, rather than women, in choirs. The only condition which must be adhered to is that the一声 questionable, since solos in church are admissible only within certain limits (Motu proprio). A choir composed of women only is not forbidden (Decree of 17 Jan., 1908). To employ non-Catholics in church as singers and organists is only tolerated in case of urgent necessity, because they neither believe nor feel the wronging.

**REFORM IN PRACTICE.**—The decadence of the Gregorian chant is to be ascribed primarily to the development of and preference given to polyphony. To this cause is due the disappearance from the chant of its original rhythm and the serious neglect of its simpler form. Even before the Council of Trent, ecclesiastical authority had recognized the abuses which had crept into polyphonic music. The Gregorian melodies, however, even in the hands of the contrapuntists, retained their character in a wonderful manner. Nevertheless, the contrast between the two kinds of music led, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, to the abbreviation of the long melismas and to a different use of the intervallic progressions, and many less important modifications (Graduale Medicaeum). Many other editions, edited according to the same principle, followed until the revised "Medicarum" (printed in Ratisbon) became in 1878 the official chant book of the Church (cf. Decreto, n. 3830). Meanwhile, the liturgical researches of the Benedictines of Solesmes had led (since 1903-4) to the new restoration, in the Vatican edition, of the chant from the manuscripts of the twelfth century. Endeavours to restore the earlier neumed texts (tenth-century), mainly on account of the primitive rhythm, have so far met with little success.

The "Motu proprio" of Pius X had for its main purpose the reform of church music in general, and covers about the same ground as the "Regolamento per la musica sacra," which the Congregation of Sacred Rites issued under Leo XIII, which applied more particularly to Italy (Decr. auth., loc. cit.). On the basis of these regulations, with which the earlier provisions of the modern decrees are in entire agreement, composers, singers, and theorists are to carry on their work of reform. They constitute the principle which the Cæcilienverein (Cecilian Society) has long endeavoured to put into practice in Germany, Italy, North America, and elsewhere. Dr. F. X. Witt, burning with zeal for the cause of reform, founded this society in 1888, and, shortly after its papal approbation, it became known as the German "Guido. The main object of the society is to cultivate the chant, polyphony, hymns in the vernacular, organ-playing, and orchestral music in conformity with the regulations of the Church. The reform endeavours were by no means confined to Germany, but extended to Holland, Italy, the United States, etc. The introduction of the Vatican edition of the chant has been, since the decree of Pius X, the main object of the society's activity. In the restoration and worthy performance of the traditional chant, the Benedictines have, even before the publication of Dom Pothier's work (Les melodies gregoriennes, 1880), displayed the greatest zeal. Thus, the fathers of Solesmes in France, Beuron in Germany, St. Anthon in Flanders, Malines in Belgium, Prague and Seekau in Austria, co-operate with the Cecilians of every part of the world in carrying out the wishes of the Holy Father and the bishops in regard to the reform of church music. Every one is under obligation to do what he can in his own particular field.

It is well to state briefly in didactic form what the Church requires in the restoration of chant. The first requisite is the recognition that the chant, as the true music of the Church, must be studied and performed with the greatest care. Whenever difficulties stand in the way of the introduction of the Vatican edition, the bishops will take such measures as are in conformity with the will of the pope. Schools for church music may, in this respect, give good results, as shown in the case of the Benedictines of Solesmes (viii, 27, 28): "Let care be taken to restore, at least in the principal churches, the ancient *schola cantorum*, as has been done with excellent fruit in many places. It is not difficult for a zealous clergy to institute such *schola*, even in the minor and country churches—nay, in them they will find a very easy field for gathering in the songs of Psalms and the adults to their own profit and the edification of the people. Let efforts be made to support and promote in the best way possible the higher schools of sacred music where these already exist, and to help in founding them where they do not. It is of the utmost importance for the Church herself to provide for the direction of its apostolate according to the true principles of sacred art."

In a similar sense it is the will of the Holy Father that in the study of liturgy attention should be directed to the principles governing liturgical music, and that aesthetic appreciation should be fostered. Singers must be humbly submissive to their pastor, and especially to the liturgical choir; they must not entertain the notion that the chant can be sung without due preparation, as though it were a question of merely singing the notes. Courses in the chant are given in various centres, and excellent books of instruction exist in great numbers (e.g., Singenberger's "Guide to Church Music"). To mention only one point, it is important to master, with the instructions of the Benedictines, the proper rhythmical divisions of periods and phrases as well as the *legato* delivery of the long jubilations.

In general, it is now-a-days impossible to do entirely without polyphonic music. It constitutes a welcome means of giving splendour to feast-days, but is a source of danger if over-indulged in. The words of the best masters of polyphony have been made accessible for study and execution by excellent editions (e.g., the works of Palestrina in Habert's edition). There is certainly no dearth of compositions in the modern homophonic style; we have but to consult the catalogues of the Cecilian and the above-named "Guide." It is better to produce and to study new compositions within the capacity of the choir than to introduce new works frequently, without completely mastering them. Critics who write on church music,
musicians, and choir-directors, should familiarize themselves with the spirit and regulations of the Church in regard to music by means of the numerous theoretical manuals. It is the spirit which vivifies; the form serves merely to give it expression. Without studying the liturgy (at least, that part of it directly connected with the music) and the texts in the original or in translations as close as possible to the original, it is not possible to penetrate into this spirit. The Church may claim our ready allegiance and respect for the laws and regulations which she, for grave reasons and to deal with existing conditions, has enacted.

In theoretical and artistic questions, however, everyone enjoys freedom. Thus the Congregation of Rites has declared (and this is the only declaration of its kind which I know): "While students of the chant always have enjoyed full freedom, a privilege which they will not be deprived of in the future, to ascertain by scientific research what was the primitive form of the chant, and what modifications it has undergone in subsequent periods (a very laudable inquiry analogous to that being prosecuted by learned scholars into the primitive rites and other departments of the liturgy), only that form of the chant which His Holiness has proposed to us, and which has been approved by the Congregation of Sacred Rites, may to-day be considered as authoritative and legitimate" (Decr. auth., n. 3830). As for choirmasters, the text continues, "But as the faithful productions which do not conform to the intentions of the Church, even if the music in itself be beautiful, nor should they aim at a mere display of their own powers thereby to gain fame and merely delight their hearers. They should, on the contrary, endeavour to imitate in their compositions the simple and unadorned melody of the Church. The faithful are not bound to accommodate themselves to the capacity of ordinary choirs. With these considerations before him, the choirmaster has to choose his music, penetrate into its spirit so that he may be able to impart the same to his singers, who must sing not only correctly but also with devotion. Order and discipline among the performers are important factors in obtaining the desired results. According to the "Motu proprio", "only those are to be admitted to form part of the musical chapel of a church who are men of known purity and probity of life, and these should by their modesty and devout bearing during the liturgical functions show that they are worthy of the holy office they exercise." The interpretation of a performance depends greatly on the interpretation, it is incumbent upon the choir-master to insist upon distinct pronunciation of the words, a noble tone quality, and a simple expression of the mood. Church music should be free from exaggerated and exaggerated expression of joy or correspondence to sentimental yearning, and theatrical effects of any kind; it should be the utterance of fervent prayer springing from faith and charity. The good intention of the singers will not only find its eternal reward, it will also evoke gratitude and respect.

The twofold aspect of the principle laid down by the Sacred Congregation for our guidance in the matter of singing in the vernacular is expressed as follows: "The Congregation urgently admonishes that hymns in the vernacular no matter of what character, should gradually and unostentatiously be eliminated from liturgical functions. On the other hand, pious hymns to approved texts, which are extensively employed, particularly in Germany during different devotions and before the Liturgy of the Sorrowful Queen of the Blessed Virgin, are by no means prohibited" (3 April, 1883; Krutscheck, 3rd ed., pp. 151, 177). Songs in the vernacular, alternating with prayer, are suitable during low Mass (within narrow limits, however), benediction, but especially during processions outside of the church. An excellent means for fostering this desirable practice is the careful training of the school children, whose singing need not, however, be confined to hymns in unison, and who also may be allowed to perform occasionally more elaborate compositions in two or more parts. The singing, however, should not be permitted to gain precedence over prayer. The hymn-book should at the same time be a prayer-book, and praying aloud should alternate with the singing. The interpretation and spirit of the hymns be carefully explained to the children. The performance should be free from dragging and slurring, faults which should be strongly discouraged by the organist. Arbitrary, unindicated pauses should be avoided. The children, especially, should be taught to respond to the celebrant at the end of the verse and to gradually do the same thing. No one exercises a greater influence in the reform of church music than the organist, provided he be animated by the spirit of the Church. His playing should be, like the chant of the Church, simple and grave, devotional and objective. Song preludes and intermezzi during liturgical functions are forbidden. The organ must be subordinate to the singing, must support and not drown it. The purely vocal style is the ideal of the Church. The papal choir, the Sistine, has always excluded instrumental music. The more humble and subordinate the rôle of the organist, the more faithful and conscientious he should be in filling it. He should never occupy the front of the nave, play a part in the service, or indulge in flashy improvisations, or keep the celebrant waiting. In extra-liturgical functions, however, he may move somewhat freely. It is decidedly preferable to play the works of good masters than to improvise. In preparing for a great liturgical function, he should aim at giving suitable and full expression to the spirit of the celebration of the feast, and the performance is indispensable, especially to the musician of mediocre talent, even though he always keep the text before him. He must be able to perform this with absolute sureness, mastery, and freedom. He must know how to modulate from one key into another, how to proceed from one number to another, what key to choose for the hymns sung by the congregation, how to transpose the chant from one key into another, how to combine the organ stops, and (to a certain extent at least) how to improvise and to harmonize at sight. Under no circumstances must he permit himself to carry reminiscences of the concert and opera into the church.

As to the use of instruments, other than the organ, we should remember the words of St. Pius X: "In the Church ordinary is necessary, and that their nature must always be in keeping with the occasion and the place. The employment of a full orchestra forms an exception (cf. Motu proprio, cited above). The wisdom of these restrictions has been cheerfully recognized by such unprejudiced authorities as Wagner and Beethoven—a fact which must be too often stated. The former maintained that "genuine church music should be produced only by voices, except a 'Gloria' or similar text." As early in his career as 1848 this master ascribed the decadence of church music to the use of instruments. "The first step toward the decadence of genuine Catholic church music was the introduction of orchestra instruments. Their character and independent use have imparted to religious expression a sensuous charm, which has proved very detrimental, and has affected unfavourably the art of singing itself. The virtuosity of instrumentalists provoked imitation on the part of singers, and soon a worldly and operatic taste held sway in church music. The past part of sacred text, e.g. the 'Kyrie Eleison', because a vehicle for operatic arias, and singers trained for Italian opera were engaged as church singers" (Gesammette Werke, II, 335). Every reform has, in accordance with the will of the Church, to be carried out in such a manner that a greater evil may not result—that is, gradually and without causing unnecessary friction.
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sensu), but yet with firmness, regardless of one's personal views. Moral necessity alone dispenses from a command of the Church. It must be considered as progress when features either forbidden or discouraged by the Church (e.g., hymns in the vernacular during liturgical functions, the use of orchestral instruments, women in choirs) are no longer fostered, and when one abuse after another is gradually reduced to a minimum. Those in charge should not cater to the false ideas of the people, but should make every effort by the performance of better compositions to ennoble popular taste. Offence is perhaps most easily given, when old and favourite hymns, though of an inferior quality, are withdrawn; modern hymn-books, however, contain such an abundance of excellent melodies that no harm is likely to be done. Harmony has never been discussed above its difficulty. The fundamental conditions for success are a good choir of men and boys, a capable organist, and a judicious choice of masses and other compositions by the choir-director.

The Vatican chant, however, presents difficulties of a special nature. It is true that mere recitation on a straight tone may in some cases be resorted to. It has also been customary from time immemorial to assign to a few chosen singers the more difficult passages. In regard to the rhythm, accent, and other points we now know the precise intentions of the Holy See. The "Aetius Apostolicae Sedis" (1910, pp. 145 sq.) contains a letter from the Prefect of the Congregation of Rites to the Archbishops of the German Church, in which this publication becomes binding on all. In this letter the direction is given that the rhythmical interpretation of the Vatican edition is to be in accordance with the rules laid down in the preface to the Graduale. The wish is also expressed that no contrary methods should be advocated in the press, as they would only cause confusion and retard the progress of the reform. Theoretic discussions seem not to have been prohibited, except in so far as they might interfere with the introduction of the Vatican edition (cf. the decree of the Congregation of Rites quoted above, which was issued under similar conditions—Decr. auth., n. 3830). A considerable latitude is allowed in the interpretation of the document. The attempts, disapproved of by the Holy Father, are characterized in a rather mild manner; critics are asked to abstain from attempting that which, in the present state of archaeological studies, can have no other result than to spread confusion and divert attention from the real work of restoring the Gregorian chant to its rightful place. In the opinion of the Prefect, we should make every effort to introduce the Vatican edition in conformity with the will of the pope. By studying the symmetrical construction of the melodies in the light of the explanations of the Benedictines, which are undoubtedly of high aesthetic value, the execution becomes not only much easier but the profound beauty of the chant revealed to us.

Religious Music.—Finally that class of religious music which may not be placed in the same category with real church music, must be mentioned. The masses by Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven have already been spoken of. The musical interpretation of the text and their operatic form render them little suited to the church. We must also name the older Protestant masters, John Sebastian Bach and G. F. Handel, whose works for Protestant services undoubtedly deserve to be studied by the church musician. The greater latitude accorded to organ playing in the Protestant cult has given occasion to the highest productions of contrapuntal harmony. We are not less aware of the fact, however, that the predominance in their works of the instrumental element, with its obtrusive arias, duets, and choruses, is in opposition to the spirit of the Catholic liturgy, which finds a more suitable medium of expression in the purely vocal style. John Sebastian Bach (b. at Eisenach, 1385; d. at Leipzig, 1750) has also set Catholic liturgical texts to music. His Mass in B minor is considered one of his greatest works, among which his oratorio, the "Passion according to St. Matthew," must be also included. Among his other compositions for Sundays and festivals, preludes and fugues hold a prominent place. He was also distinguished in the field of chamber music. George Frederick Handel (b. at Halle, 1685; d. at London, 1759) was the first to introduce oratorios, music dramas of a sacred character, into England. He composed oratorios as well as operas, cantatas, and suites. His Messiah was written in 1742.

The oratorio, which Handel brought to the highest degree of perfection (Messiah, Judas Maccabaeus, Israel in Egypt, etc.), stands midway between secular and liturgical music. Originally intended as an ethical-religious reaction against the Florentine opera, it treats Biblical and legendary themes in a lyric-dramatic form, but without dramatic action. It consists of recitations, arias (duets, trios, quartets), and choruses with a brilliant orchestral accompaniment. On account of its semi-operatic form the oratorio is not available for congregation singing. It requires for its performance a choir in former times to perform settings of the Passion in church on Good Friday. The cantata (perfected by Bach) is more lyric and less epic in style with a somewhat more modest instrumentation. The cantata and oratorio are both developments from the antiphonal sacred chants and the mystery plays of the Middle Ages. Since the beginning of the thirteenth century, existed the cantus firmus in the vernacular and also more pretentious compositions, such as the lays of the troubadours, minnesingers, and mastersingers, and the madrigal. The folk-song of olden times, springing directly from and resembling the music of the Church, was often employed as motif or canons firmus in masses and other liturgical compositions, proceeding which would not be allowed now-a-days. Christian pilgrims were wont to sing antiphonal hymns having for their burden the life and death of our Saviour and similar subjects. The dramatic element inherent in these subjects was contained in the liturgy itself. It had only to be brought into conjunction with epic recitation and references of the sacred plays in order to develop into the mystery plays, which had their secular counterparts. As far back as the eleventh century these mystery plays on feast-days served to present to the people in dramatic form the Passion, Resurrection, and Last Judgment. Their original home was the church and the monastery, from which they had later to be banished. The sacred and semi-eclesiastical or simply religious music of the Middle Ages had a decisive influence in the transformation of polyphonic music into the harmonic or homophonic, and a comparison between the various styles is a great aid in determining the character of genuine church music.

It is as important to-day as ever that we carefully distinguish between simply religious music—be it never so beautiful, artistic, and conducive to private devotion—and that kind of music which the Church requires for her services. Outside of the Church each one may sing such melodies to religious texts as best satisfy his own pious mood; he may even indulge his aesthetic predilections in choosing his hymns. The house of God, however, demands an entirely different attitude; we must realize that we are there to pray, that we may not force our personal mood on our fellow Christians, but that, on the contrary, we must follow with devout attention and pious song, according to the
It was with the advent of monody (see Harmony) that the use of instruments in connexion with the voices received a great impetus. The closely-knit, compact polyphonic structure which had predominated up to this time, needed no extraneous aid for its effectiveness and sonority. This was not the case with the new style of composition rapidly superseding the old school. It depended to a great extent for its tonal solidity and artistic existence on the aid of the instruments.

The great perfection reached in the construction of stringed instruments in the sixteenth century was both a manifestation of, and an aid to the growing tendency; virtuosity, not only on stringed, but also on wind instruments was a common accomplishment. The character and individuality of the instruments, so to speak, were being made available as means of expression for the subjective moods, dramatic feelings, and conceptions of the composer.

While all this development had, up to the first half of the sixteenth century, served mainly secular purposes, it was through Ludovico Grossi da Viadana (1564–1627) that the use of instruments became more common in churches. While choirmaster in Mantua and in Venice, this master published his "Cento concerti ecclesiastici", compositions to sacred texts, for one or more voices and basso continuo, or figured bass played on the organ and supplemented by violins, bass viol, and wind instruments, a species of compo-
sition in vogue before his time. A contemporary of Viadana, Giovanni Gabrieli (1557–1612), who was choirmaster of St. Mark's, Venice, went a considerable step further than any one before him. He wrote not only numerous works for voices and instruments, but created works for instruments alone, and discovered the principle of modern orchestration by doubling the voices in octaves and applying the same process to the organ and other instruments. Another contemporary, Francesco Cavestri, destined to exercise a momentous influence, not only on the growth of the use of instruments but also on the future development of liturgical music itself, was the birth of opera with the first performance (1594) of Jacopo Peri's "Dafne" in Florence. This new art form, originating as it did with the humanistic spirit of the time and being a return to the musical and literary ideals of antiquity which enthralled the cultivated classes of the day, soon gained an enormous popularity and completely overshadowed all previously accepted ideals in popular favour. It was but a short time before the spirit and forms of the theatre, instruments and all, found their way into the Church. With the former the same was true: the old polyphonic dominates the liturgical music. The effect of the new style on the modern liturgical music which has come down to us belonging to one or the other of the Gregorian modes) it was now the spirit, taste, and passions of the world as expressed in opera which were in the ascendency and began to dominate the compositions to liturgical texts. It was natural that the people should return to church the forms of composition which delighted them so much in the theatre. The severe simplicity of liturgical chant was set aside; polyphony was considered too formal and artificial. The spirit of universality animating them had to yield to the new style expressions of individual feeling enhanced by the sensitive charm of the instruments. That which was in accordance with the prevailing and growing taste of the generality was, if not desired, at least tolerated by those in authority, and there was no hindrance to the triumphal conquest by instrumental music which we have witnessed since.

New purely instrumental forms were developed and cultivated in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Germany, the most fruitful soil of all, until the symphony was evolved, through which the composer gives utterance to all the conflicting emotions which sway him. Peri, for the accomplishment of his first opera, "Dafne", used but a few instruments, namely, a
harpsichord (one of the predecessors of our modern pianoforte), a lute, a viola da gamba (forerunner of our violoncello), an archlute, or lute of a larger size, and a triple flute, while Claudio Monteverdi (1567–1643) employed in his opera "Orfeo" the formidable number of ten atto or stops, two cornelli, one flauto (small flute), one clarino (trumpet) and three trombe sordine (muted trumpets). While this was a formidable sonorous body, orchestra in our present day sense, that is, the utilization of the various instruments in accordance with their nature, tone quality, and compass, and their combination, with a view to the greatest variety of tone colour and sonority, was yet to be evolved. While Giovanni Carissimi (1604–74) in his oratorios, employs the instruments with more appreciation of their individuality than was manifested before him, it remained for his gifted pupil Alessandro Scarlatti (1657–1725), founder of the Neapolitan school, to establish the norm for the use of the orchestra in a way that has remained unaltered for more than a hundred years. Scarlatti's orchestra for his oratorios and operas consisted of first and second violins, violas, violoncellos, basses, two oboes (from hautbois, "high wood") developed from the ancient calamus, "reed"; French, chalumeau, German, schalmey), two bassoons (corresponding to the oboes in the lower octave), a timpani, and the brass instrument. The use of this pattern of instruments was still in vogue in the time of Haydn and Mozart, and was used in most of their works for the Church except that they sometimes added two flutes, two clarinets (woodwind instrument of ancient origin), so called on account of the resemblance of its tones to the high tones of the clarino or trumpet), and two trumpets, their use gradually increasing from modern masters added timpani (kettle-drums) and three trombones.

The instrumental idea gained such a firm hold that a very large proportion of all the music written for the Church was with orchestral accompaniment. At cathedral and other churches large orchestras were performed, many of which remained unaltered day by day, notably in Dresden, Breslau, Freiburg-in-Baden, Munich, and Vienna. In innumerable other places, the world over, the orchestra, without being always present, would be called into service on festival occasions. Up to the middle of the nineteenth century it was considered by composers practically impossible to interpret musicae text of the Mass or requiem without calling to their aid all the resources and means of expression afforded by a complete orchestra. While Beethoven, in his "Missa in C" and "Missa solemnis", as well as Cherubini in his numerous works to liturgical texts, does not go beyond the so-called classical orchestra, that is, first and second violins, viola, flute, oboe, clarinet, bassoon, horns, trumpets, trombones, and kettle-drums, Liszt and Gounod in addition to these also employ the piccolo (small flute), contrafagotto, or bassoon bassoon, the harp, cymbals, and tuba (a brass instrument serving as a bass to the trombone family). The extreme limit in instrumental tone display in modern times was reached, however, in Hector Berlioz's "Requiem Mass", performed (1837) for the first time in Notre Dame, Paris. In this work all previous efforts in the way of tonal expression are far surpassed. Besides an orchestra of one hundred and thirty instruments, including sixteen kettle-drums, the author employs in the "Tuba mirum" four separate groups of brass instruments. By mixing the trumpets calling from the four corners of the earth on the day of the Last Judgment. With this work, the last word of a mind and age which still believe but no longer adore, subjectivism finds its supreme manifestation, and the orchestra its most potent means of expression. The Church has never encouraged, and at most only tolerated, the use of instruments. She enjoinas in the *Camerale Episcoporum* that permission for their use should first be obtained from the ordinary. She holds up as her ideal the unaccompanied chant and polyphonic, a capella, style. The Sistine Chapel has not even an organ.

From time to time regulations have been issued governing the use of instruments and condemning existing abuses. In 1728 Benedict XIII rebuked a community of Benedictine nuns in Milan for using other instruments than the organ during high Mass and Vespers. He also forbade the Franciscans to use any other instrument than the organ in their conventual churches. Benedict XIV in his encyclical *Annis qui nunc vertentem* (19 February 1749) tolerates only the organ, stringed instruments, and bassoons. Kettle-drums, horns, trumpets, oboes, flutes, pianos, and mandolins are prohibited. In the *Regolamento* of 1884, flutes, trumpets, and kettle-drums are permitted on account of the improved manner in which they are now used as compared with former times. In the *Regolamento* G. M. Gh. Vicar of Rome, Patrizi, prohibited (1842) the use of instruments in the Roman churches, with the exception of a few to be used in a becoming manner in accompanying the singing, and then only after permission had been secured from the proper authority. This order was renewed in 1856 by the same cardinal in the name of Pius IX, in *Motu proprio* on church music (22 November, 1903) in paragraph III, says, "Although the music proper to the Church is purely vocal music, music with the accompaniment of the organ is also permitted. In some special cases, within due limits and with the proper regard for other instruments may be allowed, but never without the special license of the ordinary, according to the prescription of the 'Ceremoniale Episcoporum'. As the chant should always have the first place, the organ or instruments should merely sustain and never suppress it. It is not permitted to have the chant preceded by long preludes, or to have it interrupted with intermezzo pieces*. Etc. Among those services of the Church which have received survival to the present day are the Missa Papae Marcelli, Missa Papae Clari, Missa Papae Honorii III, Missa Papae Honorii IV, etc., with works for voices and instruments for liturgical use; are, I. Mitterer, G. J. E. Stehle, M. Brosig, Max Filke, George Zeller, L. Bonvín, S.J., C. Greith, F. X. Witt, P. Griesbacher, J. G. Meurer, and J. Rheinberger. The present trend is, however, decidedly away from the instrumental idea and back to the purely vocal style. And it is recognized, and in many places actually declared, that the new version of the liturgical chant, proposed to the Catholic world by Pius X, gains its full beauty and effectiveness only when sung without instrumental accompaniment of any kind.

**Kretschmer**, *Die Kirchenmusik nach dem Willen der Kirche* (Hamburg, 1907); **Riemann**, *Manual der Musikgeschichte*, II. pt. I (Leipzig, 1907); **Jungmenn, Aesthetik* (Freiburg, 1886). **Nestroy, Geschichte der deutschen Instrumentalmusik* (Leipzig, 1902); **Woodbridge, The Oxford History of Music, II* (1885); **Litkeisen, Musik-Aesthetik* (Freiburg, 1900).

**Joseph Ottten**.

**Musti**, a titular see of Proconsular Africa, suffragan of Carthage. This town, which was a Roman municipium as early as 800 B.C., is mentioned by Ptolemy, IV, 3, 33, the "Itinerarium Antonini", the Peutinger Table, and the Ravenna geographer, Vivus Sequestor, who narrates the killing at this place of an enormous serpent by Regulus. Its ruins, called Mest Henshur, are seen in the vicinity of the koubba of the marabout Sidi Abderahman, and of Koff (Tunis). Worthy of mention are two fine gates, and a triumphal arch. The inscriptions call
the inhabitants Musticienses or Mustitani; the latter name is also used by St. Augustine. In 411, at the time of the Carthage conference, Musti had besides two Donatist bishops (Felicianus and Cresconius) two Catholic bishops (Victorianus and Leonius). Anto- nius was one of the bishops exiled by huneric in 482. Musti was then included in Proconsular Numidia. In 464 Bishop Januarius signed the letter of the bishops of Proconsular Africa to Paul, Patriarch of Constantinople, against the Monothelites.

TOUSSAINT, Geogr. de l’Afrique chrétienne. Proconsulaire (Rennes, 1892), 214-217; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog., s. v.
S. PÉTRIDES.

MUSIUS, MANUIOS, learned Greek humanist, b. 1470 at Retimo, Crete; d. 1517 at Rome. The son of a rich merchant, he went, when quite young, to Italy, where he studied Greek at Florence, under the celebrated John Lascaris, whom he afterwards almost equally in classical scholarship. In 1503 he became professor of Greek at Padua, where he taught with great success. Later at Venice, he lectured on Greek, at the expense of the republic, and became a member of the Aldine Academy of Hellenists. Musiuros rendered important service to the promotion of the earliest printed editions of the Greek authors, and his handwriting formed the model of Aldus's Greek type. He contributed greatly in giving to the Aldine editions the accuracy that made them famous, while his reputation as a teacher was such that pupils came from all countries to hear him lecture. Erudite, who had attended his lectures at Padua, testifies to his wonderful knowledge of Latin. To his profound scholarship the editions of Aristophanes, Plato, Pindar, Hesychius, Athenaeus, and Pausanias owed their critical correctness. In 1499 he edited the first Latin and Greek lexicon, "Etymologicum Magnum", printed by Zacharias Colliger of Castlereagh, and incunabula are by so much more valuable, the first Greek epigraphs which with the elegy on Plato published in the Aldine edition (Venice, 1513) are about his only extant writings.

BANDITI, History of Classical Scholarship, II (Cambridge, 1908); 1. Foucart, Bibliothèque hellénique, I (Paris, 1885); Duser, Aide Manuus (Paris, 1875).

EDMUND BURKE.

MUTIS, José Celestino, eminent naturalist and scientist in South America, b. at Cadiz, Spain, 6 April, 1732; d. at Bogotá, Colombia, 2 Sept., 1808. Mutis studied medicine at Seville and Madrid and, from 1757, practised as a physician at Madrid, where he applied himself to botany. Soon afterwards he went to Mexico, where, in 1771, he was appointed Viceroy of New Granada, Mesa de la Cerda (Marqués de la Vega). In November, 1760, he landed in Cartagena, and remained in New Granada for five decades. By his great zeal for science and his untiring and versatile activity, he became more and more the soul of all scientific undertakings in Spanish South America. Although he at first taught mathematics and, after the end of his life, founded an observatory in Bogotá and directed the same as astronomer, he devoted his energies almost wholly to researches in the natural history of New Granada, even continuing this work, when, in 1772, he became a cleric (priet?) and canon at the cathedral of Bogotá. During the last years of his life at Bogotá he had planned the botanical exploration of the whole country, intending to write a book on the flora of New Granada. For his researches he maintained subterfuges at Cácase and La Montuosa, which Linné supposed to be situated in Mexico. He settled in Mariquita after he had been appointed in 1783 by Charles III, under the viceroy and Archibishop Gómez, leader of the "Expédition botanique du Nuevo Reino de Granada", which was founded by the State. Here, as Alexander von Humboldt, an eyewitness, relates, Mutis laid out a plantation of cinchona. Mutis was obliged to train his whole staff of assistants (collectors, painters, engravers, etc.; he also taught several native botanists, e. g., Zca, Codias, and Rebeco, afterwards his nephew and successor, Sinforoso Mutis. At that time, Mutis was widely known; Linné, who received from him South American plants and corresponded frequently with him, calls him "phytologist americanorum princeps". Linné's son defined the genus Mutisia in 1781. The Spanish botanist Cavanilles lauded him in 1791 as "botanicorum facile princeps". At Bogotá, where he spent the last ten years of his life, the famous explorers Humboldt and Bonpland stayed with him for two months in 1801, filled with admiration for his rich collections. Their famous work, "Plantae equinoctiales" (1818), is adorned with a beautiful portrait of Mutis, and Humboldt erected a monument to the "illustrious missions" of Mutis, and again in writing his biography ("Biographie universelle", XXX, Paris, 1831).

Subsequent generations were perhaps justified in judging Mutis less favourably, but it is unjust on the part of some critics to seek to degrade Mutis to the position of an unimportant amateur or to abuse him. He committed the same errors as other botanists of his day, but he worked assiduously, and kept up his interest in his studies; he published his results to his own satisfaction, and thus published almost nothing during his life-time. He, furthermore, had the misfortune to have his scientific legacy at first remain totally unnoticed in consequence of the political disorders of that time. His museum consisted of 24,000 dried plants, 5,000 drawings of plants by his pupils, and a collection of woods, shells, resins, minerals, and other natural objects. These treasures arrived safely at Madrid in 105 boxes, and the plants, manuscripts, and drawings were sent to the botanical gardens, where they were buried in a tool-house. Mutis's cinchona investigations render his work of lasting importance. While he was the first to discover the genuineness of the cinchona tree for New Granada—he became known with certainty only after his death—he rendered important services by his study of the cinchonas, their geographical distribution in Colombia, their species and varieties, and their utilization for medicine. This is shown by the trade, which developed in such a manner that e.g. the export of Cinchona bark from New Granada 1,200,000 pounds of cinchona bark in 1806, while previous to 1776 this country produced no quinquina at all. This is furthermore shown by Mutis's writings, which, however, were not printed in full until 1870. Mutis himself published in 1793 and 1794 a short monograph on cinchonas in "El芣o de la quína" in manuscript to Madrid, but the war with France prevented its publication; in 1828 the Spanish physician Fernández de Gregorio edited the first three parts of this work with Mutis's portrait ("El arecado de la quína. Discurso que contiene la parte médica de las cuatro especies de quínacas oficiales", Madrid, 1828, 263 pages). The manuscript of the work was also covered by Clemente R. Markham in a shed in the botanical gardens of Madrid; he published it under the title: "Tabula synoptica ad specierum generis Chin-
chose determinerem. Quinolide parva quarta" (edited in Markham, "The Cichloncha species of New Granada," London, 1867). The tables, which Mutis selected for this work, were published in 1870 in facsimile by Friant, "Nouvelles études sur les Quinolides," Paris. Through the kindness of some special investigators, it was evident, as some special investigators confessed, that Mutis had penetrated deeply into the study of the cinchonias of Central Colombia. It may be mentioned that Mutis distinguished four species of cinchona with an officinal bark, and he added to them twenty-four varieties. For other manuscripts of Mutis see Colmeiro; a part of Mutis's correspondence is to be found in the work: "A selection of the correspondence of Linnaeus and other naturalists" (London, 1801).

C. COLMEIRO, La Boliviana y los Botánicos de la Península Iberica en La Boliviana (Madrid, 1853); MARKEBRE, Forsythia Bark (London, 1880); SCHMIDT, Südamerikanische Studien (Berlin, 1894).

M. ROMPEL.

Mussarelli, Alfonso, a learned Italian Jesuit, b. 22 August, 1749, at Ferrara; d. 25 May, 1813, at Paris. He entered the Jesuit novitiate on 20 October, 1768, and taught grammar at Bologna and Imola. After the suppression of the order in 1773 he received a benefice at Ferrara and, somewhat later, was made director of the Collegio dei Nobili at Parma. Pius VII summoned him to Rome, and appointed him to the office of the Pontifical Treasury. When Pius VII was exiled in 1809, Mussarelli was also obliged to leave Rome and was transported to Paris, where he spent his remaining life at the convent of the Dames de Saint-Michel. He wrote numerous theological, philosophical, and ascetical works. His chief production is a collection of philosophical-theological treatises published repeatedly under the title: "Il buon uso della Logica in materia di Religione" (6 vols., Foligno, 1787-9), with additions by the author (10 vols., Rome, 1807; 11 vols., Florence, 1821-3). The collection contains sketches on the theological questions of the day such as: abuses in the Church, the temporal power of the pope, religious toleration, ecclesiastical immunity, riches of the Church and its clergy, primacy and infallibility of the pope, auricular confession, religious orders, indulgences, Gregory VII, moral liberty, etc. This collection of treatises, with the exception of the last five, was translated into Latin by Zeldmayer de Buzita ("Bonus usus logicae in materia religionis"), Kaeckesch, 1815-7. A French translation of 42 treatises was published in Paris in 1837. Two other important productions of Mussarelli are: "L'Emilio disingannato" (4 vols., Siena, 1782-3) and "La confutazione del contratto sociale di Gian Jacopo Rousseau" (2 vols., Foligno, 1794) — the former is a refutation of Rousseau's "Emile", the latter of his "Contrat social". The most popular of Mussarelli's many ascetical works is "Il mese di Maria o sia di Maggio" (Ferrara, 1785) of which about 100 editions have been issued (new ed., Bologna, 1901). It has been translated into English "The Month of May or the Month of May," London, 1848, 1857; Spanish ("Las Vegas", New Mexico, 1857, 1888); Portuguese (Oporto, 1890); French (Paris, 1851, and often previously); Arabian (4 ed., Beyrout, 1872); and adapted to the German (Mainz, 1883). Another little work that has been translated into English is: "Il buon uso delle vacanze" (Parma, 1798). Its English title is: "A Method of spending the Vacation profitably. Addressed to the Youth who frequent the Schools of the Society of Jesus," London and Dublin, 1848.

Sommervillo, Bibl. de la C. de Jesus, V (Brussel and Paris, 1894), 1488-1514; IX (1900), 705-710; Hettner, Nomenclator. Michael Ott.

Mykonos. See Tinos, Dioecese of.

Mylapur. See Saint Thomas of Mylapur, Dioecese of.

Mylassa, a titular see of Asia Minor, suffragan of Aphirosidae or Stauropolis, in Caria. This city, the ancient capital of Caria, was the home of the kings of the province before that honour passed to Halicarnassus. It was situated on a little promontory, at the foot of a beautiful white marble which was used for the construction or decoration of the city's temples and other buildings. Mylassa was taken by Labienus in the civil wars. In the Greek-Roman period it enjoyed a season of brilliant prosperity, and the three neighbouring towns of Olympe, Labranda, and Euromos were included within the territory of this city. It is dedicated to Zeus Osogos, which recalled to Pausanias (VIII, 3, 3) the Acropolis of Athens, and those of Zeus Karios and of Zeus Labranodos, or Stratios (Strabo, XIV, ii, 23). Mylassa is frequently mentioned by the ancient writers. At the time of Strabo the city boasted of remarkable orators, Euthydemos and Hybreus. Various inscriptions tell us that the Phrygian cults were represented here by the worship of Sabazios; the Egyptian, by that of Isis and Osiris. There was also a temple of Nemesis.

Among the ancient bishops of Mylassa was St. Ephrem (fifth century), whose feast was kept on 23 January, and whose relics were venerated in the church of Father of Pity; the name of Le Quien, Cyril, Cyril Pindar, or Paul, are mentioned by Nicephorus Callistus (Hist. ecle., XIV, 52) and in the Life of St. Xene. Le Quien mentions the names of three other bishops (Oriens christianus, I, 921), and since his time the inscriptions discovered refer to two others, one anonymous (C. I. G., 2571), the other named Basil, who built a church in honour of St. Stephen (see H. C. H., XVIII, 616). The St. Xene referred to above was a noble virgin of Rome who, to escape the marriage which her parents wished to force upon her, donned male attire, left her country, changed her name to Eusebia to that of Xene (stranger), and lived first on the island of Cos, then at Mylassa. The site of the city is now occupied by a little village called Milas, in Mylassa, inhabited by a few hundred schismatic Greeks, and containing some fine ruins. The Cyclopean walls surrounding the sacred enclosure of the temple of Zeus Osogos are still visible, as well as a row of fourteen columns. Focke (Travels, II, 2), in the eighteenth century, saw the temple of Augustus and Xene, the materials of which had been used by the Turks to build a mosque. There is also a twostoried tomb, called Diatoga, believed to be a simplified copy of the famous tomb of Mausolus, who was a native of Mylassa.

Chandler, Asia Minor, 234; Leloir, Asia Minor, 320; Field, Discoveries in Lydia, 67; Ramsay, Historical Geography of Asia Minor (London, 1860); Dorn, The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia (Oxford, 1880); Tcheria, Asia Minor (Paris, 1861), 648; Le Bas and Waddington, Inscriptions d'Asie Mineure, ii, 380-452; Bulletin de l'association hellénique, i, 191-96; V, 31-96; 119; X, 445; XI, 459; XII, 8-17; XIV, 612-223; XV, 349-544; XIX, 613-623; XXII, 421-439; Calmette, Choses d'Orient, II, 332-356; Deschamps, Sur les routes d'Orient (Paris, 1894), 254 sq. S. Salaville.

Myndus, a titular see of Caria, suffragan of Stauropolis. This city, known through its coins and the quite frequent mention made of it by ancient historians and geographers, was inhabited by a Greek colony from Troizen. It was situated on the coast of Caria, lying a little northwest of Halicarnassus on the most northerly of the three Dorian peninsulas. Although a seaport and fortified town, its role was an unimportant one, the chief event in its history being that, aided by Halicarnassus, it repulsed an attack by Alexander the Great. The "Notitiae episcopatum" allude to it as late as the twelfth or thirteenth century as one of the suffragan sees of Stauropolis. However, the names of its bishops are known: Archelaus, who attended the Council of Ephesus in 431; Alphius, who assisted at the Council of Chalcedon in 451; John who was pres-
ent at the Council of Constantinople in 680; and another John who went to the Second Council of Nicaea in 787. Myndus is now the little port of Gümüşhâli Lîmân (Liman-port) in the vilayet of Smyrna where the remains of a pier and some other ruins are to be seen.

Le Quien, Orient chrét., I, 915; Smith, Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography, s. v.; L'Ebre, Asia Minor, 226.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

MYRA, a titular see of Lycia in Asia Minor. The city was from time immemorial one of the chief places in the province. It was situated on the banks of the River Andracos, twenty stadia from the sea (Appian, "Bell. civil.", IV, 82; Strabo, XIV, iii, 7, Pliny, XXXII, 8; Ptolemy, VI, vi, 3; Stephen of Byzantium, s. v.). The hamlet of Andracos served as its port. On his way from Gaza to Rome St. Paul stayed at Myra (Acts, xxvi, 5); at least the "excertus receptus" reads thus, but the Vulgate has substituted Lystra. The Codex Beza, the Gigas Bible, and the ancient Egyptian version also mention Myra after Patara of Lycia (Acts, xxi, I). The "Acta Pauli" probably testifies to the existence of a Christian community at Myra in the second century (Harnack, "Missione und Apologetik des Christentums", 465, 487).

Le Quien, I, 965-70) opens his list of the bishops of this city with St. Nicander, martyred under Domitian about A. D. 95, and whose feast is celebrated 4 November (Acta SS., Nov., II, 225). As to St. Nicholas Thaumaturgus, venerated on 6 December, the "Index" of Theodores Lector (sixth century) is the first document which inscribes his name among the martyrs of Nicaea in 325 (Gelzer, "Patrum Nicenorum nominis", 67, n. 151). Theodosius II made the flourishing city of Myra the capital of Lycia and, it is said, erected there a church to St. Nicholas. Peter, Bishop of Myra composed in defense of the Council of Chalcedon a treatise against St. Nicholas and his followers (Bibliotheca, Codex 23). At the Sixth Ecumenical Council (787) two bishops of Myra, Theodore and Nicholas, assisted, one representing the orthodox party, the other the Iconoclasts.

Eubel ("Hierarchia catholica medii aevi", II, 1370) mentions five Latin titulaires of the fifteenth century. At present Myra is only a village called Dembre in the sanjak of Adalia and the vilayet of Koniah. Its ruins are numbered among the most beautiful of Asia Minor. Among them are the remains of a temple of Apollo, mentioned by Pliny, those of a magnificent theatre, several burial-places hewn in the rock, with tombs inscribed in Lycian and Greek, some of them octagonal. Numerous Christian ruins are also found, among them those of the Church of St. Nicholas, around which Russians have recently erected a monastery.

Fellows, Discoveries in Lycia, I (London, 1857), 189; Spratt and Forrest, Travels in Lycia, I (London, 1847), 131; Teixeira, Asie Mineure, 691-94; Ramsay, St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman citizen, 297, 300, 319; Cunet, La Turquie d'Asie (Paris, 1892), 575-77.

S. SALAVILLE.

MYRNA, a titular see of Asia Minor, suffragan of Ephesus. Herodotus (I, 149) mentions it as one of the eleven cities of Colossae, which says it was built by the Amazon Myrina, also assigned to it an "Eolani" of Gorgon (Geographia, XII, iii, 21; viii, 6; XIII, iii, 6); Xenophon (Hellenica, III, i, 6) relates that Artaxerxes gave it to a chiefman named Gorgon. According to Pliny (Hist. nat., V, 30; XXXII, 6) it was famous for its oysters, and must have borne the name of Sebasteopolis, of which mention appears elsewhere. But there is another clue. The (Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, V, 283) tells us that Myrma formed part of the Kingdom of Pergamus in the third century B.C. Destroyed by an earthquake under Tiberius (Tacitus, "Annales", II, 47) and again under the Emperor Trajan (Orosius, VII, 12), it was each time rebuilt. It was the birth-place of Agathias, a Byzantine poet and historian of the sixth century. The names are known of some of the bishops of this diocese, which still existed in the fourteenth century: Dorotheus, 431; Proterius, 451; John, 553; Cosmas, 787 (Le Quien, "Orients Chrs.", I, 705). The site of Myrina was discovered at a place called Kalabassary in the eaza of Menemen and the vilayet of Smyrna, at the mouth of the Hodja-Tchai, in the ancient Phrygica. The remains of the harbour and the arsenal have disappeared under the alluvia of the river. Excavations (1880-1882) brought to light about four thousand tombs, dating from the two centuries immediately preceding the Christian Era, in which were found numerous objects representing the divinities of the Greek pantheon; children's toys, relics of the animals, etc.; probably these may be seen to-day in the Museum of the Louvre.


S. VALIÈRE.

MYRIOPHYTUM, titular see of Thracia Prima and suffragan of Heraclea. The early history of this city is not known. We find it mentioned for the first time in connexion with an earthquake which destroyed it in the year 1063 of our era (Murault, "Essai de chronologie byzantine", I, II, 3). It was visited by Cyril Lxicene about 1350 (Hist. III, 76). As a suffragan of Heraclea we find it, under the title of Peristasis and Myriophyton, mentioned first in a "Notitia episcopatum" of the end of the fifteenth century (Gelzer, "Ungedruckte . . . Texte der Notitiae episcopatum", 633). The title of Peristasis existed already 1170 (Parthey, "Hisoria Synodeorum", 103). In the sixteenth century Myriophyton displaced Peristasis, and the diocese took the name of Myriophyton and Peristasis (Le Quien, "Orients christianus", I, 1151). No change has since taken place, except that among the Greeks in 1908 it was elevated to an autocephalous metropolitan see. To-day Myriophyton is a rather busy port on the Sea of Marmora; the city numbers 5000 Greeks and 400 Turks. The sedia Archiepiscopal includes only ten parishes with about 22,000 souls, of whom Peristasis alone includes about 6000.

Dandos, Thracika (in Greek, Athens, 1892), 72-83.

S. VALIÈRE.

MYSORA (MAISOUR), DIocese of Mysorensis, in India, suffragan to Pondicherry, comprises the territories of the Mysore native state, the British provinces of Coorg and Collegal, part of Wynad and the taluk of Ossoor, Salem district; surrounded by the dioceses of Madras, Poona, Goa, Mangalore, Coimbatore, and Pondicherry. The Catholic population is about 48,202. The diocese, like the rest of the Pondicherry province, is under the Paris Society of Foreign Missions. The clergy are 65 in number (53 European and 12 native priests), having the care of 123 churches and chapels. They are assisted by the Brothers of the Immaculate Conception, the Brothers of St. Gabriel, the Nuns of the Good Shepherd Order, the Little Sisters of the Poor, the Sisters of St. Joseph of Tarbes, and Native Sisters of St. Anne and also of the Immaculate Conception. The cathedral and the bishop's residence are at Bangalore.

History. — Originally Mysore belonged to the Archdiocese of Goa, but what early mission work was done there is a matter of obscurity. In the Canarese or western portions a mission seems to have been established about the middle of the seventh century, in the eastern or Tulagi portion another mission was brought into existence about the year 1703 by two French Jesuits who came from Vellore and founded churches at Bangalore, Devanhalli, Chikka, Ballapoores, and elsewhere. But their work was stopped and partly destroyed by the fanaticism of the sultan, Tipu (1782—99). The district came under the Foreign
Mission Society of Paris in 1776, which at that date began work at Pondicherry. The celebrated Abbé Dubois (b. 1765, d. 1848), himself a member of the Foreign Missions, spent most of his life among the Canarese Christians of Ganjam, Puthally, and Sattullali (see Dubois). In the Vicariate of the Coromandel Coast (Pondicherry), erected in 1836, but was separated in 1845, and erected into a distinct vicariate-Apostolic in 1850, at the same time as the district of Coimbator. On the establishment of the hierarchy in 1866 it was made into a diocese suffragan to Pondicherry with the same boundaries as now.

**Succession of Prelates.**—**Vicars-Apostolic:** Stephen Louis Charbonaux, 1850-73; Joseph Augustine Chevalier, 1874-1880; Jean-Yves-Marie Coaud, 1880-90 (became first bishop in 1886); second bishop, Eugene-Louis Kleiner, 1900 (absent in Europe since 1903); Augustin Francis Basle, coadjutor with right of succession, 1906, now ruling the diocese.

**Institutions.**—St. Joseph’s College, Bangalore, teaching up to F. A. Standard, with 600 pupils; Bangalore Convent School under the Nuns of the Good Shepherd, with 494 pupils; St. Patrick’s School, Shooli, with 156 pupils; St. Francis Xavier’s School for girls, Cleveland Town, with 138 day-scholars; St. Aloysius School, Bangalore, with 210 pupils; native students of the Immaculate Conception, with 26 students; St. Louis’ Boarding School, with 58 boarders; the Brothers of the Immaculate Conception, training school for teachers, with 10 European students; convent school at Mysore, under the Good Shepherd Nuns, with 185 pupils; St. Joseph’s School, Mysore, with 142 pupils; native Sisters of St. Anne, in charge of five native schools, one for the natives of the Immaculate Conception, girls’ school at Setthally, also a dispensary; Majannah Thumby Cheety School for caste girls, under the Sisters of St. Joseph of Tarbes, Bangalore, with 136 pupils. **Charitable Institutions.**—St. Patrick’s Orphanage, Bangalore, with 100 inmates; St. Martha’s public hospital and dispensary, Bangalore, to charge of the Good Shepherd Nuns, 70 beds; eye infirmary under the same; Little Sisters of the Poor, Bangalore, with 101 inmates; two orphanages at Bangalore and Mysore under the Good Shepherd Nuns with total of 263 inmates; also 2 Magdalene Asylums with 219 inmates. Four agricultural farms for orphans, round which Christian villages have been formed. Four places in the diocese; several small orphanages in country parishes.


Ernest R. Hull.

**Mysteries, Pagan.** See **Paganism.**

**Mystery (Greek μυστήριον, from μύειν, “to shut,” “to close”).**—This term signifies in general that which is unknown, or valuable knowledge that is kept secret. In pagan antiquity the word mystery was used to designate certain esoteric doctrines, such as Pythagoreanism, or certain ceremonies that were performed in private or whose meaning was known only to the initiated, e. g., the Eleusinian rite. The word is also used in the sense of a mystery in the sense of what belongs to the Godhead (see **Discipline of the Secret**). In the New Testament the word mystery is applied ordinarily to the sublime revelation of the Gospel (Matt. xiii, 11; Col. ii, 2; I Tim. iii, 9; I Cor. xv, 51), and to the Incarnation and life of the Saviour and His manifestation by the preaching of the Apostles (Rom. xvi, 25; Eph. iii, 4; vi, 19; Col. i, 26; iv, 3). In conformity with the usage of the inspired writers of the **New Testament** theologians give the name mystery to revealed truths that surpass the powers of natural reason. Mystery, therefore, in its strict theological sense is not synonymous with the incomprehensible, since all that we know as incomprehensible, i. e., not adequately comprehensible as to its interior meaning; nor with the unknowable, since many things merely natural are accidentally unknowable, on account of their inaccessibility, e. g., things that are future, remote, or hidden. In its strict sense a mystery is a supernatural truth, one that of its very nature lies beyond the finite intelligence. Theologians distinguish two classes of supernatural mysteries, the absolute or theological and the relative. An absolute mystery is a truth whose existence or possibility could not be discovered by a creature, and whose essence (inner substantial being) can be expressed by the finite mind only in terms of analogy, e. g., the Trinity. A relative mystery is a truth whose innermost nature alone (e. g., many of the Divine attributes), or whose existence alone (e. g., the positive ceremonial precepts of the Old Law), exceeds the natural knowing power of the creature.

**Catholic Doctrine.**—The existence of theological mysteries is a doctrine of Catholic faith defined by the Vatican Council, which declares: “If any one should deny that in Divine Revelation there are mysteries properly so called (cetera et propria dicta mysteria), but that through reason rightly developed (per rationem rite excultam) all the dogmas of faith can be understood and demonstrated from natural principles: let him be anathema” (cens. III, De fide et ratione, can. 1). This teaching is clearly explained in the **Sermo Speciosissimo**, which was cited in part by the Vatican Council, is I Cor., ii. Shorter passages are especially Eph., iii, 4-9; Col., i, 26-27; Matt., xi, 25-27; John, i, 17-18. These texts speak of a mystery of God, which only infinite wisdom can understand, namely, the designs of Divine Providence and the other life of the Godhead (see also Wisdom, ix, 16-17; Rom. xi, 30). Tradition abounds with testimonies that support this teaching. In the Brief “Gravissimas Inter” (Denzinger, “Enchiridion,” ed. Bannwart, nat. 1666-74), Pius IX defends the doctrine of supernatural mystery by many citations from the works of the Fathers. Numerous other patristic texts that bear on the question are quoted in the “Die Theologie der Vorzeit,” II, 75 sqq.; V, 220 sqq.; and in Schäffler’s “Neue Untersuchungen über das Dogma von der Gnade” (Mainz, 1867), 466 sqq. The manifold excellence of Christian revelation offers many theological arguments for the existence of supernatural mysteries (cf. Scheeben, “Dogmatik,” i, 24).

**Reason and Supernatural Mystery.**—(1) Errors.—The existence of supernatural mysteries is denied by Rationalists and semi-Rationalists. Rationalists object that mysteries are degrading to reason. Their favourite argument is based on the principle that no medium exists between the reasonable and the unreasonable, from which they conclude that the mystery of the Incarnation is not a mystery (Pfeiferer). This argumentation is fallacious, since it confounds incomprehensibility with inconceivableness, superiority to reason with contradiction. The mind of a creature cannot, indeed, grasp the inner nature of the mysterious truth, but it can express that truth by analogies; it cannot fully understand incomprehensibility, but it can still express the mystery of faith, but it can refute successfully the objections which would make a mystery consist of mutually repugnant elements. Rationalists further object that the revelation of mysteries would be useless, since it is the nature of reason to accept only the evident (Toland), and since the knowledge of the incomprehensible can have no influence on the moral life of mankind (Kant). To
answer the first objection we have only to recall that there is a twofold evidence: the internal evidence of a thing in itself, and the external evidence of trustworthy authority. The mysteries of revelation, like the facts of history, are supported by external evidence and therefore they are evidently credible. The second difficulty rests on a false assumption. The religious life of the Christian is rooted in his faith in the supernatural, which is an anticipation of the beatific vision (St. Thomas, "Comp. Theol., ad fratrem Reg.," cap. ii,); a profound act of religious homage (cf. Cutrerler, "Apologia," II, 2 ed., Münster, 1855, 23). Some Rationalists, trusting to far-fetched similarities, pretend that the Christian mysteries were borrowed from the religious and philosophical systems of Panagon. A study of the origin of Christian suffices to show the absurdity of such an explanation. Semi-Rationalism explains mysteries either as purely natural truths expressed in symbolic language (Schelling, Bader, Sabatier), or as solvable problems of philosophy (G. W. Leibniz). The errors of both were condemned in a pontifical letter to the Archbishop of Cologne in 1587, and in another to the Bishop of Breslau in 1860 (Denzinger, "Enchiridion," ed. Bannwart, nn. 1655-1688); those of Froshammer, in the Brief "Gravisissimae Inter.," 11 Dec., 1862.

(2) Relations of Natural and Supernatural Truth. — (a) Authority. — The mysteries contained in supernatural revelation are not simply disconnected truths lying beyond the realm of natural things, but a higher, heavenly world, a mystical cosmos whose parts are united in a living bond. (Scheeben, "Dogmatik," I, 25.) Even in those parts of this vast system that have been revealed to us that is the beatum (ibid., 16). In his treatise, "Das Mysterien des Christentums," Scheeben has sought to show the logical connexion in the supernatural order by considering its supreme mystery, the internal communication of Divine life in the Trinity, as the model and ideal of the external communication to the creature of the Divine life of grace and glory. This supernatural is more real than any human wisdom, because, although incomplete, it has a nobler object, and through its dependence on the unfailing word of God possesses a greater degree of certitude. The obscurity which surrounds the mysteries of faith results from the weakness of the human intellect; which, like the eye that gazes on the sun, is blinded by the fulness of light. (b) Harmony of Natural and Supernatural Truth. — Since all truth is from God, there can be no real warfare between reason and revelation. Supernatural mysteries as such cannot be demonstrated by reason, but the Christian apologist can always show that the truths of his Mysticism are the necessary and the conclusive (St. Thos., "Suppl. Boot. de trinitate," Q. ii, a. 3). The nature of God, which is infinite and eternal, must be incomprehensible to an intelligence that is not capable of perfect knowledge (cf. Zigliara, "Propedectica," I, ix). The powerlessness of science to solve the mysteries of nature, a fact that Rationalists admit, shows how limited are the resources of the human intellect (cf. Daumer, "Das Reich des Widersammen und Geheimnisvollen," Ratisbon, 1872). On the other hand reason is able not only to recognize wherein consists the special mysteriousness of a supernatural truth, but also to dispel to some extent the obscurity by means of natural analogies and to show the way in which the constituent individuals are united, as are also the members of a body, to effect a common end: while the parts they severally play correspond to the functions of the bodily organs. They form a moral unity. This, of course, is true of the Church, but the Church has also a unity of a higher order: it is not merely a moral but a mystical body. This truth, that the Church is the mystical body of Christ, all its members being guided and directed by Christ the head, is set forth by St. Paul in various passages, more especially in Ephesians, iv, 4–13 (cf. John, xv, 5–8). The doctrine may be summarized as follows: (1) The members of the Church are bound together by a supernatural life communicated to them by Christ (ibid., 5). Christ is the centre and source of life to Whom all are united, and Who endows each one with gifts fitting him for his position in the body (ibid., 7–12). These graces, through which each is equipped for his work, form it into an organized whole, whose parts are knit together as though by a system of ligaments and joints (ibid., 6). (2) The Church has its growth and increase, growing in extension as it spreads through the world, and intensively as the individual Christian develops in himself the likeness of Christ (ibid., 13–15). (3) In virtue of this union the Church is the fulness or complement (νηστίου) of Christ (Eph. i, 23). It forms one whole with Him, and the Apostle even speaks of the Church as "Christ" (I Cor. xii, 12). (4) This union between head and members is conserved and nourished by the Holy Eucharist. Through this sacrament our incorporation into the Body of Christ is alike outwardly symbolized and inwardly actualized. "We being many are one bread, one body; for we all partake of the one bread and one body." (1 Cor. x, 17.)

G. H. JOTICE.

Mystical Phenomena. See THEOLOGY, MYSTICAL.

Mystical Sense of Holy Scripture. See EXEGESIS.

Mystical Theology. See THEOLOGY, MYSTICAL.

Mysticism (from μυστήριον, to initiate), according to its etymology, implies a relation to mystery. In philosophy, Mysticism is either a religious tendency and characteristic of the human soul, or a system of thinking with the Divinity, or a system growing out of such a tendency and desire. As a philosophical system, Mysticism considers as the end of philosophy the direct union of the human soul with the Divinity through contemplation and love, and attempts to determine the processes and the means of realizing that end. This contemplation, according to Mysticism, is not based on a merely analogical knowledge of the Infinite, but on a direct and immediate intuition of the Infinite. According to its tendency, it may be either speculative or practical, as it limits itself to mere knowledge or traces duties for action and life; contemplative or affective, according to the object of the mystic's meditation being the nature or the part of the will; orthodox or heterodox, according as it agrees with or opposes the Catholic teaching. We shall give a brief historical sketch of
MYSTICISM and its influence on philosophy, and present a criticism of it.

Professor J. S. Mill.—In his "History of Philosophy", Cousin mentions four systems, between which, he says, philosophical thought has continually wandered, viz., Sensism, Idealism, Scepticism, and Mysticism. Whatever may be thought of this classification, it is true that Mysticism has exercised a large influence on philosophy, becoming at times the basis of whole systems, but always working as an element into their constitution. Mysticism dominated in the symbolic philosophy of ancient Egypt. The Taoism of the Chinese philosopher Lao-tse is a system of metaphysics and ethics in which Mysticism is a fundamental element (cf. De Harles, "Laozte, le premier philosophe chinois", in "Memoires couronnees et autres de l'Academie des Sciences, lettere et arts"). The same may be said of Indian philosophy; the end of human reflection and effort in Brahmanism and Vedantism is to deliver the soul from its transmigrations and absorb it into Brahma forever. There is little of Mysticism in the first schools of Greek philosophy, but it already takes a large place in the system of Plato, e.g., in his theory of the soul and the transcendent ideas, and in his doctrine of recollection and intuition. The Alexandrian Jew Philo (30 B.C.—A.D. 50) combined these Platonic elements with the data of the Old Testament, and taught that every man, by freeing himself from matter and receiving illumination from God, may reach the mystical, ecstatic state of soul and body (καθαρσις, καιρος), matter inactive, and the principle of perfection. The human soul had its existence in the world-soul until it was united with matter. The end of human life and of philosophy is to realize the mystical return of the soul to God. Fleeing itself from the sensuous world by purification (καθαρσις), the human soul ascends by successive steps through the various degrees of the metaphysical order, until it unites itself with the world-soul, as it unites itself with the One, and sinks into it; it is the state of ecstasy.

With the admission of Mysticism into the Church, the Christian Church enters into a new period. The Fathers recognized indeed the partial truth of the pagan system, but they pointed out also its fundamental errors. They made a distinction between reason and faith, philosophy and theology; they acknowledged the aspirations of the soul, but, at the same time, they emphasized its essential inability to penetrate the mysteries of Divine life. They taught that the vision of God is the work of grace and the reward of eternal life; in the present life only a few souls, by a special grace, can reach it. On these principles, the Christian school of Alexandria opposed the true gnosis based on grace and faith to the Gnostic heresies. St. Augustine teaches indeed that we know the essence of things in rationibus exteris, but this knowledge has its starting point in the data of sense (cf. Quæstiones, LXXXIII, c. xlv). Pseudo-Dionysius, in his various works, gave a systematic treatment of Christian Mysticism, carefully distinguishing between rational and mystical knowledge. By knowledge, he means knowledge through the order of the universe, but through the wonderful order of the universe, which is a participation of the divine ideas ("De Divinis Nominibus", c. vii, §§ 2–3, in P. G., III, 887 sq.). There is, however, he adds, a more perfect knowledge of God possible in this life, beyond the attainments of reason even enlightened by faith, through which the soul contemplates directly the mysteries of Divine life. The contemplation of life is possible only to a few privileged souls, through a very special grace of God: it is the θεομορφία, the "wondrous image".

The works of Pseudo-Dionysius exercised a great influence on the following ages. John Scotus Erigena (ninth century), in his "De Divinæ Naturæ", took them as his guide, but he neglected the distinction of this master, identifying as anathema alike the dogma of the Trinity and of Christ. His position was adopted by the Romish Church, and there was also a restatement of Erigena’s principles with Amaury de Bène, Joachim de Floris, and David of Dinant. A legitimate element of Mysticism, more or less emphasized, is found in the works of the Schoolmen of the thirteenth century. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries there was, as a protest against a formalism that was crowning the edifice of scholastic philosophy, a new mystical movement (cf. J. Ruysbroek, Gerson, Peter d’Ailly, Denys the Carthusian, and others). In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the "Theologia Germanica", and, to a certain extent, Nicholas of Cusa (1401–84) with his theory of the coincidentia oppositorum. Protestantism, by its negation of all ecclesiastical authority and by avowing the "real presence" of Christ in the Eucharist, found a new forum for the logical outcome in the Mysticism of its most pantheistic exponents.

Protestant Mysticism is represented by Sebastian Frank (1490–1542), by Valentine Weiler (1533–88), and especially by J. Böhme (1575–1624), who, in his "Aurora", conceived the nature of God as containing in itself the energies of good and evil, and identified the Divine nature with the human soul whose operation is to kindle, according to its free will, the fire of good or the fire of evil (cf. Deuszen, "J. Böhme ueber sein Leben und seine Philosophie", Kiel, 1897). Reuchlin (1455–1522) developed a system of cabalistic Mysticism in his "De arte cabalistica" and his "De verbo mirifico". We may also assign to its influence of Mysticism the ontological system of Matthias von Rapperswil and the Ontologists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The romantic Mysticism of Fichte (1762–1814), Novalis (1772–1801), and Schelling (1775–1854) was a reaction against the Rationalism of the eighteenth century. A pseudo-Mysticism is also the logical outcome of the Idealism and evolutionary Subjectivism of modern Protestants, inaugurated by Lessing (1728–81), developed by Schleiermacher (1768–1834), A. Ritschl (1822–89; cf. Goyau, "L’Allemagne Religieuse, Le Protestantisme" 6th ed., Paris, 1906), Sabinier, etc., and accepted by the Modernists in their theories of vital immamance and religious experience (cf. Encyclopædica "Pascendi"). See Modernism.

Carriccius.—A tendency so universal and so persistent as that of Mysticism, which appears among all peoples and influences philosophical thought more or less throughout all centuries, must have some real foundation in human nature. There is indeed in the human soul a natural desire for, an aspiration towards, the highest. The highest, not the highest, but the infinite good. We know by experience and observation that the knowledge and enjoyment of created things cannot give the fulness of truth and the perfection of beatitude which will completely satisfy our desires and aspirations. There is in our soul a capacity for...
more truth and perfection than we can ever acquire through the knowledge of created things. We realise that God alone is the end of man, that in the possession of God alone we can reach the satisfaction of our aspirations. Cf. S. Thom., Theol., I, Q. ii, a. 1, ad 1um; Q. xii, a. 1; Q. xliv, a. 4, ad 3um; I-II, Q. iii, a. 8; “Contra Gentes”, III, cc. i, xxv, 1; “De Veritate”, Q. xxii, a. 2; “Compend. Theologie”, 104, etc. Cf. Sestili, “De naturali intelligentia animae appetitu intundii divinam essentiam”, Rome, 1896. But the rational effort of our intelligence and positive aspirations of our will find here their limits. Is there truly possible a union of our reason and will with God more intimate than that which we possess through created things? Can we expect more than a knowledge of God by analogical concepts and more than the beatitude proportionate to that knowledge? Here human reason cannot answer. But where reason was powerless, philosophers gave way to feeling and imagination. They dreamt of an intuition of the Divinity, of a direct contemplation and immediate possession of God. They imagined a notion of the universe and of human nature that would make possible such a union. They built systems in which the world and the human soul were considered as an emanation or part of the Divinity, or at least as containing something of the Divine essence and Divine ideas. The logical outcome was Pantheism.

This result was a clear evidence of error at the starting-point. The Catholic Church, as guardian of Christian doctrine, through her teaching and theologians, gave the solution of the problem. She asserted the limits of human reason: the human soul has a natural capacity (potentia obedientialis), but no exigency and no positive ability to reach God otherwise than by analogical knowledge. She condemned the immediate vision of the Beghards and Beguines (cf. Denzinger-Bannwart, “Enchiridion”, nn. 474–5), the pseudo-Mysticism of Eckhart (ibid., nn. 501–29), and Molinos (ibid., nn. 2121–88), the theories of the Ontologists (ibid., nn. 1859–65, 1891–1930), and Pantheism under all its forms (ibid., nn. 1801–5), as well as the vital Immanence and religious experience of the Modernists (ibid., nn. 2071–109). But she teaches that, what man cannot know by natural reason, he can know through revelation and faith; that what he cannot attain to by his natural power he can reach by the grace of God. God has gratuitously elevated human nature to a supernatural state. He has assigned as its ultimate end the direct vision of Himself, the Beatific Vision. But this end can be reached only in the next life; in the present life we can but prepare ourselves for it with the aid of revelation and grace. To some souls, however, even in the present life, God gives a very special grace by which they are enabled to feel His sensible presence: this is true mystical contemplation. In this act, there is no annihilation or absorption of the creature into God, but God becomes intimately present to the created mind and this, enlightened by special illuminations, contemplates with ineffable joy the Divine essence.

GREGORI, Gesch. der deutschen Mystik im Mittelalter (Leipsig, 1881); SCHMID, Der Mysticismus in seiner Entstehungsperiode (Jena, 1924); GÖBBELS, Die obrקלי. Mystik (Ratisbon, 1538–42); CROZAT, Histoire générale de la philosophie (Paris, 1853); IDEM, Du Vrai, du Beau et du Bien (23rd ed., Paris, 1881); GENNARI, Del falso Mysticoismo (Rome, 1907); DELACHaux, Essais sur le mysticisme spirituel en Allemagne au xvi siècle (Paris, 1900); ÜBERWEG, Hist. of Philos., tr. Morris with additions by PORTER (New York, 1894); DE WULF, Hist. de la Philos. médievale (Louvain, 1900); TURNER, Hist. of Philos. (Boston, 1903).

GEORGE M. SAUVAGE.

Mysticism, Theological. See Theology, Mystical.

Mythology. See Paganism.
Nabonucedonosor.—The Babylonian form of the name is Nabu-kudurri-usur, the second part of which is variously interpreted ("O Nebo, defend my crown", or "tiara", "empire", "landmark", "work"). The original has been more or less defaced in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin transliterations, from which are derived the modern English forms, Nabuchodonosor, Nebuchadnezzar, and Nebuchadrezzar. On the whole, Nabuchodonosor appears to be nearer to the original Babylonian pronunciation than Nebuchadrezzar and especially Nebuchadnezzar (A. V., Ezra, ii, 1) taken from the Massoretic transliteration, and would be still nearer if the "é" were restored to the second element where "é" has crept in. Two kings of this name are known to have ruled over Babylon.

Nabuchodonosor I (c. 1152–1124), is the most famous monarch of the dynasty of Pashi or Isin. A prince of untiring energy, he led the Chaldea armies east and west, against the Lulubi, Elam, and Syria, and although twice defeated by the Assyrian king, Ashshur-shesh-ishi, succeeded in arresting for a time the decay of the first Babylonian Empire (see Babylon, II, 183).

Nabuchodonosor II is often mentioned in various parts of Holy Writ, and will claim our especial attention here. He was the oldest son of Nabopolassar, the Chaldean restorer of Babylonian independence. His long reign of forty-three years (c. 605–562 B.C.) marks the zenith of the grandeur reached by the short-lived second Babylonian Empire (625–538). Although we possess long inscriptions of Nabuchodonosor, yet as these deal chiefly with the account of his architectural undertakings, our knowledge of his history is incomplete, and we have to rely for information mostly on the Bible, Berosus, and Greek historians. Of the wars he waged either before or after his coming to his father's throne, nothing need be said here: their recital can be read in this Encyclopaedia, II, 183–84; only let it be remarked that after the Cimmerians and Scythians were definitively crushed, all his expeditions were directed westwards, although a powerful neighbour lay to the North: the cause of this was that a wise political marriage with Amuthia, the daughter of the Median king, had insured a lasting peace between the two empires.

Nabuchodonosor seems to have prided himself on his constructions more than on his victories. During the last century of Ninevah's existence Babylon had been greatly devastated, not only at the hands of Sennacherib and Assurbanipal, but also as a result of her own renewed rebellions. Having heard of his father's work of reconstruction, aimed at making his capital one of the world's wonders. Old temples were restored; new edifices of incredible magnitude (Diodor. of Sicily, II, 95; Herodot., I, 183) were erected to the many gods of the Babylonian pantheon; to complete the royal palace begun by Nabopolassar, nothing was spared, neither "cedar-wood, nor bronze, gold, silver, rare and precious stones"; an underground passage and a stone bridge connected the two parts of the city separated by the Euphrates; the city itself was rendered impregnable by the construction of a triple line of walls. Nor was Nabuchodonosor's activity confined to the capital; he is credited with the building of the Tower of Babel, the opening of a port on the Persian Gulf, and the building of the famous Median wall between the Tigris and the Euphrates to protect the country against incursions from the North: in fact, there is scarcely a place around Babylon where his name does not appear and where traces of his activity are not found.

These gigantic undertakings required an innumerable host of workmen: from the inscription of the great temple of Marduk (Meissner, "Assyr. Studien", II, in "Mitteil. der Vorderas. Ges.", 1904, III), we may infer that most probably captives brought from various parts of Western Asia made up a large part of the labouring force used in all public works.

From Nabuchodonosor's inscriptions and from the number of temples erected or restored by this prince we gather that he was a very devout man. What we know of his history shows him to have been of a humane disposition, in striking contrast with the wanton cruelty of most of the iron-souled Assyrian rulers. It was owing to this moderation that Jerusalem was not captured and repeatedly sacked and finally destroyed only when its destruction became a political necessity; rebel princes easily obtained pardon, and Nebuchadnezzar himself, whose ungratefulness to the Babylonian king was particularly odious, would, had he manifested less stubbornness, have been treated with greater indulgence (Jer., xxxviii, 17, 18); Nabuchodonosor showed much consideration to Jeremiah, leaving him free to accompany
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the exiles to Babylon or to remain in Jerusalem, and appointing one of the Prophet's friends, Godolias, to the governorship of Jerusalem; he granted likewise such a share of freedom to the exiled Jews that some rose to a position of prominence at Court and Baruch thought it a duty to exhort his fellow-countrymen to have the welfare of Babylon at heart and to pray for her king. After Baruch in 739 had passed the middle of his life, Nabuchodonosor, inspired from on high, prophesied the impending ruin to the Chaldean Empire (Berosus and Abydenus in Eusebius, "Prep. Evang.", IX, xii). The Book of Daniel (iv) records how God punished the pride of the great monarch. On this mysterious chastisement, which some think connected with the madness called apoplexy as well as on the interregnum which it must have caused, Babylonian annals are silent: clever hypotheses have been devised either to explain this silence, or in scanning documents in order to find in them traces of the wanted interregnum (see Oppert, "Expedit. en Mesopot." I, 186-187; Vigouroux, "La Bible et les decouvertes modernes", IV, 337). Nabuchodonosor died in Babylon between the second and sixth months of the forty-third year of his reign.


CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

Nacchiante (Naclantus). Giacomo, Dominican theologian, b. at Florence, d. at Chioggia, 6 May, 1454, where Michael iguatus afterwards Pius V, was his fellow-student. He subsequently taught philosophy and theology for a number of years, in the college of St. Thomas of Minerva, Rome. Paul III, struck with his talents, made him Bishop of Chioggia (3 June, 1544). At the Council of Trent his vigorous protest against the words of the decree of the IV Session (8 April, 1546), which asserts that the traditions of the Church are to be received with the same reverence and piety as the Scriptures, cast some suspicions on his orthodoxy; but he gave a reverent assent to the decree, when he saw it confirmed by the authority of so great an assembly. Other serious suspicions of his orthodoxy seem afterwards to have been formed. As for his remark, his see is vindicated from such charges by the grave affairs of trust which were assigned him under Pius IV. His works were published by Pietro Fratino at Venice in 1567. Among the more important are "Enarrationes . . . in ep. D. Pauli ad Ephesios", "In ep. ad Romam", "S. Scriptura medulla"; "Tractata in XVIII theologales"; "Theoremata metaphysica"; "Theoremata theologicae".

HUNTER, Nomenclator Literarum, I, 28, 29; QÜSTP, Script. Ord. Pr., II, 202; SYMESBER, in Kirchenlexikon, s. v.

EDWARD P. GARESCHÉ.

Nachtagl (Nachtagall). See Luscinius, Ottmar.

Naccola (Nacoleia).—A titular metropolitan see in Phrygia Salutaris. This town, which took its name from the nymph Nacolla, had no history in antiquity. It was there that Valens deified the usurper Procopius; under Arcadius it was occupied by a garrison of Goths who revolted against the emperor. At first dependent on Synnada, the see became autocephalous between 787 and 802, and metropolitan between 1035 and 1066. Seven of its bishops are known, among them being Constantine, one of the chief supporters of Iconoclasms under Leo the Isaurian, who rejoiced to abjure his error before the patriarch, St. Germanus, and was condemned as an hereapist at the Second Council of Nicea (787). Nacolla is the modern village of Seyyid el-Ghâzi, chief town of Nahi, in the Villayet of Brusa, about twenty-two miles southeast of Eski Sheir. The name of the village is derived from Seyyid (Sidi) el-Battâl, an Arab sheikh who died in 1011, near the Isaurian, and buried in a tekke of Bektashi dervishes founded by the mother of the Seljukian sultan, Aladdin the Great. Seyyid el-Ghâzi contains some unimportant ruins.


S. PéTRIDES.

Nagasaki, Diocese of (Nagasakiensis).—Nagasaki, capital of the prefecture (ken) of the same name, is situated on a small peninsula on the south-eastern coast of the Island of Kiushiu, Japan. Its harbour, enclosed on three sides by mountains sloping down to the sea-shore and sheltered on the fourth (the entrance) by numerous islands, is one of the safest and most important in Japan. Being the first port of entry for vessels coming from the south and west, it is also one of the leading coal-stations of the Far East. The principal industries of the town are the manufacture of engines and ship-building. It imports mainly cotton, coal, sugar, and petroleum; among its exports are coal-tar, flour, cephalopod, and tobacco. In the first ten centuries of our era there are no certain references to the town under no less than seven distinct names, of which Fukayone Ora (Fukay Bay) is the best known. Its present name is probably derived from a certain Nagasaki Kotaro, who, about 1185-90, received Fukayone Ora as his fief. Prior to the arrival of the Christian missionaries, however, Nagasaki was an insignificant village.

Although St. Francis Xavier's missionary labours in Japan were confined to the territory now included in the Diocese of Nagasaki, and the ecclesiastical history of this territory is practically identical with the early Christian history of Japan, the town of Nagasaki appears not to have been visited by the missionaries until 1509. In this year Father Vilela, S.J., erected a church on the site of a pagoda which had been given him by the Christian lord of the district, and in 1571 had already made 1500 converts. In 1570 the Portuguese began trading with Nagasaki. Yimayemon, the imperial governor of the province, received them kindly, and, perhaps too confidently, conducted them thence alone, and thus to prevent others from obtaining firearms, affected to favour the Christian religion. When, however, the traders and missionaries, as a safeguard against future oppression, insisted on his recognizing the ecclesiastical authority over the territory of Nagasaki, he showed great hesitation and yielded to their wishes only when the missioners themselves withdrew and chose some other headquarters if their request were refused. From the arrival of the foreigners dates the rapid growth of Nagasaki, numbers of the native merchants settling in the town in the hope of enriching themselves by foreign commerce. By 1587 the last traces of the Buddhist and Shinto religions had vanished from the district, which already contained three principal churches (called by the Japanese Ki-kwan or "strange sight") and numerous chapels. To 1587 must also be referred Hideyoshi's sudden change of attitude towards Christianity (see Japan). Influenced by the bonzes' insinuations concerning the ultimate end of their missioners, he issued, during a month's fast, (24 July), a decree prohibiting the practice of that religion and ordering the Jesuits to leave Japan within twenty days. Subsequently, however, the taiko grew calmer and consented to ten fathers remaining at Nagasaki, nor did he adopt any active measures to suppress Christianity as long as outward respect was shown for his decrees.

Edward F. Garesché.
The San Felipe incident, however (see JAPAN), led to a new persecution in 1596, and twenty-six missionaries (6 Franciscans, 3 Jesuits, and 17 Japanese Christians) were crucified at Nagasaki in 1597. Persistent rumors that the talk was to revisit Kiushiu in person led the Governor of Nagasaki, who had previously shown himself not unfavourable towards the Christians, to send a force to destroy the churches and residences of the missionaries in 1598. In the territory of the present Diocese of Nagasaki 137 churches of the Jesuits were demolished, as well as their college in Amakusa and their seminary in Arima. The death of Hideyoshi on 16 Sept., 1598, put an end to this persecution. Ieyasu, anxious to promote commerce with the Philippines, allowed free ingress to the missionary nations, and issued a charter that set no conditions; all who should receive baptism, showed at first no hostility to Christianity. In 1603 Nagasaki, the population of which had grown from about 2500 to 24,500 in fifty years, possessed eleven churches. About 1612 or 1613 the shoguns—assisted, it is to be feared, by some English and Dutch captains—succeeded in thoroughly alarming Ieyasu as to some imaginary intrigue between certain of his officers and the representatives of Philip III of Spain and Portugal. On 27 January, 1614, orders were issued for the expulsion of the missionaries and the destruction of the churches. In 1622, Nagasaki was the scene of the "Great Martyrdom." (See Martyrs, Japanese.) In 1629 the expulsion was completed, or temporarily for the Jesuits, who were at last allowed to bring about the introduction of paper pictures, which were first used, but later more durable images were utilized—at first wood, and still later (1669) 20 bronze images cast by an engraver of Nagasaki from metal obtained from the altars of the demolished churches. Between the 4th and 9th day of the first month of each year all suspect Christians were required to submit to the test of fire upon the threatened loss of all they possessed. Those who refused were banished from their homes, and when again caught, if still recalcitrant, were taken to the boiling springs of Shimabara and thrown in, or subjected to crucifixion and various kinds of refined torture. Loaded into action by such persecution and by the miseries consequent on the suppression of the religious houses, which had been the only source of alleviation for the needs of the impoverished peasantry, the people rose in revolt, in 1637, but, after some fierce fighting, were crushed by the shogun's forces, assisted by Dutch artillery. In 1640 four Portuguese envoy.s from Macao were seized at Nagasaki, and, on refusing to apostatize, were put to death.

For more than two centuries after 1640, Japan was practically closed to the outside world. The persistent attempts of missionaries to penetrate into the country during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had no other success than that of winning them the martyr's crown. The discovery of a large body of Christians by Father Petijean on 17 March, 1805, when he was establishing the first Catholic church in Nagasaki, after the reopening of Japan to the missionaries, has been referred to in the article JAPAN. In 1806 this zealous missionary was created Bishop of Myriophye and Vicar Apostolic of Japan, and in 1876, on the division of the territory into two vicariates, he retained the administration of Southern Japan (1879-85). On the cessation of persecution (see JAPAN), Mgr Petijean devoted his whole energy to winning back into the Fold the descendants of the old Christians, organizing the first Christian districts, and founding a seminary for the formation of a native clergy. He was succeeded as Bishop of Osaka by Father Mgr. Cousin (5, April, 1842), now Bishop of Nagasaki. Father Cousin landed in Japan in 1866, and was the first missionary to penetrate into the Goto Islands. In 1869 he founded the first Catholic station at Osaka, where he laboured for eighteen years. Created Bishop of Aomori in 1885, on succeeding Mgr Petijean, he fixed his residence at Nagasaki, when Southern Japan was divided into two vicariates, in 1887. In 1890 the First Synod of Japan was held at Nagasaki, of which Mgr Cousin became first bishop, on the establishment of the Japanese hierarchy, in 1891. In 1897 the third centennial of the twenty-six Japanese martyrs, canonized by Pius IX in 1867, was celebrated by the construction and solemn consecration of the new cathedral of Nagasaki. The episcopal jubilee of Bishop Cousin was celebrated in 1910. During his episcopate of twenty-five years, Bishop Cousin has laboured to increase the native clergy and to extend the work of the mission. He has ordained 40 Japanese priests, founded 35 new stations (with residences), established 103 parochial churches, and erected 60 churches and chapels. During his administration the Catholic population has more than doubled.

The Diocese of Nagasaki includes Kiushiu and the neighbouring islands—Amakusa, Goto, Iketsuki, Tsushima, Oshima, and the Ryukyu (Lu Chu) Archipelago. The total population is about 7,584,900; the Catholic population was 47,104 on 15 Aug., 1910 (23,000 in 1885). The personnel of the mission is: 1 bishop, 36 missionaries (French), 26 diocesan priests (Japanese), 6 tonsured clerics, 35 native (male or female) catechists labouring for the conversion of pagans, 350 catechists entrusted with the instruction of the Christian communities, 15 itinerant baptizers (female, 12, male, 3), 962 religious sisters, including 17 of education and charity, are: 17 Brothers of Mary (14 foreigners, including 3 priests), 21 Sisters of the Holy Child Jesus (Chauffailles—5 Japanese), 16 Franciscan Sisters (Missionaries of Mary), 8 Sisters of St. Paul of Chartres (3 Japanese), 10 communities of native women, with 177 members. The establishments include: 40 missions, mostly in 35 sub-stations; 153 Christian communities; 67 blessed churches and chapels; 52 unblessed oratories and chapels; 1 seminary with 31 students (8 theological; 4 philosophical; 19 studying Latin); 1 Apostolic school with 18 pupils (10 postulants of the Brothers of Mary); 1 college, primary and commercial, with 325 pupils (30 boarders); 1 school for women catechists, with 15 pupils; 3 boarding-houses for girls with 224 pupils; 1 professional school, with 18 pupils: 1 primary school for girls, with 149 pupils; 2 kindergartens, with 149 pupils, 8 orphanages, with 64 children (65 boarders); 2 workrooms, with 39 workers; 1 leper asylum, with 28 patients; 3 hospitals, with 479 patients (4005 patients cared for); 15 conference halls for religious instruction (total number of hearers about 2730). The Brothers of Mary have the direction of the Apostolic school and the college. The Sisters of the Holy Child Jesus manage 2 boarding-houses (high-schools), the professional school, primary school, kindergartens, 2 orphan asylums, 1 hospital dispensary, 1 conference hall, and 1 work-room. The Francisca Sisters have charge of the leper asylum, 1 hospital, 3 dispensaries, 2 conference halls, 1 orphan asylum, and 1 work-room; the Sisters of St. Paul of Chartres; 1 boarding-house (high-school), 1 hospital dispensary, 1 conference hall, and 1 orphan asylum. As the State insists on the attendance of all children between the ages of six and twelve at the secular public primary schools, parochial schools are practically impossible in Japan. The administrative statistics for the year ending 15 Aug., 1910, are: baptisms of adults, 592 (208 in extremis and 384 abjurations); baptisms of pagan children (in extremis), 811; baptisms of taostic children (in extremis), 29,414; paedical denominations, 25,015; Holy Viaticums, 340; extreme unctions, 476; marriages, 323; known deaths, 1097; increase, 1179.

In addition to the works named under JAPAN, consult Travels in Japan and Christianity in the Year 1854 (Feb. 28th to June 12th) by WOOLEY, Hist. Notes on Nagasaki in Asiatic Society of Japan: Transactions, IX ( Yokohama, 1881), 125-51; CATH. Hist. of

THOMAS KENNEDY.

NAGPUR, DIocese OF (NAGPURensis), in India, sufragans to Madras. Formerly the north-western portion of the Vicariate Apostolic of Vizagapatam, it was erected into a diocese on 29 July, 1887, and its boundaries finally readjusted on 10 July, 1895. It comprises the greater portion of the Central Provinces, Berar, a portion of the Indore State, a strip of the Nisam's dominions as far south as the Godavere River, etc., the boundaries being in many parts independent of civil divisions. The area is about 124,000 square miles with a Catholic population of 15,000 out of a total population of 3,500,000 inhabitants. The diocese is divided by 28 priests of the Congregation of the Missionaries of St. Francis de Sales, Annecy, and 7 secular clergy, assisted by 7 brothers of the above congregation; 13 Franciscan Brothers from Paderborn in Germany; 4 Sisters of St. Joseph from St. Jean de Maurienne, Savoy; 23 Daughters of the Cross; and 28 Catechist Sisters of Mary Immaculate. The diocese has 12 churches and 53 chapels. The cathedral, bishop's residence, and diocesan seminary are at Nagpur.

HISTORY.—Although the territories comprised under Nagpur were included within the Vicariate of the Great Mogul, there is no trace of any missionary ever having set foot there till the beginning of the nineteenth century. Both Ajmer, Nizamabad, and Jaunlah were first visited by priests of the Goan jurisdiction, from Pooa, about 1514. A chapel in honour of St. Anthony existed at Takli, suburb of Nagpur, where the troops of the Raja of Nagpur were quartered. Another was built in Kamptee, and held in great veneration by native Christians. A Goan priest died there in 1683. Some other Goan priests established themselves at Aurangabad, and built a chapel in honour of St. Francis Xavier in 1816; another chapel was built by them at Karran, two miles from Aurangabad. Military cantonments for British troops were created at Kamptee in 1821, and at Jaunlah in 1827. The Goan priests retained their jurisdiction in these parts until 1839, when, in consequence of the Apostolic Brief "Multa praecrite" of 24 April, 1838, the district fell to the jurisdiction of the Vicar Apostolic of Madras. In January, 1839, priests from Madras took possession of Kamptee and Jaunlah. They were Fathers Brecan (died 1844) and Egon at Kamptee from 1839-44. Father Brecan was at the same time superintendent of the hospital, whose registers are preserved in the bishop's residence at Nagpur, subsequently became Vicar Apostolic of Hyderabad and then Archbishop of Hobart Town, Tasmania, where he died in 1908. In 1845 some missionaries of St. Francis de Sales, from Annecy (Savoy, France), were appointed to the charge of the northern portion of the Vicariate of Madras, which was thus separated and made into the Vicariate of Vizagapatam. They took possession of Aurangabad, Jaunlah, and Kamptee in 1846, and visited Nagpur, Ellibelpur (1849), Jubbulpur (1850), and Khandwa. Jubbulpur became a military cantonment in 1857. From 1846 to 1870 Nagpur was a sub-station of Kamptee, and then became a residential station. It developed into the headquarters of the mission when the district was finally separated from Vizagapatam and made into an episcopal see, suffragan to Madras, in 1887.

SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS.—Alexis Riccaz, 1887-92; Charles Felix Pelvart, 1893-1900; J. M. Crochet, 1901-06; E. F. X. Bodin, 1906-07; F. E. Coppel, present bishop from 1907.

INSTITUTIONS.—Schools for Boys: St. Francis of Sales' College, Nagpur, Calcutta, with 350 pupils, also industrial school, printing press and Catholic young men's institute; St. Francis of Sales' Native School, Nagpur, with 220 pupils; St. Joseph's Day School, Kamptee, with 130 pupils; St. Aloysius' School, Jubbulpur, with 120 pupils; small schools at Amraoti and Aurangabad; native training school at Ghoghaorgaon with 15 boarders, and 26 other schools in the villages with 215 pupils; thirty schools in Khandwa under 25 catechist teachers with 396 pupils; 17 schools round Ellibelpur under 17 catechists with 155 pupils.


Charitable Institutions.—Poohouse, Nagpur, with 18 inmates; a leper hospital with 30 inmates; 14 dispensaries in various places; boys' orphanages at Nagpur, Kamptee, Thans, Jubbulpur, and Amraoti, with 249 inmates, and girls' orphanages at the same places with 229 inmates. St. Vincent de Paul Society at Nagpur; catechumenates at Ghoghaorgaon, Khandwa, and Ellibelpur; training schools for catechists at Ghoghaorgaon and Ellibelpur with 100 students. The mission centres are (1) Ghoghaorgaon near Aurangabad, created in 1893, with 55 villages, 23,288 Catholics, and 26 schools; (2) Passan near Bilaspur, opened in 1900 with 80 Catholics; (3) Aulia in Khandwa, opened in 1902. 36 villages with 2100 Catholics and 30 school; (4) Ellibelpur in Berar, opened in 1903, with 16 villages with 870 Catholics.

Nahanes, or “People of the Setting Sun”, a tribe of the great Déné family of American Indians, whose habitat is east and west of the Great Divide, just north of latitude 58° N. Broadly speaking they are divided into two branches, the eastern and the western Nahanes. The latter are themselves subdivided into the Thalhthans, so called after their general rendezvous at the confluence of the river of the same name with the Steckine, and the Takus, whose territory is the basin of the Taku River, together with the upper portions of the streams which flow northward to the Lewes, as far east as the upper Liard River. The Kaskas live just west, and through the Rocky Mountains, and by speech, physique, and sociology they are eastern Nahanes, while just east of them in the same range lies the Thalhtans, called the ranch of the tribe roams over the mountains of the Mackenzie, and while the tribe cannot now number much more than 1000 souls, viz., 175 Thalhtans, 200 Kaskas, 150 Takus, and 500 eastern Nahanes proper. The latter, as well as the Kaskas, are pure nomads, without any social organization to speak of, following patriarchal lines of their descent and laws of inheritance, while the westernmost Nahanes have adopted the matrilineal institutions of their neighbours on the Pacific Coast, the clans, with petty chiefs (some of whom are quite influential and are occasionally women), potlatches or public distributions of goods or eatables, creation of the dead, ceremonial dances, etc. Physically they also resemble the coast Indians, with whom they have intermarried to a great extent, and from the language of whom they have borrowed not a few words.

From a religious standpoint the Nahanes have fared badly. The secluded position of the western branch and the nomadic habits of the eastern subdivision have conspired to keep them away from religious influence. At no event contact with the miners of the Cassiar goldfields has been considered detrimental to the Nahanes of the Far West and sadly thinned their ranks. The Anglican Church has for a dozen years or so maintained a mission at Thalhtian, which has met with a limited measure of success. The only visit of a Catholic priest to the same was paid
by the writer in the summer of 1903, and it is understood that it is now to be followed up by either the establishment of a permanent post there or by periodic visits of Oblate missionaries. As to the eastern branch of the tribe, they have been more or less within reach of the priests of the Mackenzie valley. To this day, however, both east and west of the Rockies the tribe can be pointed out as one of the least civilized of the North American Indians.

See bibliography to DENÉS, HAZEN, AND LECHEUREUX; MORICE, \textit{The Nah'ane and Their Language in Transactions of the Canadian Institute} (Toronto, 1900).

A. G. MORICE.

\textbf{Nachato, Bartolomé de Torres. See Torres Nachato, Bartolomé de.}

\textbf{Nahum}, one of the Prophets of the Old Testament, the seventh in the traditional list of the twelve Minor Prophets.

\textbf{NAME.}—The Hebrew name, probably in the intensive form, \textit{Na'um} (Gesenius-Hutsech, "Heb. Gramm.", § 846, g.), signifies primarily "full of consolation or comfort," hence "consoler" (St. Jerome, \textit{consolator}), "comforter." The name Nahum was apparently of not rare occurrence. Indeed, not to speak of a certain Nahum listed in the Vulgate and Douay Version (II Esd., vii, 7) among the companions of Zoroabel, and another who seems to have been rather named Elnoah (II Esd., i, 2; Heb. has Rehum in both places), St. Luke mentions in his genealogy of Our Lord a Nahum, son of Hesli and father of Amos (iii, 25); the Mishna also occasionally refers to Nahum the Mede, a famous rabbi of the second century (Shabb., ii, 1, etc.), and another Nahum who was a scribe or copyist (Pekah, ii, 6); inscriptions show names like Nahum and Pharnaciai (Gesenius, "Monum. Phcen.", 133; Boeckh, "Corp. Inscrip. Graec.", ii, 25, 26; "Corp. Inscrip. Semiut.", i, 123 a-b').

\textbf{THE PROPHET.}—The little we know touching the Prophet Nahum must be gathered from his book, for nowhere else in the canonical Scriptures does his name occur, and extracanonical Jewish writers are hardly less reticent. The scant positive information vouchsafed by these sources is in no wise supplemented by the worthless stories concerning the Prophet put into circulation by legend-mongers, and which may be found in Carpzov's "Introduct. ad lib. canon. Bibliorum Vet. Test." (III, 380 sqq.). We will deal only with what may be got from the canonical Scriptures. Nahum is the only available first-hand document at our disposal. From its title (i, 1), we learn that Nahum was an Elcoseite (so D. V.; A. V., Elkosite; Heb., הֶלְכַּשְׁ ב). On the true import of this statement commentators have not always been of one mind. In the prologue to his commentary on the book, St. Jerome informs us that some understood Elcoshite as a patronymic indication "son of Elcosh," he, however, holds the commonly accepted view that the word Elcoshite shows that the Prophet was a native of Elcgosh.

But even understood in this way, the intimation given by the title is disputed by biblical scholars. Where, indeed, should this Elcgosh, nowhere else referred to in the Bible, be sought? (1) Some have tried to identify his place, Amlath, with the place where the tomb of Nahum is still shown. According to this opinion, Nahum was born in Assyria, which would explain his perfect acquaintance with the topography and customs of Ninive exhibited in the book. But such an acquaintance may have been acquired otherwise; and it is a fact that the tradition connecting the two places with Nahum cannot be traced back beyond the sixteenth century, has been conclusively proven by Assemani. This opinion is now generally abandoned by scholars. (2) Still more recent and hardly more credible is the view advocated by Hitizig and Knobel, who hold that Elcgosh was the old name of the town called Capharnaum (i.e., "the village of Nahum") in the first century: a Galilean origin, they claim, would well account for certain slight peculiarities of the Prophet's dictation that smack of provincialism. Apart from the somewhat precarious etymology, it may be objected against this identification that Capharnaum, however well known a place it was at the New Testament period, is never mentioned in earlier times, and, for all we know, may have been founded at a relatively recent date; moreover, the priests and the Pharisees would most likely have asserted less emphatically "that out of Galilee a prophet riseth not" (John, vii, 52) had Capharnaum been associated with our Prophet in the popular mind. (3) Still, it is in Galilee that St. Jerome located the birthplace of Nahum ("Comment. in Nah." in P. L., X, 212) supposed to be Elkozech, in N. Galilee; but "out of Galilee doth a prophet rise?" might we ask again. (4) The author of the "Lives of the Prophets" long attributed to St. Epiphanius tells us "Elcgosh was beyond Beth-Gabre, in the tribe of Simeon." (Greek text in P. G., XI, LIII, 499; Syriac text in Nestle, "Syrische Grammatik, Chrestomathia," 99). He unquestionably means that Elcgosh was in the neighbourhood of Beth-Gabre (Beth Jibrin), the ancient Eleutheropolis, on the borders of Judah and Simeon. This view has been adopted in the Roman Martyrology (1 December; "Begabar" is no doubt a corrupt spelling of Beth-Gabre), and finds more and more acceptance with modern scholars.

\textbf{THE BOOK.}—\textbf{Contents.}—The Book of Nahum contains only three chapters and may be divided into two distinct parts: the one, including i and ii, (Heb., i-ii, 1-3), and the other consisting of iii, 1, 3-iii (Heb., ii, 4-iii). The first part is more undetermined in tone and character. After the twofold title indicating the minor subject-matter and the major of the book (q. 1), the writer enters upon his subject by a solemn affirmation of what he calls the Lord's jealousy and revengefulness (i, 2, 3), and a most forceful description of the fright which seizes all nature at the aspect of Yahweh coming into judgment (i, 3-6). Contrasting admirably with this appalling picture is the comforting assurance of God's loving-kindness towards His true and trustful servants (7-8); then follows the announcement of the destruction of His enemies, among whom a treacherous, cruel, and god-ridden city, no doubt Ninive (although the name is not found in the text), is singled out and irretrievably doomed to everlasting ruin (9-14); the glad tidings of the oppressor's fall is followed by a psalm of glory for the people of God (i, 15; ii, 1; Heb., ii, 1, 3).

The second part of the book is more directly than the other a "burden of Ninive"; some of the features of the great Assyrian city are described so accurately as to make all doubt impossible, even if the name Ninive were not explicitly mentioned in ii, 8. In a first section (ii, ii, 4-6), the Lord forgives the sin of Ninive, and tells her that her fasts are null (6-9; Heb.: 7-10); and now Ninive, once the den where the lion hoarded rich spoils for his whelps and his lionesses, has been swept away rich for ever by the mighty hand of the God of hosts (10-12; Heb., 11-13). The second section (iii) develops with new details the same theme. The bloodthirstiness, greed, and craft of Ninive are more fully depicted, her walls thrown down, her women washed away as the waters when the flood came; most graphically depicted (1-4); complete and shameful will be her downfall and no one will utter a word of pity (5-7). As No-Amon was mercilessly crushed, so Ninive likewise will empty to the drear the bitter cup of the Divine vengeance (8-11). In vain does she trust in her stronghold, her warriors, her preparations for a siege, and her officials and scribes
(12–17). Her empire is about to crumble, and its fall will be hailed by the triumphant applause of the whole universe (18–19).

Critical Questions.—Until a recent date, both the unity and authenticity of the Book of Nahum were unchallenged, and the text of the Assur-
menkh, ii, § 75, Wellhausen (Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, 1893, p. 155), and Cornill (Einleitung, 1892, p. 188), and the objections alleged by a few against the gen-
uniness of the words "The burden of Nineve" (i, 1) and the description of the overthrow of No-Ammon (iii, 8–10) were regarded as trifling cavils not worth the trouble of an answer. In the last few years, however,
the document has had a new turn: facts hitherto unnol-
ticed have added to the old problems concerning au-
thorship, date, etc. It may be well here for us to bear
in mind the twofold division of the book, and to begin
with the second part (ii, i, 3–iii) which, as has been
noticed, unquestionably deals with the overthrow of
Nineve. That these three chapters of the prophecy
can constitute a unit and should be attributed to the same
author, Happel is the only one to deny; but his odd
opinion, grounded on unwarranted alterations of the
text, cannot seriously be entertained.

The date of this second part cannot be determined
to the year; however, from the data furnished by the text
it can be determined if the sufficient evidence of ma-
terial is obtained. First, there is a higher limit which we
have no right to overstep, namely, the capture of
No-Ammon referred to in iii, 8–10. In the Latin Vul-
gate (and the Douay Bible) No-Ammon is translated by
Alexandria, whereby St. Jerome meant not the great
Egyptian capital founded in the fourth century b. c.,
but a city in Assyria, more exactly somewhere in Assyria
stood Alexandria ("Comment. in Nah."). iii, 8: P. L.,
XXV, 1260; cf. "Ep. CVIII ad Eustoch." 14: P. L.,
XXII, 890; "In Is.", XVIII: P. L., XXIV, 178; "In
Os.", IX, 3–6; P. L., XXV, 892). He was mistaken,
however, and so were Champollion and Brugsch, ac-
cording to whom No-Ammon should be sought in Lower
Nubia, or, as Pharaohs, ii, 123–130; As-
syrian and Egyptian discoveries leave no doubt whatever
that No-Ammon is the same as Thebes in Upper
Egypt. Now Thebes was captured and destroyed by
Assur-bani-pal in 664–663 b. c., whence it follows that
the opinion of Nicephorus (in the edition of Geo. Syn-
cell, "Chronographia", Bonn, 1829, i, 759), making
Nahum prophesy in 628 b. c., is impossible. The early
tradition according to which this prophecy was ut
15 years before the fall of Nineve (about 721
b. c.; Josephus, "Ant. Jud.", IX, xi, 3), and the con-
cclusions of those modern scholars who, as Pussey,
Nägelsbach, etc., date the oracle in the reign of Exe-
chias or the earlier years of Manasseh, ought to be dis-
carded as impossible. The lower limit which it is al-
lowable to assign to this part of the Book of Nahum is,
of course, the fall of Nineve, which a well-known
inscription of Nabonidus permits us to fix at 607 or 606
b. c., a date fatal to the view adopted by Eutychius,
that Nahum prophesied five years after the downfall
of Jerusalem (therefore about 593–591; "Annal." in
P. L., XXI, 361). Within these limits it is difficult to fix the date more
precisely. It has been suggested that the freshness of the allusion to the fate of Thebes indicates an early
date, about 660 b. c., according to Schrader and Orelli; but the memory of such a momentous event
would long dwell in the minds of men, and we find
hardly any trace of it in one of his utterances delivered
about 702 or 701 b. c. recalling with the same vivid-
ness of expression Assyrian conquests achieved thirty
to forty years earlier (1a, x, 3–4). Nothing there-
fore compels us to assign, within the limits set above,
664–606, an early date to the two chapters, if there are
cogent reasons to conclude to a later date. One of
the arguments advanced is that Nineve is spoken of as
having lost a great deal of her former prestige and
sunk into a dismal state of disintegration; she is, more-
ever, represented as beset by mighty enemies and pow-
erless to avert the fate threatening her. Such condi-
tions existed when, after the death of Assurbanipal,
Babylonia succeeded in regaining her independence
(625), and the Assurbanipalid dynasty began
(623; Kuenen, Van Hoonacker). Modern critics
(Davidson, Kennedy, etc.) appear more and more in-
clined to believe that the data furnished by the
Prophet lead to the admission of a still lower date,
namely the moment before the actual invasion of
Assyria by a hostile force and the commencement of
the attack on its capital (Kennedy). The "mauler"
indeed, is already on his way (ii, 1; Heb., 2); frontier
fortresses have opened their gates (iii, 12–13); Nineve
is at bay, and although the enemy has not yet invested
the city, to all appearances her doom is sealed.

We may now return to the first part of the book.
This first chapter, on account of the transcendent
ideas it deals with, and of the lyric enthusiasm which
permeates it throughout has not inappropriately been
called a psalm. Its special interest lies in the fact
that it is an alphabetical poem. The first to call at-
tention to this feature was Frohmeyer, whose obser-
ations, however, did not extend beyond vv. 3–7.
Avaluing himself of this key, Bickell endeavoured to
arrange a parallelism of the twenty letters of the alphabet.
He found all the words of the whole passage and include the twenty-two letters of the alphabet, and he attempted repeatedly but
without great success ("Zeitschr. der deutsch. morg.
Gesell."). 1880, p. 599; "Carmina Vet. Test. metrice,
1882; "Zeitschr. für kath. Theol.", 1886), to restore the
psalm to its pristine integrity. This failure did not
arouse Gunkel, who was the first to point out that the
poem is alphabetical throughout, although it is difficult, owing to the present condition of the text, to trace the initial letters Ε to Ν (Zeitschr. für
alttest. Wissenschaft., 1893, 233 sqq.). This was for
Bickell an incentive to a fresh study (Das alphab. Lied
in Nah. i–ii, 3, in "Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist.
 Classe der kaiser. Akademie der Wissenschaften.", Wien,
1894, 5 Abhandl.), the conclusions of which show a
notable improvement on the former attempts, and
suggested to Gunkel a few corrections (Schöpfung
und Chaos, 120). Since then Nowack (Die kleinen Prophet-
aten, 1897), Gray ("The Alphab. Poem in Nah.")." in
"The Expositor", for Sep. 1898, 207 sqq.), Arnold
("Com. in Nah.", i–ii, 3, in "Wissenschaft.", 1901, 225 sqq.), Happel (Das Buch des
Prop. Nah., 1903), Marti (Dodekakap. erklärt,
1904), Lohr (Zeitschr. für alttest. Wissenschaft.
1905, I, 174), and Van Hoonacker (Les douze petits proph.,
1908), have more or less successfully undertaken
the difficult task of extricating the original psalm from
the textual medley in which it is entangled. There
is among them, a sufficient agreement as to the first
part of the poem (N–); but the second part still remains a
classical ground for scholarly tilte.

Wellhausen (Die kleinen Prophet., 1898) holds that
the noteworthy difference between the two parts from
the point of view of poetical construction is due to the
fact that the writer abandoned halfway his undertak-
ing to write acrostically, and that the material which he
worked out separately from an unacrostic original.
The first corrector went as far as the line begin-
ning with the letter Θ, and as the last sentence closed on
the word Ψ, he noted in the title that his revision
extended from Θ to Ψ; and so the mysterious Ψ–Ψ
(later on misconstrued and misspelled ΨΨ) has
neither a patronymic nor a gentile notation. Critics
are inclined to hold that the disorder and corruption
which disfigure the poem are mostly due to the way it
was tacked on to the prophecy of Nahum: the upper
margin was first used, and then the side margin; and as,
in the latter instance, the text must have been over-
crowded and blurred, this later on caused in the sec-
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Percy, The Minor Prophets, II (London, 1860); Davidson, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah (Cambridge, 1860), 9-44; Smith, The Minor Prophets, II (London, 1888); Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, (Edinburgh, 1898), 334-37; Gion, Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament, II (New York, 1906), 422-426; Kennedy in Hastings, Dict. of the Bible, s. v.; Filliozat in Viganoux, Dict. de la Bible, s. v.; Knauf in Tischendorf, Les douze petits prophètes (Paris, 1898), 412-32; Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, V: Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt mit Noten (Berlin, 1883), 31-33; 135-161; Kleinert, Die Propheten, Beda, Jona, Micha, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah (Biefeild, 1893); Müller, Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form (Vienna, 1896); Nowack, Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt (Göttingen, 1897), 220-16; Billerbeck and Jeremias, Der Untergang Nizaehs und die Wiederaufnahme des Nahums von Elohim in Beiträge zur Semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, 87-186; Haasl, Das Buch des Propheten Nahum erklärt (1893); Marti, Dodekapropheton erklärt (Tübingen, 1894), 365-362; Stracke, Nahums und Nizaeh intertext (Berlin, 1895); Knauf, Commentarius in Prophetas Minoros, II (Paris, 1886), 1-50.

Charles L. Souvay.

Nails. Holy.—The question has long been debated whether Christ was crucified with three or with four nails. The treatment of the Crucifixion in art during the earlier Middle Ages strongly supports the tradition of four nails, and the language of certain hist. rical writers (none, however, earlier than Gregory of Tours, "De glor. mart.", vi for the supposed sermon of St. Cyriakus, "De passione", iii, 6 (fascicle), favours the same view. On the other hand, from the thirteenth century, Western art began to represent the feet of the Crucified as placed one over the other and pierced with a single nail. This accords with the language of Nonnus and Socrates and with the poem "Christus patiens" attributed to St. Gregor Nyssen, which speaks of three nails. More recent archaeological criticism has pointed out not only that the two earliest representations of the crucifixion (the Palantine graffito does not here come into account), viz., the carved door of Santa Sabina in Rome, and the ivory panel of the British Museum, show no signs of nails in the feet, but also Ambrose ("De obitu Theodossii" in P. L. XVI, 1402) and other early writers distinctly imply that there were only two nails (see Billerbeck, "Kreuza u. Kreuzigung Christi"). Further, St. Ambrose informs us that St. Helen had one nail converted into a bridegroom's horse (early commentarists quote Zach., xiv, 20, in this connexion), and that an imperial diadem was made out of the other. Gregory of Tours speaks of a nail being thrown (deponi), or possibly dipped into the Adriatic to calm a storm. It is impossible to discuss these problems adequately in brief space, but the information derivable from the general archaeological of the practice of crucifixion as known to the Romans does not in any way contradict the Christian tradition of four nails.

Very little reliance can be placed upon the authenticity of the thirty or more holy nails which are still venerated, or which have been venerated until recent times, in such treasuries as that of Santa Croce in Rome, or those of Venice, Aachen, Reichenberg, Prague, etc. Probably the majority began by professing to be facsimiles which had touched or contained filings from some other nail whose claim was more ancient. Without conscious fraud on the part of anyone, it is very easy for imitations in this way to come in a very brief space of time to be reputed originals. The bride of Constantinople is believed to be identical with a relic of this form which for several centuries has been preserved at Carpentras, but there is another claimant of the same kind at Milan. Similarly the diadem of Constantine is asserted to be at Monza, and it has long been known as "the iron crown of Lombardy".

Rouault de Fleurt, Mémoires sur les instruments de la passion (Paris, 1870), 165-181; Forrer and Müller, Kreuz u. Kreuzigung Christi in ihrer Kunstentwicklung (Strasbourg, 1884); Friedländer and Martin, Archäologie de la passion (Berlin, 1888); Friedländer in Beiträge zur kirchischen Archäol. (Trier, 1886); Feld, Das Kreuz u. die Kreuzigung (Breslau, 1878); Ferrua, Le saint morce de Carpentras (Carpentras, 1874); De Combris, The Findings of the Cross, tr. (London, 1907); Blant and Malt, Eucharistic Sacraments and polities (Paris, 1877—).

Herbert Thurston.

Naim (NAIN), the city where Christ raised to life the widow's son (Luke, vii, 11-17). The Midras (Bereshit rabba, 88) gives the significance 'agree-
able" to a place called Naim (Nain) in the territory of Issachar, in Galilee. Eusebius and St. Jerome (Onomasticon) place Naim south of Mount Thabor, and not far from Dor. Now, opposite to Thabor, and a mile and a half north of the En-Gedi (doublings the Biblical En-Gedi), lies a village called Nahun ("pleasantness"). It is situated on the north-western ridge of Jebel Dahy, the Little Hermon, and commands a magnificent view. There are traces of ruins beyond its boundary to the north, but no sign of fortifications. "The gate of the city" (Luke, vii, 12) might have belonged to a wall of enclosure, built to protect the place against marauding tribes, as was often the case in the East. A steep path leads up to the village, passing by the site of an ancient church which had been converted into a mosque, "Moukâm Lidn Aisa" (Oratory of the Lord Jesus). The mosque, having fallen into ruins, was replaced by another in the vicinity. In 1880 the Franciscans bought the ruins of the first building, and erected thereon a chapel. Not far away may be seen Jewish rock-tombs. Thus the details of Naim's graphic story find an easy localization.

Barnabas Meisterman.

Namaqualand, Prefecture Apostolic of Great. See Orange River, Vicariate Apostolic of the.

NAME, Baptismal. See Baptism, sub-title XV: Names, Christian.

Names of Jesus, Religious Communities of the. — (1) Knights of the Name of Jesus, also known as Seraphim, founded in 1334 by the Queens of Norway and Sweden to defend their respective countries from the onslaught of heathen hordes. They did not survive the Reformation. (2) Sisters of the Name of Jesus comprise six congregations founded in France during the sixteenth century in the Dioceses of Besançon, with mother-house at Grande-Fontaine, Paris; of Valence (1815 or 1825), mother-house at Lorial; of Rodez, mother-house at Ste-Radegonde; of Toulouse (1827); and of Marseilles (1852). These sisters devote themselves chiefly to the work of teaching and caring for the sick. (3) Confraternity of the Name of Jesus, formed by the amalgamation of the Portuguese Confraternity of the Most Holy Name of Jesus, founded by Andreas Dias, O.P., in 1432, with the Spanish Confraternity of the Most Holy Name of God, established by Diego Victoria, O.P., in the sixteenth century. Approbation was granted by Popes Paul V (1606) and Innocent XI (1678), and the confraternity was enriched with indulgences and placed under the Dominican general.


Florence Ridge Mcgahan.

Names of Mary, Feast of the Holy. — We venerate the name of Mary because it belongs to her who is the Mother of God, the holiest of creatures, the Queen of heaven and earth. Gen., xvi, 1, translates the Hebrew term for the object of the feast is the Holy Virgin bearing the name of Miriam (Mary); the feast commemorates all the privileges given to Mary by God and all the graces we have received through her intercession and mediation. It was instituted in 1513 at Cuenca in Spain, and assigned with proper Office to 15 Sept., the octave day, 716. It was celebrated by the Spanish Breviary by St. Pius V, by a Decree of Sixtus V (16 Jan., 1587), it was transferred to 17 Sept. In 1622 it was extended to the Archdiocese of Toledo by Gregory XV. After 1625 the Congregation of Rites hesitated for a while before authorizing its further spread (cf. the seven decrees, Analécte Juris Pontifici, 1, LVII, 1921). But it was celebrated by the Spanish Trinitarians in 1640 (Ordo Hispán., 1640). On 15 Nov., 1658, the feast was granted to the Oratory of Cardinal Berulle under the title: Solemnitas glories Virginis, dupl. cum oct., 17 Sept. Bearing the original title, SS. Nomina B.M.V., it was granted to all Spain and the Kingdom of Naples on 26 Jan., 1671. After the siege of Vienna and the glorious victory of the Sobieski over the Turks (12 Sept., 1693), the feast was extended to the universal Church by Innocent XI, and assigned to the Sunday after the Nativity of Mary by a Decree of 25 Nov., 1683 (duplex majus); it was granted to Austria as d. é. classis on 1 Aug., 1694. According to a Decree of 8 July, 1908, whenever this feast cannot be celebrated on its proper Sunday on account of the occurrence of some feast of a higher rank, it must be kept on 12 Sept., the day on which the victory of Sobieski is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology. The Calendar of the Nuns of Perpetual Adoration, O.S.B., in France, of the year 1827, has the feast with a special Office on 25 Sept. The feast of the Holy Name of Mary is the patronal feast of the Clerics Regular of the Pious Schools (Piarist) and of the Society of Mary (Marians), in both cases with a proper office. In 1666 the Discalced Carmelites received the faculty to recite the Office of the Name of Mary four times a year (duplex). At Rome one of the twin churches at the Forum Trajani is dedicated to the Name of Mary. In the Ambrosian Calendar of Milan the feast of the Holy Name of Mary is assigned to 11 September.

Abel, Blasius, (Paderborn, 1894), IV, sqq.; Holweck, Festi Mariiani (Freiburg, 1882).

Frederick G. Holweck.

Names, Christian. — "Christian names", says the Elizabethan antiquary, Camden, "were imposed for the distinction of persons, surnames for the difference of families." It would seem from this that, even in the sixteenth century, the etymological and historical significance of the phrase "Christian name" was growing dim, and it is commonly quite forgotten in our own time. But the phrase "Christian name" is not merely the forename distinctive of the individual member of a family, but the name given to him at his "christening," i.e., his baptism. It should be remembered that in pre-Reformation England the laity were taught to administer baptism in case of necessity with the words: "I christen thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," or, as is more common, "baptise," and "Christian name" means baptismal name.

Origins. — Some vague idea that nomina sunt omnia (names are omens) seems to be a sort of primitive human instinct. Thus throughout Old-Testament times the significance of names passed as an accepted principle. They were usually given in reference either to some trait in the child, actual or prophetic, or to some feeling or hope in the parent at the time of its birth. It was only a very slight development of this idea to suppose that a change of condition appropriately demanded a change of name. Thus the conversion of Abram into Abraham (the "father of many nations"") Gen., xxviii, 3, 12-15, was the renunciation of the covenant of circumcision and ratified a claim to God's special benediction. In view, then, of this recognized congruity and of the Hebrew practice of giving a name to the male child at the time of its circumcision on the eighth day after birth (Luke, i, 59), it has been maintained that the custom of conferring a name upon the newly baptised was of Apostolic origin. An instance in point is declared to be found in the case of the Apostle of the Gentiles who before his conversion was called Saul and afterwards Paul. But modern scholarship, and with reason, has altogether rejected this contention. The baptism of St. Paul is recorded in Acts, ix, 18, but the name Paul does not occur before Acts, xi, 26, while Saul is used several times in the interval. We have no more reason to connect the name Paul with the Apostle's bap-
dissem than we have to account in the same way for the giving of the name Cephas or Peter, which we know to be due to another cause. Moreover, it is certain, both from the inscriptions of the catacombs and from early Christian literature, that the names of Christians in the first three centuries did not distinctly differ from the names of the pagans around them. A reference to the Epistles of St. Paul makes it plain that even the names of heathen gods and goddesses were borne by his converts after their conversion as before. Hermes occurs in Rom., xvi, 14, with a number of other purely pagan names, Euphrates in Phil., iv, 18, Phebe, the deaconess, in Rom., xvi, 1. Not less conclusive are the names which we find in the Christian inscriptions of the earlier period or in the lists of the names of the deceased in the Catacombs. There are names like Anxora (see Turner, "Eccl. Occident. Mon. Juris." I, 36–50; II, 50–53), or again in the lists of martyrs. Even at a later date the names are of a most miscellaneous character. The following classification is one that has been worked out by J. Bass Mullinger founded on Martigny.

A.—Names without Christian significance and probably derived from pagan ancestors:—(1) names derived unchanged or but slightly modified from pagan mythology, e. g., Mercurius, Bacchus, Apollo (I Cor., xvi, 12), Hermogenes (Rom., xvi, 4), etc.; (2) from religious rites or omens, e. g., Augustus, Auspicium, Augurinus, Opistus; (3) from numbers, e. g., Primus, Primula, Secundus; (4) from places, e.g., Eburnius, from colours, e. g., Albinus, Candidus, Rufus, etc.; (5) from animals and birds, e. g., Agnes, Aetius, Columba, Leo, Taurus, Ursula, etc.; (6) from agriculture, e. g., Agricola, Armentarius, Palatinus, Stercoreus, etc.; (7) from flowers, e. g., Balsamia, Flosculus, Narcissus, Rosula; (8) from jewels, e. g., Chrysanthis, Maccolla; (9) from religious offices, e. g., Papae, from martyr life or the sea, e. g., Emerentiana, Navigia, Pelagia, Scutarius, Thalassus; (10) from countries, cities, rivers etc.; Afræus, Cydnus, Gallus, Jordanis, Macedonius, Maurus, Sabina, Sebastianus, etc.; (11) from the months, e. g., Aprilis, Januarius, Junius, etc.; (12) from personal qualities, etc., e. g., Aristote, Hilarius, Modestus, Pubdens, etc.; (13) from servile condition, e. g., Servus, Servilius, Vasnalis, Vernaculius, (14) names of historical celebrities, e. g., Cæsarius, Cornelius, Pompeius, Ptolemeus, Vergilus.

B.—Names of Christian origin and significance.—(1) Names apparently suggested by Christian dogmas, e. g., Anastasis, Athanasius, Christophorus, Redemptor, etc.; (2) names derived from persons or things, e. g., Ephiphanis, Eulogia, Natalis, Paecalis, Sabbatius, and the frequently recurring Martyrius; (3) from Christian virtues, e. g., Agape, Elpis, Fides, Irene, with such derivatives as Adelphius, Agapetus, Caritoos, etc.; (4) pious sentiment, e. g., Aedoeata, Ambrosia, Benedictus, Deostatis, etc., and possibly such names as Gaudens, Hilarus, Illuminas, Victoriamus, Vincentius, but it is very hard to be sure that any distinctively Christian feeling is here latent.

On the other hand though the recurrence of such names as Agnes, Balbina, Cornelius, Felicitas, Ireneus, Justinus, etc. may very probably be due to veneration for the martyrs who first bore these names, it is rather curious that the names of the saints of the New Testament are but rarely found while those of the Old Testament are hardly less uncommon. Susanna, Daniel, Moyseus, Tobias, occur pretty frequently, but it is only towards the end of the fourth century that we find the name of our Blessed Lady or become at all familiar with those of the Apostles. Even then we cannot feel that in the saints in particular there is any intentional reference to the Apostle and to the Gentiles, but Johannes at least, and Andreas, with Petrus and its derivatives like Petronia, Petrius, Petronilla, etc. are less open to doubt. The name of Mary occurs occasionally in the catacomb inscriptions towards the close of the fourth century, for example, in the form Livia Maria in pace (De Rossi, "Rom. Sot." I, 143) and there is a martyr Maria assigned to the date A.D. 256 (De Rossi, "Rom. Sot." III, 200 sqq. and compare other instances of the name, De Rossi, "Inschr. Christ." I, 331; II, 160 and 173).

Change of Name at Baptism.—If we could trust the authentic and contemporary character of the Acts of St. Balsamus, who died in A.D. 334, we have an early example of the connexion between baptism and the giving of a name. "By my paternal name", this martyr is said to have declared, "I am called Balsamus, but by the spiritual name which I received in baptism, I am known as Peter." It would seem in any case that the assumption of a new name was one of the things to which the Church instructed Christians. Eusebius the historian took the name Pamphilus from Pamphilus the martyr whom he especially venerated. Earlier still St. Cyprian chose to be called Cyprianus Cecilius out of gratitude to the Cecilius to whom he owed his conversion. Moreover St. Dionysius of Alexandria (c. 260) declared "I am of opinion that there were many of the same name as the Apostle John, who on account of their love for him, and because they admired and emulated him, and desired to be loved by the Lord as he was, took to themselves the same name, just as many of the children of the faithful are called Paul or Peter" (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl." VII, xxv). It would be only natural that the assumption of a new name at baptism, in which the catechumen, then probably as now, had to be addressed by some distinctive appellation. On the other hand it seems likely that the imposition of a new name at baptism only became the invariable rule after infant baptism had become general. Every child had necessarily to receive some name before baptism or on the day before. After birth, this must have offered a very suitable opportunity for the public recognition of the choice made.

No doubt the thirtieth of the supposed Arabian Canons of Nicaea: "Of giving only names of Christians in baptism is not authentic, even though it is of early date; but the sermons of St. John Chrysostom seem to assume in many different places that the conferring of a name, presumably at baptism, ought to be regulated by some idea of Christian edification, and he implies, though this does not seem to be borne out by the evidence now available, that such had been the practice of earlier generations. For example he says: "When it comes to giving the infant a name, caring not to call him after the things of this world or after things of the night, but for light lamps and give them names and so name the child after the one which continues burning the longest, from thence conjecturing that he will live a long time" (Hom. in Cor. xii, 13). Similarly he commends the practice of the parents of Antioch in calling their children after the martyr Meletius (F. G., L, 515), and again he urges his hearers not to give their children the first name that occurs, nor to seek to gratify fathers or grandfathers or other family connexions by giving their names, but rather to choose the names of holy men conspicuous for virtue and for their courage before God (F. G., LIII, 179). History preserves sundry examples of such a change of name in adult converts. Socrates (Hist. Eccl., VII, xvi) tells us of Athenais who married the Emperor Theodosius the Younger, and who previously to marriage was baptised (A.D. 421) receiving the name Eudoxia. Again Bede tells us of the case of King Cædwalla who went to Rome and was baptised by the Pope Sergius who gave him the name of Peter. Dying soon afterwards he left his name in the name of Pæbæ in. Later he says "Hic deposuit est Cædwalla qui est Petrus" was long pointed out (Bede, "Hist. Eccl." V, vii). Later we have the well-known instance of Guthrum the Danish leader in England who after his long contest with King Alfred was eventually defeated and, consenting to so-
cept Christianity, was baptised in 878 by the name of Ælhestan.

**Practice Regarding Names.**—But while various Fathers and spiritual writers, and here and there a synodal decree, have exhorted the faithful to give no names to their children in baptism but those of the sainted saints or of the angels of God, it must be confessed that there has never been a time in the history of the Church when those injunctions have been at all strictly attended to. They were certainly not heeded during the early or the later Middle Ages. Any one who glances even casually at an extensive list of medi eval names, such as are perhaps best found in the indexes to the volumes of legal proceedings which have been edited in modern times, will at once perceive that while ordinary names without any very pronounced religious associations, such as William, Robert, Roger, Geoffrey, Hugh, etc. enormously preponderate (William about the year 1200 was by far the most common Christian name in England), there are also always a very considerable number of exceptional and out-of-the-way names which have apparently no religious associ ations at all. Such names, to take but a few specimens, as Ademar, Alina, Ailward, Albreza, Alditha, Amsury, Aesselins, Avice, Aystorius (these come from the old Anglo-Saxon, and from the Latin respectively, and are of the Canterbury school), are of frequent occurrence. The point however cannot be dwelt on here. We may note on the other hand that a rubric in the official "Rituale Romanum" enjoins that the priest ought to see that unbecoming or ridiculous names of deities or of godless pagans are not given in baptism (euret ne obsequemur, fabulasque et ridiculas vel inani mum, doctrin vel impiorum ethnocorum hominum nomina imponen tur). Some of the seventeenth century French rituals have gone further than this. For example that of Bourges (1666) addressing parents and godparents urges: "Let them give to boys the names of male saints and to girls those of women saints as right order requires, so that we may be distinguished between the children of Piety like Eseter (Pâques), Christmàs (Noel), All Saints (Toussaint) and others that are sometimes chosen." Despite such injunctions "Toussaint" has become a not uncommon French Christian name and "Noel" has spread even to England. The addition of Marie, especially in the form Jean-Marie, for boys, and of Jeanne, especially in the form Jeanne-Marie, for girls, is strange on the other hand that the name Mary has by no means always been a favour ite for girls, possibly from a feeling that it was too august to be so familiarly employed. In England in the twelfth century Mary as a Christian name is of very rare occurrence. George again is a name which despite the veneration of the warrior saint as patron of Eng land, was by no means common in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, though strangely enough it grew in popularity after the Reformation. A writer who has made a minute examination of the registers of Oxford University from 1560 to 1821, has made out the following list of the more common names borne by the students in order of popularity: John, 3526; Thomas, 2777; William, 2546; Richard, 1691; Robert, 1222; Edward, 957; Henry, 908; George, 647; Francis, 447; James, 424; Nicholas, 326; Edmund, 298 (see Oxford Hist. Soc. Transactions, XIV). In Italy and Spain it has always been a tolerably common Practice to call a child after the saint upon whose feast.

**Confirmation Names.**—The practice of adopting a new name was not limited to baptism. Many medieval examples show that any notable change of condition, especially in the spiritual order, was often accompanied by the reception of a new name. In the eighth century the two Englishmen Winfrith and Willibald going on different occasions to Rome received from the reigning pontiff of the time, the names respectively of Boniface and Clement. So again Emma of Normandy when she married King Ethelred in 1002 took the name Ælfgifu; while, of course, the reception of a new name upon entering a religious order is almost universal even in our own day. It is not strange, then, that at confirmation, in which the interposition of a godfather emphasises the resemblance with baptism, it should have become customary to take a new name, though usually no great use is made of it. In one case, however, that of Henry III, King of France, who being the godson of our English Edward VI had been christened Edouard Alexandre in 1551, the same French prince at confirmation received the name of Henri, and by this he afterwards reigned. Even in England the practice of adopting a new name at confirmation was remembered after the Reformation, for Sir Edward Coke declares that a man might validly buy land by his confirmation name, and he recalls the case of a Sir John Chetwyne, who, having the name of Common Pleas, whose name of baptism was Thomas and his name of confirmation Francis (Co. Litt. 3s).

**Names, Hebrew.**—To the philosopher a name is an artificial sign consisting in a certain combination of articulate sounds, whereby a particular class of people are wont to designate one thing and distinguish it from all others. If the name conveys an idea, it is merely because of a wholly artificial relation once arbitrarily established between the name and the thing it stands for. Primitive people, using a language as it is handed down to them without inquiring into its origin, are inclined to make much of names. This is true of the old Semitic peoples, especially of the Hebrews. All Hebrew names were supposed to bear a significance, as originally individual subjects were called by a name expressive of some of their characteristics, e.g., Edon, red; Essu, hairy; Jacob, supplanter. They were carefully and solemnly selected, especially personal names. Leaving aside cases where the name was Divinely given (Abraham, Gen., xvii, 5; Isaac, Gen., xvii, 19; Ismael, Gen., xvi, 11; John, Luke, i, 13; Jesus, Matt., i, 21; etc.), the naming of a child usually devolved upon the parents, and, it appears, preferably upon the mother. The women of the family (Ruth, iv, 17), or the neighbours (Luke, i, 59), talked over the name to be given. The name seems to have been given ordinarily at the time of the birth; but at a late period the day of circumcision was more usual (Luke, i, 59; ii, 21). Of the customs connected with the naming of cities we know nothing except what may be casually deduced from the names themselves, and what is said of a few cities named after their founders and conquerors (Gen., iv, 17; Num., xxxii, 42; Deut., iii, 14; Jos., xix, 47; etc.). So intimate was the relation conceived to be between the individual and his name, that the latter came frequently to be used as an equivalent of the former; "to be called" means "to be", the name being taken to be equal to the person of him or her. Nothing is more eloquent of this fact than the religious awe in which the Hebrews held the name of God (see JEHovah). Similar notions prevailed with regard to all proper names. Nor were the Hebrews an exception: all Semitic peoples, and, to some extent, all other primitive peoples shared the same belief. This is why the study of these names is looked upon by students of history as a sort of key to the knowledge of the reli-
gnious and social conditions of these peoples. We shall here discuss only Hebrew names: I. Divine Names; II. Personal Names; III. Place Names.

I. Divine Names.—Yahweh.—Jehovah (q. v.), the traditional form of this name in Western languages, is based on a misunderstanding of the Massoretic vocalization. The name Yahweh, of which an abbreviated form, Yah, and a spelling, Yhwh, seem to have become popular, is derived doubtlessly from the verb hašōw, "to be," and is best translated by "he is" (Lagrange in "Revue Biblique," 1903, pp. 370-86; 1906, pp. 383-86). 'El, which is found among all Semitic peoples (Phoen., Arab.: 'El; Assy.: 'Išu; Aram.: 'Aššu), is, in the Bible, appellative in most cases, but was certain-ly used in a proper name (so, e.g., in Gen., xlviii, 20; xxxvi, 8). Its etymology to the present day a much mooted question: some derive the word from a root 'al, "to be strong;" others from yl', which might connote the idea of "being the first;" others finally from 'Išh, by which, at an early stage of the development of the Semitic languages the idea of mere relation (case ad) was conveyed. According to the first two opinions, the name is intended primarily to express the superiority of the Divine nature, whereas, according to the third, God is 'El because He is the term of the aspirations (finis) of mankind (Lagrange, "Études sur les religions sémitiques," 70 sqq., especially 78-90; "Revue biblique," 1903, pp. 363-70). Lagrange states that the name is often translated as Elohim, sometimes used as appellatives, but more frequently as proper names. The plural form of the latter to some extent still puzzles grammarians and students of the religious belief of the Hebrews (see Gesenius-Kautzsch, "Hebr. Gramm.," § 124, g-i; Prat, "Le nom divin est-il intensif en hébreu?" in "Revue des études hébraïques," p. 207; Schürer, "The Religion of the Semites," London, 1907, 445; Lagrange, "Études sur les religions sémitiques," 77). We need not dwell upon the many cases where 'El and 'Elohim are used as appellatives, either by themselves, or as parts of compound names such as 'El Roy (the God of the apparition), 'El Olam (the Eternal God), 'El Elyon (the Most High God), 'El Sebaoth (the God of Hosts), etc. (see Lagrange in "Revue biblique," 1903, pp. 364-67). Shadday.—As to the name Shadday, which is found sometimes alone, and at other times in connexion with 'El ('El Shadday), it was originally an adjective conveying possibly the idea of fecundity (Gen., xvi, 1; xlix, 25) or of highness (Ps. 68, 18). But it more emphatically denotes their threats of divine punishment, spoke as if the word were related to shadad, to "devastate;" but the people at large, unmindful of these etymological niceties, used Shadday merely as a substitute for 'El, perhaps with the special connotation of "Almighty."

II. Personal Names.—Personal names are either purely Hebrew or hebraized. To the latter category belong not only (passing over foreign names such as Tegiel-phalasar, Asuerus, etc.) Babylonian (Daniel-Balt-hassar) and Persian (Hadassa-Esther) names assumed by some persons of Hebrew origin living in far-away countries, and the Greek and Latin names in use among Jews of late times. Jointly with their Hebrew or Aramaic names (John-Mark; Saul-Paul, etc.), but also certain very old names which were handed down by tradition, such as Cain, Abel, Noah, Abraham, etc., and treated by the sacred writers as Hebrew words. There is scarcely any doubt but that in passing from one language to the other these names were preserved. Of the etymology Schürer's explanation pretends to interpret the Hebrew form, the meaning arrived at can hardly be more fanciful. It is from the original language of these names that their meaning should be sought (so Abram and Abraham may be explained from the Assyr. Abi-rāmā, or Abi-rāmē, "my father loveth"); Sarai and Sara from Sharat, "the great princess"); Lot from Lātū, or Lātī, the "consumer;" from the Egyptian might be explained likewise a few names, e. g., Moes, "the child," etc.). Of the pure Hebrew names some are simple and others compound. Simple names appear to have been more frequent in early times, but some are in reality hypocoristic, i. e., abbreviated forms of compound names, as Saul (asked), David (beloved), Nathan (he has raven), which were probably combined with a Divine name, Yah or 'El.

Simple Names.—Of the simple names a few seem to have been suggested by particular circumstances, especially circumstances attending the child's birth: e.g., Jacob (the supplanter), Joseph (possibly an hypo- coristic form of the name Jacob; so Joseph was at one time a favourite name for the young man of the family). A large class of proper names for men and women is made up of adjectives denoting personal characteristics. Here are a few instances: Acan (afflicting), Achar (possessor), Agar (wanderer), 'Amos (strong), Amri (eloquent), Aod (praising), Assaph (gatherer), Asor (happy), Asir (live), Ath (bound), Ašāī (dwarf), Balāq (vain), Baruch (blessed), Betar (sweet-smelling), Dālilah (yearning). Doēg (anxious), Edom (red), Eṣṭōn (woman-like), Gaddel, Geddil (tall), Gedon (destroyer), Hedel (fat), Job (ruthlessly treated), Laban (white), Manahem (com- sole), Nabal (fool). Nachor (painting or smoring), Nahum (grand), Nāshir (name of the name, backward), Orman (nimble), Osîn (long-eared), Pheesēr (lame), Ruth (friend), Sepho (bald-headed), etc.

Names of animals and of plants were at the same period not infrequently given to persons both by the Hebrews and by their neighbours, the Chanaanites and others. Among the names of animals assumed as proper names are the names of birds (see, for example, the names of the vulture, Aman (wild goat), Caleb (dog), Deborah (bee), Eglon (calf), Gaal (beetle), Habsa, in N. T. Aga-bus (locust), Hula (wasp), Jabol (chamois), Jonas (dove), Nahas (snake), Ozi (goose-like), Rachel (ewe), Saphan (coney), Seba (gazelle), Sephora (little bird), Sual (jackal), Tabitha (Aram., gazelle), Tola (worm), Zeb (wolf).—Of the names of plants, apparently less frequently used than those of animals, here are a few instances: Asena (bush), Cessia (a kind of balsam-tree), Cos (thorn), Elias (oak), Elon (terebinth), Ha-daas (myrtle), Oren (pine), Susan (lyle), etc. Some modern scholars explain the relatively frequent recurrence of these two kinds of names among Palestinian communities as, in other cases also, a method which scholars maintain, prevailed in early times. This is hardly the place to discuss such a question. It is illogical to extend to all primitive peoples religious conceptions observed in some few; were we to yield to the fascination for totems which prevails among some writers, we might consider as traces of totemism such English names as Wolf, Hawthorne, and the like. Granting even that the names mentioned above are unmistakable signs of totemism among the early populations of Palestine, it would by no means necessarily follow that these names manifest the prevalence of the same religious ideas among the Hebrews. Hebrew was not the primitive language of the descend- ants of Abraham, they having adopted it (from the natives of the land of Chanaan) naturally along with the language they adopted certain of their modes of speech.

Sometimes names of things, also of natural phenomen- ena, even (though rarely) abstractions, and words referring to trades or avocations were taken as proper names. Of the etymology of the names of trades: Abdon, Obed (servant), Amon (architect), Bersellai (blacksmith), Charmi (vina-dresser), Somer (watch- man, Zamri (singer); of the former: Agag (fire), Abod (union), 'Amos (burden), Anna (grace), Barac (light- ning), Besec (thunderbolt), Cis (straw), Core (frost), Ephron (dust), Hon (strength), Mary (stoutness),
Disobedience, see Num., xii, Naboth (fruit), Ur (light), Samson (sun), etc.

Compound Names.—Compound personal names are so numerous that only a few main points concerning them can be touched on here. First comes the question of the exact meaning of these names. Although the sense of each part separately is usually clear enough, yet that of the compound is not. The difficulty is to decide whether these parts are in genitive relation, or in relation of subject to predicate (the verb in the latter case being understood). In certain names, no matter which view is taken, the meaning remains practically the same; it is immaterial whether “Eliasher” be interpreted “God of help” or “God is help”; but with names like Abinadab, the difference in both constructions becomes marked, for “Father of generosity” is by no means equivalent to “my father is generous”. Since no rule for all cases is available, for the sake of clearness it will be well to divide compound names into three classes: (1) Names having as one of their component parts a term connoting either kindred (father, son, etc.) or accidental relations (e.g., servant); (2) Names (known as theophoraneous names) containing a Divine element; (3) Names including terms both of kindred and Divinity.

(1) There is no doubt but that only a genitive relation obtained between the first element and the second in their first element Ben (son), Bath (daughter), Ebed or Obed (servant). Thus Benjamin is to be interpreted “son of the right hand”, Bethsheba, “daughter of the oath”; Obed-edom, servant of Edom. Names in which the first element is Ab (father), Ah (brother), Amm (uncle by the father's side) are to be considered sentences, for such a construction is possible only to names such as Abigail, Abiasag, etc., if they meant “father of joy”, “father of error”, would be most unsuitable for women. The name Achab some regard as a possible exception to this rule (it might then be interpreted “brother of the father”—uncle), whether this exception is warranted remains problematical. As to the letters (') and (u) (frequently introduced after the first element of this class of names (Abi, Achi, Ammi), it seems rather a connecting vowel than a personal suffix.

(2) Theophoraneous names were at all times widely used among Semitic peoples. To limit ourselves to names found in the Bible, although names including the name of God (El) are not infrequent (El Rapha, El Shaddai). They are numerous, yet they were not in use as early as those formed with 'El. These names have for their other component element either a verb or a noun. In the former case, the Divine name is the subject of the verb (Elissama, “God heard”; Jonathan, “Yahweh gave”); in the latter the Divine name may be regarded again as the subject, and the noun as the predicate (Elissua, “God is salvation”); Joose, “Yahweh is salvation”.

Not only the name of the true God, but also names of foreign deities, especially Adon, Baal, Melek, entered into the composition of names taken by Hebrews at a period when the relations of God's people with their neighbours were most intimate. Naturally such names became common, their kindred being used as names of those including Yah or 'El. Hence Adonizedee shall be understood “Adon is justice”, etc.; but Esbaal can hardly mean anything else than “man of Baal”. In this connexion it is noticeable that at a later period abhorrence of these foreign deities prompted first the reading, and then afterwards the writing of Bosheth rather than Bosheth (Laboath, for Isbaal). Moreover, it matters not, in theophoraneous names, whether the Divine element stands in the first or in the last place (theophoraneous names have among western Semitic peoples only two component parts, contrary to the Assyrian and Baby- lonian). Thus for Nathan-El is equivalent to El-Nathan, Joose to Issaia, etc.

Not unfrequently two Divine names are united to form a compound, as in Joel, Elimelech, etc. In these cases it is clear that we should see a sentence expressing an act of faith in the divinity of the god the subject of the sentence. Accordingly Joel will be interpreted “Yahweh is God”, and Elimelech “Melek is Yahweh”. On the other hand, the names Adon and Melek cannot mean “Adon is Yahweh” or “Melek is Yahweh”, because, unlike ‘El, Yah is never appellative; in these words, Adon and Melek are common nouns, and the compounds are equivalent respectively to “Yahweh is master” and “Yahweh is king”.

(3) The rules laid down for interpreting the above classes of compound names are equally applicable to those made up of a word denoting relationship and a word denoting divinity. If the first part of these names be Ben, Bath, Bar (Aram., son), Ebed, Iah (man), a genitive relation may be understood to exist between it and the second part; thus Benadad or Barhadad stands for “son of Hadad”; Abdeel for “servant of God”; Esbaal for “man of Baal”. On the other hand, if the first element be Ah, Ahab, Amm or the like it seems that the relation to the Divine name should be regarded rather as one of predicate to subject. It is clear that the interpretation indicated here is the right one, for otherwise some names would convey absurd meanings: surely Ahiab, Abiel, Abbaal, Aboel, cannot mean “brother of Yahweh”, “of God”, “of Baal”. There might be no objection, absolutely speaking, in words like Achiel, Achia, being understood “brother of God”, “of Yahweh”; but it is hard to believe the sense could be, as it is, different when the elements appear in the reverse order, as in Joaah.
considering these names as Hebrew, since Hebrew is the Chassanite language of the early inhabitants of Palestine, adopted by the Israelite conquerors.

In all countries, many names of places have been suggested by the topography. The Palestinians named the mountain Ramiah, Ramath-edem, Ramath-judah, Ramathaim; for the same reason we would name them "Height"; they said Gabaa, Gaba, Gaban, as we would say "Hill"; their Sela (Petra) would be our "Cliff"; what we might style our "Hollow" they called Horen or Horonaim. They had their Lebanon as we have our "White Mountains"; and where we would say "Black Rock", they said Hauran; the names of some of their rivers: Jordan, Cedron, Sichor, resemble our "Rapids", "Dusky", "Blackwater". Argob means a layer of rich soil; Horeb or Jabes, dry lands; Accaron, "Bad Lands". "Spring" and "Well" were then as now a prominent element in compound names of places (hence, Ender, Engadik, etc.; Beroth, Bersabee, etc.); to a native of the Holy Land, Hammat, Hammam sounded like "Hot Springs" to us. A large proportion of compound names are made up of Hasar (enclosed settlement), Carith, Ir, Qir (city), Beth (house), and another element the origin of which is not always obvious (Cariarith, Bethlehem). Sometimes also the locality derived its name from some "tree" or "fruit". Abimilcham. The fruit of the kind of Rhamnus), Baca (mulberry-tree), Abel-karam, Bethacarem, Escol, Sorec (vine); Dilan (cucumber); Ela, Elath, Elik, Eloth, Elon (oak and terebinth); Gamzel (acamaro); Luas (almond-tree); Mount Olivet; Remon (pomegranate); Rithmah (broom); Samir, Bethaceta (ascacia); Betafitra (apple of Bita or a taking-tree).

Places named after animals are not rare in Palestine: Acrabim (scorpion), Aiaon (stag), Arad (wild ass); Eglon, Eglaim (eagle), Ephron, Ophra (gazelle); En-gaddi (kid), Etam (hawk); Bethhagla (partridge); Humza (lizard); Lais, Lebatho (lion); Irna-has (snake); Beth-nemra (leopard); Para (cow); Sebaim, Sebain (jackal); Haasar-eusa, -eum (horse); Telaim, Bethcar (lambs); Zora (boar-net); etc.

An important and interesting class of topographical names have reference to the religious practices of the early inhabitants of Chanaan. Such cities as Beth-ssames, Ennsenes, the various Hares clearly owed their name to their use as grazing places. Abraham was, perhaps such names as Sin, Sinai (Babyl. Sin, i.e., Moon-god), and Jericho, tell us of places consecrated to the cult of the moon. Many were the cities and mountains dedicated to the Chassanites to the various Baals. Even Babylonian gods possessed shrines in Palestine: the names of Mt. Nebo, Nebo of Moab, Nebo of Juda (Ed, ii, 29), are of themselves very suggestive; Anath, the female companion of Anu, gave her name to Beth-Anath, Beth-Anoth, Anathoth; Bel was honoured in Riba (Ar-bela); Ishtar in Astaroth, Astaroth-carnaim, Beestern; the name Beth-Dagon needs no comment.

Finally a certain number of distinctly Hebrew names, which either superseded older ones, or were given to, or modified, have special interest because they took their origin from events enshrined in the memory of the Hebrews. Bersabee recalls the league of Abraham and Abimelech (Gen. xix, 20); Eseq, the quarell of the herdsmen of Gerara with those of Isaac (Gen. xxvi, 20); Bethel, the vision of Jacob (Gen., xxviii, 17); likewise the names Abel-Midian, Berar, Meribah (Ex., xvii, 7), Thabeera (Num., xi, 3), Horna (Num., xxii, 3), Galgala (Jos., v, 9), Bokim (Judges, ii, 5), Abenerser (I Kings, vi, 12), Pherex Oza (II Kings, vi, 8), etc., were for the Hebrew people so many records of the memorable past. And this custom of renaming places in commemoration of momentous facts persisted until the times of the New Testament, as we gather from the (Aramaic) name Hacealada (Matt., xxviii, 18; Acte, i, 19) given to the potter's field bought with blood in Jerusalem.

Cathay in Bucki, Bibl., s. v.; AN, Ami, Ans, CLAT, Jacob, Notes and Anecdotes in the Foreign Church Review, XIV, 190-201; GRAT, Hebrew Proper Names (London, 1898); IDRIE, Names on an Edomite Inscription in Revue des Lettres Anciennes (Feb., 1890), 235-34; IDRIE in Hasting, Dict. of the Bible, s. v. Name and Proper Names: JASTROW, On Compound with Backward Compounds in Journ. of Bibl. Lit. (1894), 101-117; Smith, The Rel. of the Semites (London, 1897); IDRIE, Animal and Plant Names, in Journ. of Phil. Lit. (1890), 170-71; SCHRADER, On the Edomite Names of Circe, in Der Testament, in ihrer Bedeutung für die Kenntniss des hebräischen Volksglaubens (Breval, 1885); KEIL, Die religiöse-sprachliche und religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Namen, in K obedient, De obduris agnoscentibus (Leipsig, 1895; NESTLE, Die semitischen Eigenamen nach ihrer religiöse-sprachlichen Bedeutung (Harlem, 1876).

CHARLES L. SOUVAT.

Names of Jesus and Mary, sisters of the Holy, a religious congregation founded at Longueuil, Quebec, 8 December, 1844, under the patronage of Bishop Bourget of Montreal, for the Christian education of young girls. The institute is based upon the religious community of the Sisters of St. Joseph at Montreal. The institute was incorporated by act of the Canadian Parliament, 17 March, 1845. A Decree cum laude was issued by Pius IX, 27 February, 1863, and a further Decree of 4 September, 1877, approved the institute; the constitutions received definite approval 29 June, 1901, and the institute was divided into seven provinces, 11 May, 1894. Later increased to nine, 25 August, 1910. Under the direction of Rev. J. Allard three Canadian aspirants—Miss Eulalie Durocher, Miss Henriette Céré, and Miss Mélodie Dufrêne—were trained according to the institute of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary established by Mgr Eugène de Maesand of Marseilles. They took simple religious vows at Longueuil, 5 November, 1878. The name of St. Mary’s School was changed to St. Mary’s Academy and College, Portland, this school
was empowered to confer degrees (July, 1893), also to grant a Teachers' State Certificate good for five years, and a Teachers' State Diploma qualifying the holder for life. In 1907, an Act of the Washington State Legislature, afterwards ratified by the State Board of Education, made attestation of the attainment of the B.S. in Education (or the equivalent) for admission into the teaching profession in the State of Washington mandatory. In 1909, the school was accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the United States and Canada.

2 Other provinces are located in the United States. That of California, established at Oakland (1868) by Bishop Meek, possesses a novitiate since 1871; the New York province includes Florida. Quebec has four provinces: Ontario, one; Manitoba, one. Attached to Ontario are parochial schools in Detroit and Chicago. St. Mary's, Portland, opened (1890) a refuge for destitute and orphaned children and still conducts a Home for Orphan Girls. The congregation numbers (1910) 500 members, 1257; novices, 110; postulants, 81. It conducts 99 schools, residential, select, and parochial, attended by 24,205 pupils. Of these establishments, 48 are in the United States.

MAGGIE R. MADDEN.

NAMUR, DIocese OF (Namurcensis), constituted by the Bull of 12 May, 1559, from territory previously belonging to the Diocese of Liege, and made suffragan of the new metropolitan See of Cambrai. The Concordat of 1870 would recognize the limits of Namur to coincide with those of the Department of Sambre-et-Meuse, and to be suffragan of Meclins. On 14 Sept., 1823, the Diocese of Namur was increased by the territory of Luxembourg, which had formerly belonged to the Diocese of Metz, and which, forming, under the First Empire, part of the Departments of the Forêts and the Ardennes, had been given, in 1815, to the Kingdom of the Netherlands. After the Revolution of 1830, which brought about the separation between the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and the Belgian Province of Luxembourg, the City of Luxembourg received a vicar Apostolic. In 1840 the jurisdiction of this vicar was extended to the whole grand duchy. On 7 October, 1842, the jurisdiction of the Diocese of Namur was definitively restricted to the two Belgian Provinces of Namur and Luxembourg.

In 1047, Albert II, Count of Namur, caused the erection, on the site of an ancient chapel, which an unauthenticated legend says was dedicated by Pope Cornelius in the third century, of a collegiate church, served by the descendants of the Abbots who administered justice within their lands. The first dean, Frederick of Lorraine, brother-in-law of Albert II, about 1050 secured from the chapter of Mainz a portion of the head of St. Aubain, martyr. The collegiate church took the name of St. Aubain the Martyr. In 1057 Frederick became pope under the name of Stephen IX. The various successors of Albert II enriched this foundation with numerous privileges. In 1209 Innocent III, by a Brief, took it under his protection. In 1263 Baldwin, Emperor of Constantinople, heir of the counts of Namur, sold the countship to Guy de Dampierre, Count of Flanders, and the House of Dampierre also protected the collegiate church. In 1429 Couin John III sold it to Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy. Thenceforth, until the French Revolution, Namur belonged to the House of Burgundy-Austria, except during the years 1692–95, when it was occupied by Louis XIV. Charles the Bold, Philip the Fair, Charles V, Albert and Isabella all knelt and took the oath in the sanctuary of St. Aubain. This church thus held a most important position in the political life of the country. It was rebuilt in the eighteenth century after the model of St. Peter's at Rome, as the cathedral.

The Church of Namur resisted Josephinism. In 1789, under the provisional Act of Joseph II, the image of the Blessed Virgin was carried in processions through the streets in honour of the Immaculate Conception. Under the Directory, the vicar capitular, Stevens, formerly a professor in the University of Louvain, and famous for his opposition to Josephinism, directed the clergy by mysteriously circulated communications issued from his hiding-place at Fleury-la-Rivière. After the Concordat, Leopold-Claude de Bexon had been made Bishop of Namur, Stevens feared that the new bishop would be too compliant towards Napoleon. The pamphlets which he circulated under the title "Sophisme dévolé" advised the clergy to refuse admission to the Concordat. As it would be taken by the State for admission to the Organic Articles. A petite équipe formed of persons calling themselves "Steenistes" was formed in the diocese. It was strengthened by the subservience of Bishop Bexon, whom age had weakened, for the prefect Peres and by the circular (13 November, 1802) in which he denied having disapproved of the Organic Articles. At last Bexon resigned, 15 Sept., 1803, and was succeeded by Pissani de la Gaude. But Stevensism continued to exist. Stevens admitted that the Concordat was legitimate, and that the new bishops might be received; he only protested against the formula of adhesion to the Concordat. But the Stevensists went farther: they held that the jurisdiction of the bishops was radically defective, and that the aforesaid lease of the Organic Articles was null and void for the Stevensists. Stevens died 13 February, 1828. He submitted all his writings to the Holy See, which never passed judgment. Since 1806 the right of appointing the dean and chapter of Namur has been in the pope's hands. In 1884, in the absence of a dean and chapter, the pope, Pius IX, established the title of cardinal deacon of the Holy Name of Jesus. The Diocese of Namur honours with special veneration Sts. Maternus, Servatius (Servais), and Remacu.
lous, the first apostles of the Diocese of Tongres, which
later became that of Liège (q. v.), and some saints of
the Diocese of Liège, Sts. Lambert, Hubert, and
Juliana. Mention may also be made of St. Foillan,
Irish origin, founder, in 690, of the monastery of
Fosses; St. Begge, sister of St. Gertrude of Nivelles,
and foundress, in 692, of the monastery of Andenne,
which she presided over; St. Hadelin, founder of the
monastery of Cellies, d. about 690; St. Walhère, or
Voxy, parish priest of Ohany (thirteenth century); St.
Mary of Oignies, b. at Nivelles about 1177, celebrated
for her visions, in d. at the bégugnais of Oignies, where
her director, Jacques de Vitry, who became Bishop of
St. Jean d’Acre and cardinal, wished also to be buried.
Lastly, the Diocese of Namur honours in a special
manner the Martyrs of Gorkum, whose relics it pos-
sesses. At Arlon, which now belongs to the diocese,
was born Henri Busch, famous as “Bon Henri”,
founder of the shoemakers’ and the tailors’ fraternities
in Paris (seventeenth century).

The religious congregations administer in the Di-
ocese of Namur, according to “La Belgique Charit-
able”, 2 orphanages for boys, 7 for girls, 1 mixed, 18
hospitals or infirmaries, 4 clinics, 194 infant schools,
1 house of rescue, 6 houses for the care of the sick in
their homes, 1 asylum for deaf mutes, 2 houses of
retract, 1 insane asylum. In 1907 the Diocese of
Namur numbered 583,722 inhabitants, 36 deaneries,
37 parishes, 677 sucursals, 96 auxiliary chapels, 111
curacies paid by the State.

Galliot, Histoire générale ... de la ville et province de Namur
(Liège, 1788-91); Reippenberg, Boronett, and Ram, Monu-
ments pour servir à l’histoire des provinces de Namur, de Hainaut, et
de Luxembourg (10 vols., Brussels, 1844-60); Boronett and Bome-
mann, Cartulaire de la Commune de Namur (Namur, 1871-76); Aigret,
Histoire de l’Église et du chapitre de St. Aubin à Namur (Namur,
1881); Berlière, Monasticon belg. I (Maastricht, 1897); Dutten,
Bibliotheque (Namur, 1884-1902); Claessens, La Belgique chrétienne ... .
1724-1889 (Ixelles, 1883).

Georges Goyau.

Nancy, Diocese of (Nanciensis et Tullensis),
comprises the Departments of Meurthe and Moselle,
France, suffragan of Besançon. The See of Nancy is
the heir, so to speak, of the celebrated See of Toul.

St. Mansuetus, Apostle of the Leuci and first Bishop
of Toul, and according to some a disciple of St. Peter,
cannot have been anterior to the fourth century.
The days of his saintly successors, Amonatus, Alchus,
and Celsinus, cannot be determined. Among the bishops
of the diocese may be mentioned: St. Auspicius (about
470); St. Ursinus (Our); St. Clouva in 596, who
requested an ecclesiastical to instruct him in the teachings
of Christianity; St. Epvre (Aper) (500-505), brother of
St. Evrone (Apromia); St. Alband (about 508), es-
ctablished a community of ecclesiastics from which
originated the Abbey of St. Epvre; St. Leudinus-Bodo
(second half of the seventh century), founder of the
monastery of Bon Moustiers; and brother of St. Sal-
berge, foundress and first abbess of the monastery of
Laon; St. Jacob (756-65); St. Gauzelin (922-62), who
reformed the monastery of St. Epvre and founded that
of Notre-Dame de Bouzicules; St. Gerard (963-94);
Bruno of Dagsberg (1026-51), eventually St. Leo
Ligier (1449-60); Cardinal John of Lorraine (1517-43),
who held twelve sees in six large abbeys; Charles of
Lorraine, cardinal of Vaudemont (1580-87); Cardinal Nicholas Francois of Lorrain-
e (1625-34); Andre du Saussay (1649-75), author of “Martyrologium Gallicanum”.

The title of count and the rights of sovereignty of
the episcopal Bishops of Toul originated in certain
grants which Henry the Fowler gave to St. Gauzelin in
927. The See of Toul was disturbed by the Conflict of
Investitures in 1108. The chapter was divided; the
majority elected Riquin of Commercy bishop; the
minority chose Conrad of Schwarzenburg. Henry V
declared for the latter; Ponsel II for the former, but
nevertheless he granted Conrad the title of bishop,
provided he performed no episcopal office. In 1271
grave differences broke out again in the chapter of
Toul; after seven years’ vacancy the Holy See re-
sinded the four elections made by the chapter, and in
1278 Nicholas III personally appointed as bishop Con-
rad of Tübingen. Thenceforth it was generally the
Holy See which appointed the bishops, alleging vari-
ous reasons as the vacancies arose; hence the many
Italian prelates who held this important see until 1552.
when Toul was occupied by France. In 1597 Charles
III, Duke of Lorraine, impatient of his dependence on
a diocese henceforth French, asked Clement VIII for
the dismemberment of the See of Toul and the creation
of a see at Nancy; this failed through the opposition

of Arnaud d’Ossat, Henry’s ambassador at Rome.
Clement VIII, however, decided that Nancy was to
have a primatial church and that its prelate would
have the title of primate of Lorraine and wear episco-
pal insignia, but should not exercise episcopal juris-
diction.

In 1777 and 1778 Toul lost territories out of which
were formed two new dioceses: Saint-Dié and Nancy,
both of them suffragan of Trier. The Concordat of
1802, which suppressed Toul, made Nancy the seat of
a vast diocese which included the three Departments
of Meurthe, Meuse, and Vosges; the latter two were
detached from Nancy in 1822 on the re-establishment
of the Dioceses of Verdun and Saint-Dié. When
France lost Alsace-Lorraine in 1871, Nancy lost the
arrondissements of Sarrebourg and Château-Salins
which, having become German, were united with the
Diocese of Metz. Nancy however annexed the ar-
rondissement of Briey which remained French, and
was detached from the Diocese of Metz (consistorial
decrees of 10 and 14 July, 1874). Since 1824 the
bishops of Nancy have borne the title of Bishops of
Nancy and Toul, as the ancient Diocese of Toul is
almost entirely united with Nancy. It has had some
illustrious bishops: Forbin-Janson (1824-44); Darboy
(1859-83); the future Cardinal Lavergne (1863-67);
and the future Cardinal Foulon (1867-82). Since
1165, whenever the Bishop of Toul officiated pontifi-
cally, he wore an ornament called surhumeral, or ra-
ionale, a sort of pallium covered with precious stones,
which decoration he alone of all the bishops of the
Latin Church wore. A brief of 16 March, 1865, re-
stored this privilege to the bishops of Nancy and Toul. Concerning the insinuations of the Old Catholics in 1870 apropos of this Brief, see Grandther, "Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils", II, 589, and III, 748. St. Sigisbert, III (630-54), King of Austrasia, and founder of twelve monasteries, is patron of the City of Nancy.

On 5 Dec., 1572, Gregory XIII signed the Bull for the erection of a university at Pont-à-Mousson; the faculties of theology and arts were entrusted to the Jesuits; the learned Father Sirmond made his profession there, and in 1681 Queen Mary Stuart established a seminary for twenty-four Scotmen and Irishmen. St. Peter Fourier was a pupil of this seminary. Cardinal Mathieu (d. 1908) was for many years parish priest of Pont-à-Mousson. The congregation of Our Lady of Refuge was founded at Nancy for penitent women in 1627, by Elizabeth of Ranfaing, known as Sister Mary Elisabeth of the Cross of Jesus. This congregation had numerous houses throughout France. Mattaincourt, the parish of St. Peter Fourier, belonged to Toul when the saint established his important foundations in the seventeenth century.

The chief pilgrimage centres are: Notre-Dame de Bon Secours, at Nancy, dating from the fifteenth century, and for which King Stanislaus built (1738-41) a large sanctuary on the site of the humble chapel erected by King René; Notre-Dame de Sion, at Saxe-Sion, dating from the episcopate of St. Gerard, and whose madonna, broken during the Revolution, was replaced in 1802 by another (miraculous) statue of the Blessed Virgin; and St-Nicolas du Fort, in honour of St. Nicholas, Bishop of Myra, patron saint of Loraine.

Prior to the enforcement of the Associations Law of 1901, there were in the diocese, Carthusians, Jesuits, Dominicans, Oblates of Mary immaculate, Redemptorists, and several orders of teaching brothers, one of which, the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine (founded in 1822 by Dom Fréchard, former Benedictine of Senones Abbey), had its mother-house at Nancy.

Orders of women: the Canonesses Regular of St. Augustine of the Congregation of Notre Dame, a teaching order founded at Vezelay in 1629, and transferred to Lunéville in 1850; Sisters of St. Charles, a nursing and teaching order, the foundation of which in 1831 is due to the laymen, Joseph and Emmanuel Chauvenel; Sisters of the Christian Doctrine, called Vatelottes, a nursing and teaching order founded about 1718 by the Duke of Lorraine and Father Jean-Baptiste Vatelot; Sisters of the Holy Childhood of Mary, a nursing and teaching order which Canon Claude Daunot took thirty-five years to establish (1820-55); Sisters of the Holy Heart of Mary, a teaching order founded in 1842 by Bishop Manuau and Countess Clara de Gondrecourt; Daughters of Compassion, a nursing order of Servite tertiaries, established in 1854 by Abbé Thiriet at St-Firmin.

The religious congregations of the diocese conduct 6 crèches, 57 day-nurseries, 2 institutions for sick children, 1 school for the blind, 1 school for deaf-mutes, 3 boys' orphanages, 23 girls' orphanages, 12 teaching rooms (industrial), 3 schools for apprentices, 32 hospitals or asylums, 17 houses for visiting nurses, 16 houses of retreat, 1 insane asylum. In 1909, the Diocese of Nancy had 517,508 inhabitants, 29 deaneries, 462 succursal parishes, and 91 vicariates.

NANNI, GIOVANNI. See ANNIUS OF VITERBO.

Nantes (NANNETES), Dioecese of (NANCELIENSIS).—This diocese, which comprises the entire department of Loire Inferieure, was re-established by the Concordat of 1802, and is suffragan of Tours. According to late traditions, St. Claurus, first Bishop of Nantes, was a disciple of St. Peter. De la Borderie, however, has shown that the ritual of the Church of Nantes, drawn up by preconvent Helius in 1263, ignores the apostolic mission of St. Claurus; that St. Peter's nail in the cathedral of Nantes was not brought thither by St. Claurus, but at a time subsequent to the invasions of the Northmen in the tenth century; that St. Felix of Nantes, writing with six other bishops in 567 to St. Radegund, attributes to St. Martin the chief rôle in the conversion of the Nantais to Christianity; that the traditions concerning the mission of St. Claurus are later than 1400. The earliest list of the bishops of Nantes (made, according to Duchesne, at the beginning of the tenth century) does not favour the thesis of a bishop of Nantes prior to Constantine. The author of the Passion of the Nantes martyrs, St. Donatian and Rogatian, places their death in the reign of Constantius Chlorus, and seems to believe that Rogatian could not be baptized, because the bishop was absent. Duchesne believes that the two saints suffered at an earlier date, and disputes the inference of the ancient writer concerning the absence of the bishop. He believes that the first bishop of Nantes, whose date is certain, is Desiderius (453), correspondent of Sulpicius Severus and St. Paulinus of Nola. Several bishops, it is true, occupied the see before him, among others St. Clarus and St. Similianus, but their dates are uncertain. Mgr. Duchesne considers as legendary the St. Emilianus supposed to have been Bishop of Nantes in Charlemagne's reign and to have fought the Saracens in Burgundy.

Among the noteworthy bishops are: St. Felix (550-83), whose municipal improvements at Nantes were praised in the poems of Fortunatus, and who often mediated between the people of Brittany and the Frankish kings; St. Pacharius (end of seventh century); St. Gohard (Gohardus), martyred by the Northmen in 845, with the monks of the monastery of...
Aindre; Actardus (843–71), during whose time the Breton prince, Nemenoë, in his conflict with the metropolis See of Tours (q. v.), created a see at Guerande, in favour of an ecclesiastical of Vannes, in the heart of the Diocese of Nantes; the preacher Copeau (1621–36). The diocese venerates: the monk St. Hervé (sixth century); the hermit Sts. Friard and Saint-Martial of Paris, first church of Cambon (sixth or seventh century); the English hermit Vital, or St. Vital (seventh or eighth century); the Greek St. Benoît, Abbott of Masserac in Charlemagne's time; St. Martin of Vertou (d. 601), apostle of the Herbaugis district and founder of the Benedictine monastery of Vertou; St. Hermeland, sent by St. Leo the Great to Britain to propagate the faith; and St. Alban, sent to convert the British in the seventh century to found on an island in the Loire the great monastery of Aindre (now Indret); the celebrated missionary St. Amand, Bishop of Maastricht (seventh century), a native of the district of the Herbaugis. Blessed Francoise d'Amboise (1427–85), who became Duchess of Brittany in 1450, had a great zeal in the foundation of the Little Brothers of St. Vincent Ferrier, rebuilt the choir of the collegiate church of Notre-Dame, and founded at Nantes the monastery of the Poor Clares. Widowed in 1457, she resisted the intrigues of Louis XI, who urged her to contract a second marriage, and in 1468 became a Carmelite nun at Vannes. In 1477, at the request of Sixtus IV, she restored the Benedictine convent of Fontevraud near Nantes, the Obedience of the Anjou. In 1477 it was a native of the diocese. The Abbey of La Meilleraye, founded in 1132, was the beginning of an establishment of Trappist Fathers, who played a most important part in the agricultural development of the country. The crusades were preached at Nantes by Blessed Robert of Arbrissel, founder of the Venerable Order of the Charteries of Blois, and Nantes from his rival Jean de Montfort in 1341. On 8 August, 1499, Louis XII married Anne of Brittany at Nantes—a marriage which later led to the annexation of the Duchy of Brittany to the Crown of France (1532). Chateau briant, a town of the diocese, was a Calvinistic centre in the sixteenth century. For the Edict of Nantes (1558), which granted Protestant religious freedom and certain political prerogatives, see HUGENOTS.

In 1665, by order of Louis XIV, Cardinal Retz was imprisoned in the castle of Nantes, from which he contrived to escape. A college was created at Nantes in 1680 for the education of Irish ecclesiastics. Certain regions were-won during the Revolution, the scene of the War of Vendée, waged in defence of religious freedom and to restore royalty. At Savernay in December, 1793, succumbed the remains of the Vendean army, already defeated in the battle of Choleot. The atrocities committed at Nantes by the terrorist Carrier are well-known. Four councils were held at Nantes, in 664, 1127, 1264, and 1431. The mausoleum of Francis II, last Duke of Brittany, executed in 1507 by Michel Colom, is one of the finest monuments of the Renaissance. The chief places of pilgrimage of the diocese are: Notre-Dame de Bon Garant at Orvault, a very old pilgrimage, repeatedly made by Francis II, Duke of Brittany; Notre-Dame de Bon Secours at Nantes, a pilgrimage centre which dates back to the fourteenth century; Notre-Dame de Toutes Aides. Notre-Dame de Miséricorde was a place of pilgrimage in 1026 in memory of the miracle by which the country is said to have been freed from a dragon; the present seat of the pilgrimage is the Church of St. Similien at Nantes. Before the law of 1801, the diocese counted Capuchins, Trappists, Jesuits, Missionary Priests of Mary, Augustinians, Franciscans, Missionaires of Africa, Premonstratensians, Sulpicians, and several orders of teaching brothers. The Ursulines of Nantes were established by St. Angela of Merci in 1840.

Among the congregations for women originating in the diocese are: the Sisters of Christian Instruction, a teaching order founded in 1820 at Beignon (Diocese of Vannes) by Abbé Deshayes, of which the motherhouse was transferred to St-Gildas des Bois in 1828; Sisters of the Immaculate Conception, a teaching and nursing order, founded in 1853 (mother-house at La Haye-aux-Bois); Franciscan Sisters, founded in 1871 (mother-house at St-Philbert de Grandlieu); Oblate Franciscan Sisters of the Heart of Jesus, founded in 1875 by Mlle Gazeau de la Brandanniere (mother-house at Nantes). At the beginning of the twentieth century, the religious congregations of the diocese conducted three écoles, 44 day nurseries, 3 homes for sick children, 1 institution for the blind, 1 deaf and dumb institution, 6 boys' orphanages, 17 girls' orphanages, 3 homes for poor girls, 1 institution for the extinction of mendicity, 2 houses of mercy, 1 house to supply work to the unemployed, 1 vestiary, 10 houses of visiting nurses, 7 homes for invalids and for retirement, 23 hospitals or asylums. The Diocese of Nantes has 604,971 Catholics, 52 parishes, 209 succourable parishes.

Scolia christ. (nov., 1856), XIV, 794–842; Instrumentum, 171–188; Travaux, Hist. aérope des églises de Nantes (3 vols.), Nantes, 1883; REBERGUER, L'épiscopat nantais à travers les siècles in Revue hist. de l'Ouest (1888–90); DECHERNE, Fontes Epircorporates, II, 356–989; CABOUR, L'apothéose de Saint Clair, premier éveque de Nantes et fondateur de la tradition nantaise (Nantes, 1883); DE LA BONNÉROIE, Études hist. borroméennes, St. Clair et les origines de l'épiscopie de Nantes (Rennes, 1894); RICHARD, Études sur la légende historique de Saint Clair de Nantes, premier éveque du Nantes (Nantes, 1886); RICHARD, La prenne de l'épiscopie de Nantes (Nantes, 1887); BOYNE, The Irish Colisation of Nantes (London, 1901); Lallier, Le Diocèse de Nantes pendant la Révolution (Nantes, 1889). For further bibliography see CHEVALIER, Topobibl., s. v.

GEORGES GOYAT.

Nantes, Edict of. See HUGENOTS.

Nanteuil, Robert, French engraver and crayonist, b. at Reims, 1623 (1626, or 1630); d. at Paris, 1678. Little is known of his early life save that his father, a merchant of Reims, sent him to the Jesuit school, where he received a splendid classical training but no encouragement to draw. In every spare moment he was busy with his pencil or burin, and he even engraved on the trees in the forest. He cut in wood the name of a "Christ" and a "Virgin," copying from old copper plates. He later went to the Benedictines, who fostered his artistic bent; one of the order, who patiently sat for him, is seen in the "Buste d'un Religieux" (published in 1644). He also engraved ornaments for his thesis in philosophy in 1645 (Piety, Justice, and Prudence Saluting the University), both these early attempts with the graver being notable successes. His family being in dire financial straits, Nanteuil went to Paris (1648), and worked with Regnoss, whose sister he had married. His style now changed and developed quickly; his first method had been to use straight lines only, shallow or deep; then he practised cross-hatching and added stippling for the middle-tints (in this following Boulanger). The acme of his style shows special strokes and individual treatment for each part of the face and for each texture of the draperies. His crayon and pastel por-
traits brought him a pension of 1000 liras and the appointment of Royal Engraver (1658), together with an atelier in the Gobelin. Two years later Louis XIV issued an edict, mainly inspired by Nanteuil, lifting engraving out of the realm of mechanical arts and giving to engravers all the privileges of other artists.

Nanteuil’s bold, broad, and vigorous pastel or crayon life-size sketches have nearly all disappeared, for he used them only as studies for his engravings; and his rich, yet delicate and silvery tones, his splendid modelling of the face, his suggestion of colour throughout the plate and unaffected justness of the likenesses are largely due to his following the fresh and often wet chalks. He engrossed portraits of many of the princes of Europe and of all the celebrated men of France in Louis XIV’s time. Of the Grand Monarque alone he made nineteen portraits at various periods of his life. He was rich, affable, and very generous, and would often send back payments for great plates when he found the sitters were poor. He was revered by the nobility and men of letters, and himself wrote poetry and recited pleasantly. His verses are often to be found beneath his portraits. He was the pioneer of modern engraving, and much of his work equals and strongly resembles the best of recent times. He was a rapid and prolific worker, many of his 243 plates being life-size. Fairthorne, a great collector of his works, learned much from him, and Edelinck was his friend and follower. His masterpieces are: J. B. van Steenbergen (after Duchatél), called “L’Advocat de Hollandie” (1688); M. de Pomponne (after Le Brun); Jean Loret; Duchesse de Nemours; and Marshal Turenne. A few of his chalk originals are in the Louvre and all of his 243 plates are in the Musée Richelieu.

Richard, Magasin Pittoresque (Paris, 1859); Dumesnil, Le Peintre Graveur Français, IV (Paris —); Delaborde, La Gravure (Paris, s. d.).

LEIGH HUNT.

Naples. See Neaphtali.

Naples, the capital of a province in Campania, southern Italy, and formerly capital of the Kingdom of Two Sicilies; the most memorable of these is the bay of Naples, on the Capodimonte, the Vesuvius, and the Posilipo hills, in one of the most enchanting spots upon the earth. The most populous town in Italy, its suburbs stretch along the bay, as far as Torre Annunziata. Naples is a very industrial town, and its fisheries, navigation, and commerce are very important. The yards by Loretto, a centre of the port, and near the Royal Navy. In its neighbourhood, the vine and all species of esculent plants are cultivated; and fruits and vegetables are exported in great quantities. The silk industry is very important. Naples has frequently been damaged by the eruptions of the neighbouring Vesuvius, and the most memorable occurred in the year 72 of the Christian era, the first eruption of Vesuvius after several centuries of inactivity; in 205, 407, 512, 982, and 1139, the eruptions were less violent; until 1631, the volcano gave no signs of activity, and was covered with vegetation; there were more or less violent eruptions, however, in 1650, 1694, 1707, 1723, 1794, 1804, 1805, 1822, 1828, 1839, 1850, and 1872; the eruption of 1904 was one of the most violent of all, and caused the ruin of Ottaviano and of San Giuseppe.

Buildings.—Sacro.—The cathedral or church of Saint Januarius, begun by order of Charles of Anjou in 1272, on the site of the ancient Stefania cathedral of S. Gennaro, is one of the finest buildings in Italy; the façade of Nicolò Pisano, Maglione, and Muccio, is in Gothic style with three naves; the façade, modified by the restoration of 1788, has been brought again to its original style; its principal door is a work of Babbcuccio Piferino (1407), while its chapel of St. Restituta is said to date from the time of Constantine. The fourteen pilasters are adorned with busts of famous archbishops of Naples. In the crypt, which was built by Malvito by order of Archbishop Carafa, is venerated the body of St. Januarius, taken there from Montevergine in 1479. Of the lateral chapels, that of the Treasure is the most notable; it is there that the head of St. Januarius and the amputated leg of blood are preserved (see Januarius, St.). The cathedral contains the superb sepulchres of Innocent IV and of Cardinal Minutoli, the second, a work of Girolamo d’Auria; also, valuable thirteenth-century frescoes of Santafede, Vincenzo Porti, Luca Giordano, and others, and paintings by John of Nola, Franco, Fontana, and others. Among the most remarkable are the church of St. Augustine of the Mint, which has a pulpit of the fifteenth century, sculptures by Vincent d’Angelo and Gian da Nola, and a painting by Diana (the Communion of St. Augustine); the church of the Holy Apostles, restored in 1908 by the labour of famous artists, among whom were Giordano, Marco da Siena, Bonomini, and others; a fine series of letters, high altar being the work of Cagiano; the church of S. Domenico Maggiore, dating from 1255, is rich in paintings, mosaics, and sepulchres, and in the ancient monastery connected with this church is the cell of St. Thomas Aquinas; the church of Dona Regina, built by Mary of Hungary, in 1300, and renewed by the Theatine Guarino in 1670, contains valuable paintings and frescoes, and also, in its tomb, the body of the pope, with two wings that have porticoes, is adorned with paintings of the nineteenth century. The church of San Giacomo of the Spaniards (1540) is decorated with works of art; St. John Carbonara (1343) contains the mausoleum of King Ladislaus and of the constable Serpignanni Caracciolo, and paintings by famous artists. The church of St. Barbara, a work of Giovanni di Sale, has a beautiful bas-relief of the Madonna with angels over the principal entrance, and another fine bas-relief within the edifice; adjacent to the church is the cell inhabited by St. Francis of Paula. The church of St. Clare (1310), restored in 1752, contains the mausoleum of Robert the Wise and of other personages, and also, in its chapel of St. John Nepomucen, a pulpit is a graceful work of art. The church of Santa Maria del Carmine, built in the thirteenth century, and restored in 1769, contains the tomb of Conradin executed by Schoepf in 1574 by order of King Louis of Bavaria. The church of St. Mary of Pedirotta, where each year, about September, popular feasts are celebrated; the church of St. Gennaro, the church of Mt. Olivet (1411) contains many works of art, and also the tomb of the architect Charles Fontana; the church of St. Peter ad Ulamam, so called because it contains an altar upon which St. Peter is said to have celebrated Mass. The church of Santa Maria del Parto, built by the poet Sannazaro, contains the mausoleum of its founder, a work of Fra Giovanni Montorsoli; the church of S. Paolo Maggiore, built on the ruins of the ancient temple of Castor and Pollux, after the plans of the Theatin Grimaldi; the church of SS. Severinus and Sosius, which is very ancient, was restored in 1490 and in 1609. While painting the vault of this temple, the artist Correggio, falling from the scaffolding, was killed (1519). But the most fallible of his fall; other artists have also adorned this church with fine works. The church of the Most Holy Trinity, or the New Gesù, an ancient palace converted into a church by the Jesuit Provedo (1584). Mention should be made, however, of the catacombs, near the
church of St. Januario of the Poor, famous in the second century, and of the new cemetery, rich in artistic monuments, among which are the Pietà by Calli in the chapel, and the statue of Religion by Angelini.

Secular.—The Royal Palace, which ranks among the grandest of palaces on account of the majestic severity of its style, was begun in the early part of the seventeenth century by the viceroy Count of Lenne according to the designs of Domenico Fontana; it has a sumptuous interior, and contained valuable artistic collections, one of which, consisting of 40,000 engravings, is now at the Museo Nazionale. There is another royal palace at Capodimonte, built by Charles III, where there is a collection of arms and of modern paintings; the Palace of the Prefecture is a modern; S. Giacomo Palace, formerly the residence of the minister of State, now contains the municipal and scientific institute, a nautical institute, and many intermediate schools. The National Library has nearly 300,000 volumes, and the Brancacciana Library more than 115,000 volumes. The State Archives are very important. Nearly all of the great families of the ancient Kingdom of Naples built sumptuous palaces, the private monumental architecture of Naples antedating that of Florence. Naples has more than 60 charitable institutions, some of which date from the thirteenth century, as, for example, the boarding-school of St. Eligius (1273), accommodating 300 young girls; the Casa Santa dell' Annunziata (1304); the boarding-school del Carmelo (1611); for 300 girls; and St. Januario of the Poor (1669). Few ancient monuments are to be found at Naples; there is the piercing of the Pizzofalcone (crypto nepotiorum), 815 m. in length, done by one Cocceius, probably under Tiberius, and there are the ruins of villas of the ancient

other offices. The Capuan Castle, built by William I in 1131, and thereafter the residence of the Durazzos, of the sovereigns of the house of Aragon, and of the viceroy, is now the court-house; the Castle of the Egg, also built by William I (1154), is at present a barracks and a fort, as are also Castel del Carmine and Castelnuovo, built by Charles I, and having a triumphal arch of Alfonso of Aragon. Castel San Erasmo is a fort, situated upon a height commanding the city and the harbour. The museum of ancient art at Naples is one of the best of its kind in the world; its chief sculptures, the Hercules, the Farnese Bull, and others, are from the collections of the Farnese family, and it possesses many interesting objects found in the ruins of Pompeii and Herculanum, frescos and mosaics, among others; it contains also rich collections of cameos, coins, and inscriptions (Neapolitan laws), besides a gallery of pictures. At S. Martino, a former convent of the Cistercians, there is a collection of paintings by Neapolitan artists, which belonged, for the most part, to that monastery. The Filanzieri Museum and the Gallery of the Fondi palace should also be noted. The aquarium for the study of submarine animal life was established by the cooperation of several countries, among them, the United States. There is in Naples a university founded in 1224, furnished with various scientific collections and with a library of more than 260,000 volumes; the town has a seminary, a theological institute, a naval institute, and many intermediate schools. The National Library has nearly 300,000 volumes, and the Brancacciana Library more than 115,000 volumes. The State Archives are very important. Nearly all of the great families of the ancient Kingdom of Naples built sumptuous palaces, the private monumental architecture of Naples antedating that of Florence. Naples has more than 60 charitable institutions, some of which date from the thirteenth century, as, for example, the boarding-school of St. Eligius (1273), accommodating 300 young girls; the Casa Santa dell' Annunziata (1304); the boarding-school del Carmelo (1611), for 300 girls; and St. Januario of the Poor (1669). Few ancient monuments are to be found at Naples; there is the piercing of the Pizzofalcone (crypto nepotiorum), 815 m. in length, done by one Cocceius, probably under Tiberius, and there are the ruins of villas of the ancient

CHURCH OF ST. FRANCIS OF PAULA, NAPLES
Built by Ferdinand I, King of the Two Sicilies—Modeled after the Roman Pantheon

city, of a theatre and some temples; there is also the tomb of Vergil on the Pozzuoli road.

History.—Naples was founded by Greeks from Cumae, and Cumae, according to Mommsen, is the Palaeopolis to which Livy refers as existing not far from Naples and as being allied with the latter city against the Samnites. Naples, also, was obliged to receive the Samnites within its walls and to give to them participation in the government of the city, which explains her ambitious conduct towards Rome during the Samnite War (326 B.C.). In alliance with Rome, Naples furnished only ships. During the Punic War, the town was so strongly fortified that Hannibal did not venture to attack it. When Roman citizenship was offered to Naples, the latter accepted, on condition that it should retain its language and its municipal institutions; and consequently, even in the time of Tacitus, Naples was a Greek city, to which those Romans who wished to devote themselves to the study of philosophy betook themselves by preference. In the games, called Sebastia, celebrated at Naples every five years, Nero once appeared. In 476, the last Emperor of the West was relegated to this city. The capture of Naples by Belisarius, in the Gothic War, when he entered the city through the tube of the aqueduct (538), is famous. Totila captured the town in 543, but the battle of Mt. Vesuvius decided the fate of the Goths, and Naples came under the Byzantine power, receiving a duc who depended
on the Exarch of Ravenna; and that condition remained, even after the invasion of the Lombards. In 642, under the Empire, he attempted to seize Ravenna, but his independence, and the exarch Exulaterius defeated and killed him in the following year. A hundred years later, at the instance of the iconoclast, Leo the Isaurian, Exulaterius moved upon Rome to assassinate Pope St. Gregory II, but he was compelled to turn back, and was killed by the infuriated people. From that time on, the Byzantine influence at Naples was merely nominal; in place of a dux, there was frequently a consul in command of the city, which flourished in wealth, and displayed military virtues in the defence of its independence against the Lombard dukes of Benevento, Spoleto, Capua, and Salerno, and also against the Saracens; in 850, however, the town was taken, and burned, by Roger I, Duke of Calabria. The unhappy Sergius drove the Saracens from the island of Ponza, while his son Cessarius, in 846, went to the assistance of Leo IV against the same foe, and in 852, freed Gaeta; but to save their commerce, the Neapolitans thereafter allied themselves with the Mohammedans. Bishop Athanasius II imprisoned Sergius and proposed in the meantime for duke, to the Byzantine general, Maniakiis, his Sicilian undertaking, and, indignant at being defrauded of their reward, turned their arms against the Byzantines. Their subsequent conquest laid the foundation of what came to be the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, or the Kingdom of Naples. After their victory near Gaeta in 1041, the Normans of Calabria and Apulia, with the exception of the seaboard towns; their capital was established at Melfi, and the twelve counts divided the territory among themselves—they reconquered by the Byzantines having been frustrated by the defection of Maniakiis. In 1052, Argyros was again defeated, near Sipontum, and the troops of Leo IX were defeated near Civitella; whereupon the pope confirmed the Normans in the possession of their conquests. The first count of Apulia whose title was recognized was William of the Iron Arm, who was succeeded by his brothers, Drogo (1046), assassinated at the instigation of the Byzantines; Humphrey; and, in 1067, Robert, elected Guiscard, by the rebels. In 1060, Orlando (1063) and Bari and Brindisi (1071), submitted to Byzantine rule in Italy, while (1059) he obtained from Nicholas II the title of Duke of Calabria, Apulia, and Sicily, which island he had yet to conquer. On the other hand, he took the oath of allegiance to the pope, so that all his possessions and future conquests should be held of the Holy See. The pope acquired a new defender, especially against the empire, and also a new encumbrance. The conquest of Sicily was accomplished by Roger, a brother of Robert, after a struggle of thirty years (1061-1091); the first city of the island that was taken from the Saracens was Messina; Girgenti and Syracuse were among the last (1060-1067); the Musulmans, however, were given the freedom of the country. Meanwhile, Robert conquered the Republic of Amalfi (1072) and the Duchy of Salerno (1077), the last remnant of the Lombard power. He attempted the conquest of Epirus in 1052, but died in 1085, contemplating a movement against Venice. Robert was succeeded by Roger (1068-1111), William II (1111-1127), and then Roger II (1127-1154). The latter, in 1189, had reduced Prince Richard of Capua to vassalage, and, it is said, obtained from Urban II the dignity of hereditary legate of the Holy See (see MONARCHIA SICULA); and his son Roger II became duke of all those states, with Palermo for his capital. In 1130 the antipope, Anacletus II, conferred upon him the title of King of Sicily, bestowed by Innocent II (1139), to whom Roger renewed the oath of allegiance. On the other hand, Naples under its duke, Sergius VII, had thrown open its gates to Roger, who extended his power in Epirus and Greece (1142 sq.), and also in Africa (Tripoli and Bona, 1152). He gave new constitutions to his states, protected education, promoted agriculture and industry, especially the silk and textile branches, and during his reign Sicily increased in population. His successor William the Wicked (1154) became a prisoner of Matteo Bonellocapo, one of the conspiring barons, but was freed by the people. William the Good (1166-89) conquered Durazzo and Saloniki. His heiress was his aunt, Constance, who married Henry VI, the future Emperor of the empire. As this was contrary to the wishes of the people and of the Holy See, who desired the kingdom to be independent of the empire, Tancred was acclaimed king. Tancred, an illegitimate offspring of the royal house, was soon succeeded by his son William III. Henry VI triumphed in 1184, and was crowned in the cathedral of Benevento, in which the congregation, instead of the infant Frederick I (the II of Germany), whose tutors were entrusted by Constance to Innocent III. In the long contest for the succession of the empire, Innocent finally permitted Frederick to occupy both thrones, on condition that the two Governments should remain separate and independent of each other, that is, at the ascension of the former, the younger should not be inherited by the same prince. These conditions were not fulfilled, and the long struggle between the emperor and the Holy See arose, made all the more bitter by the ecclesiastical usurpations of Frederick. Conrad and Conradin continued the struggle, as did King Manfred, a natural son of Frederick II; and the latter was deposed and beheaded in reality as sovereign. The Holy See (Innocent IV, Clement IV, and Urban IV) as suzerain of the kingdom, offered it to whoever would free the pope of the domination of the Swabians; and Charles of Anjou, a brother of St. Louis, King of France, offered himself. Manfred perished in the battle of Benevento (1266), and Conradin, after his defeat at Tagliacozzo, was taken to Naples and executed in the Piazza del Mercato (1268). Naples then became the capital of the kingdom, to which, however, Peter III of Aragon laid claim on account of his marriage to a daughter of Manfred. The people, who could not endure French rule, opened the way for him by the Sicilian Vespers (1282), and Sicily remained under the rule of the Greek; but, under James, second son of Peter, it became an independent kingdom. When the former was called to the throne of Aragon (1295) he wished to restore Sicily to Charles II, but a brother of James, Frederick II, was acclaimed king by the Sicilians, and Charles, although several times illustrious, was obliged to make peace with Calabria (1302), and to recognize Frederick as King of Trinacria. Frederick was succeeded by Peter II (1336), Louis (1342), and Frederick III (1355-77), who were continually at war with Naples, and always under the domination of the two parties into which the nobility was divided, the National and the Catalonian. Mary, daughter and heiress of Frederick, was married to Martin, son of the King of Aragon, who re-united Sicily to that realm in 1410, and was succeeded by Alfonso V (1416-58). The throne of Naples had been inherited by Robert the Wise (1309-1343), whom the Guelphs of Italy regarded as their leader, and who aspired to the conquest of the Italian peninsula. He was succeeded by his daughter Joanna I, Queen of Naples, and the first of whose husbands, Andrew of Hungary, was brutally murdered in 1345. Louis of Hungary came to avenge his brother's death, and drove Joanna from Naples; but he was obliged to return to his coun-
try, and after a long war Joanna was restored (1832). Having no children, she adopted as her heir Louis of Anjou, a brother of Charles V, King of France. This action led Charles of Durazzo to declare war upon Joanna, in which he received the support of Urban VI; the queen was killed (1382), and Louis, also, having died (1384), the throne was left to Charles without a contest, but Charles died in Hungary in 1386.

Many who were dissatisfied with the regency for Ladislaus I, the minor son and heir of Charles, called to the throne Louis (II) of Anjou, also a minor, and thereby gave rise to a new war between the Durazzo and the Angevin parties. Ladislaus was victorious (1400) and sought to restore to Naples its preponderance in Italy; in this attempt, he invaded the Papal States (1402), but was driven from Rome in 1404. His successor was Joanna II (1414-1434), who was noted for the perversity of her life. Louis III (of Anjou) declared war against her in 1420, on which account she adopted Alfonso V, son of Ferdinand of Aragon and Sicily; but as that prince wished the immediate possession of the kingdom, Joanna adopted Louis III, and after his death in 1434 his brother René. The latter, assisted by Filippo Visconti, defeated the Sicilian fleet of Alfonso near Ponzia, in 1435; Alfonso himself was taken prisoner to Milan, but was soon set at liberty, and received even the assistance of Filippo to conquer Naples, which he accomplished in 1442, establishing Spanish rule in that kingdom, which he left to his illegitimate son; over to Cambodia, Sicily remained united to Aragon. Ferdinand refused to pay tribute to the pope, his suzerain, usurped ecclesiastical rights, violated boundaries, and in other ways provoked the displeasure of the barons of the kingdom and of Innocent VIII; the latter, therefore, gave his support to the barons, who revolted (1445-97), but Jeanne de Médicis, his ordinary, Scarcely had Alfonso II ascended the throne (1494), when Charles VIII, wishing to maintain the rights which he claimed to inherit from the House of Anjou to the throne of Naples, undertook his famous expedition into Italy. Alfonso II, knowing the hatred in which he was held, abdicated in favour of his son Ferdinand II; vainly, however, for almost without striking a blow, Charles became master of the kingdom. His success was but transitory, and Ferdinand was able to return to Naples in 1496, leaving the principal ports of the Adriatic coast in the hands of the Venetians. By the Treaty of Granada, Ferdinand the Catholic and Louis XII divided the Kingdom of Naples, and the latter appointed his brother, Charles VIII, to govern it; the latter died in 1498, and his son became Charles VII, who in 1503, when Andrea Doria suddenly passed over with his fleet to the side of the Spaniards, who remained masters of the country. There were a great many insurrections against Spanish rule; in 1547, on account of the attempt to introduce the Inquisition; in 1599, at the instigation of Tommaso Campanella, O.P., in 1647 (Giuseppe d'Alfiero to Messina, and Masaniello at Naples) it was proposed to offer the crown to Duke Henry of Guise; in 1674, there was a revolt at Messina; all of these insurrections were suppressed.

In the war of the Spanish succession, Naples was conquered by the Austrians for Charles III, son of Emperor Leopold, and pretender to the throne of Sicily, who invaded the Lombardies. By the peace of Utrecht (1713), Sicily was given to King Amadeus of Savoy, but in 1720, it was reunited to Naples. In 1734 Charles of Bourbon, son of Duke Philip of Parma, assisted by the Spanish general Montemar, conquered Naples without much difficulty and took the name of Charles III; the Austrians attempted in the following year to retrieve their loss, but were defeated at Velletri. Charles introduced many reforms, several, however, to the disadvantage of the Church (Tannucci ministry), and consequently he had difficulties with the Holy See which were not entirely cleared away by the concordat of 1755. When Charles ascended the throne of Spain, he left Naples to his third son Ferdinand.

Having failed to drive the French from the Papal States in 1798, Ferdinand was compelled to withdraw to Sicily; the French invaded Naples, and in January, 1799, proclaimed the Parthenopian Republic. The kingdom was soon restored, however, through the efforts of Cardinal Fabrizio Ruffo Scilla. In 1806, his son was succeeded by his grandson,"
NAPLES

1. DRYING MACARONI
2. PESTA AT FEDIGROTTA
3. ROYAL PALACE AND CASTEL S. ELMO
4. CATHEDRAL, INTERIOR
5. CATHEDRAL, EXTERIOR
Napoleon I (Bonaparte), Emperor of the French, second son of Charles-Marie Bonaparte and Maria-Lettia Ramolino, b. at Ajaccio, in Corsica, 15 August, 1769; d. on the Island of St. Helena, 5 May, 1821.

His childhood was spent in Corsica; at the end of the year 1778 he entered the college of Autun, in 1779 the military school of Braine, and in 1780 the military school of Paris. In 1785, when he was in garrison at Valence, as a lieutenant, he occupied his leisure with researches into the history of Corsica and read many of the philosophers of his time, particularly Rousseau. These studies left him attached to a sort of Deism, an admirer of the personality of Christ, a stranger to all religious practices, and breathing defiance against "sacerdotism" and "theocracy". His attitude under the Revolution was that of a citizen devoted to the new ideas, in testimony of which attitude we have his scolding letter, written in 1790, to Battafoco, a deputy from the Corsican noblesse, whom the "patriote" regarded as a traitor, and also a work published by Bonaparte in 1793, "Le souper de Beauregard", in which he takes the side of the Mountain in the Convention against the Federalist tendencies of the Girondins.

His military genius revealed itself in December, 1793, when he was twenty-four years of age, in his recapture of Toulon from the English. He was made a general of brigade in the artillery, 20 December, and in 1794 contributed to Masséna's victories in Italy. The political suspicions aroused by his friendship with the younger Robespierre after 9 Thermidor of the Year III (27 July, 1794), the intrigues which led to his being removed from the Italian frontier and sent to command a brigade against the Vendéens in the west, and ill-health, which he used as a pretext to refuse his post and became the victim of the Terror, were the cause of his political end. He contemplated leaving France to take command of the sultan's artillery. But in 1795 when the Convention was threatened, Bonaparte was selected for the duty of pouring grape-shot upon its enemies from the platform of the church of Saint-Roch (13 Vendémiaire, Year IV). He displayed great magnanimity in his victory, and midst the ravages of the Convention, and the earthquake of the Girondins, he never lost hope nor his memory of the country of his birth. His return to Italy was viewed as a victory, and he went on to win a great victory at Marengo, and to earn at once the gratitude of the Convention and the esteem of its enemies.

The Campaign in Italy.—On 8 March, 1796, he contracted a civil marriage with the widow of Alexandre de Beauharnais, Marie-Josephine-Rose Tascher de la Pagerie, who was born in Martinique, in 1763, of a family originally belonging to the neighbourhood of Blois. In the same month Napoleon set out for Italy, where the Directory, prompted by Carnot, had appointed him commander-in-chief against the First Coalition. The victory of Montenotte, over the Austrians commanded by Beauhieu, and those of Millesimo, Dego, Ceva, and Mondovi, over Celle's French and Austrian troops, to complete the conquest of Sardinia, to conclude the armistice of Cherasco (25 April, 1796). Wishing to effect a junction on the Danube with the Army of the Rhine, Bonaparte spent the following May in driving Beauhieu across Northern Italy, and succeeded in pushing him back into the Tyrol. On 1 May he was ordered by the Directory to leave half of his troops in Lombardy, under Kellermann's command, and march with the other half against Leghorn, Rome, and Naples. Unwilling to share the glory with Kellermann, Bonaparte replied by tendering his resignation, and the order was not insisted on. In a proclamation to his soldiers (20 May, 1796) he described his intention of driving the Tiber to chastise those who had "whetted the daggers of civil war in France" and "basely assassinated" Basseville, the French minister, to "re-establish the Capitol, place there in honour the statues of heroes who had made themselves famous", and to "arouse the Roman people benumbed by many centuries of bondage". In June he entered the Romagna, appeared at Bologna and Ferrara, and made prisoners of several prelates. The Court of Rome demanded an armistice, and Bonaparte, who was far from eager for this war against the Holy See, granted it. The Peace of Bologna (23 June, 1796) obliged the Holy See to give up Bologna and Ferrara to French occupation, to pay a indemnity of two hundred thousand louis d'or, to pay to the French 2,700,000 pounds, confiscate, 500 manuscripts, and the busts of Junius and Marcus Brutus. The Directory thought these terms
too easy, and when a prelate was sent to Paris to negotiate the treaty, he was told that as an indispensable condition of peace, Pius VI must revoke the briefs relating to the Civil Constitution of the clergy and to the Inquisition. The pope refused, and negotiations were broken off; the fleet again assembled at Toulon, where an attempt had been made to renew them. During these pourparlers between Paris and Rome, Bonaparte repeated the repeated efforts of the Austrian Wurmser to reconquer Lombardy. Between 1 and 5 August, Wurmser was twice beaten at Lonato and again at Castiglione; between 8 and 15 September, the battles of Roveredo, Pramollano, Bassano, and San Giorgio forced Wurmser to take refuge in Mantua, and on 16 October Bonaparte created the Cispadan Republic at the expense of the Duchy of Modena and of the Legations, which were pontifical territory. Then, 24 October, he invited Casault, the French minister at Rome, to re-open negotiations with Pius VI ("so as to catch the old fox"); but on 28 October he wrote to the same Casault: "You may assure the pope that I have always been opposed to the treaty which the Directory has offered him, and above all to the manner of negotiating it. I am more ambitious to be called the preserver than the destroyer of the Holy See. If they will be sensible at Rome, we will profit by it to do to that fine race part of the world what we have done to other; and to calm the conscientious fears of many people." Meanwhile the arrival in Venetia of the Austrian troops under Alvincz caused Cardinal Bussa, the pope's secretary of State, to hasten the conclusion of an alliance between the Holy See and the Court of Vienna; of this Bonaparte learned through intercepted letters written to Archduke Charles on 13 December, 1796 and Rivoli (14 January, 1797) and the capitulation of Mantua (2 February, 1797), placed the whole of Northern Italy in his hands, and in the spring of 1797 the Pontifical States were at his mercy.

The Directory sent him ferocious instructions. "The Roman religion," they wrote, "will always be the irreconcilable enemy of the Republic; first by its essence, and next, because its servants and ministers will never forgive the blows which the Republic has aimed at the fortune and standing of some, and the prejudices and habits of others. The Directory requests you to do all that you deem possible, without rekindling the torch of fanaticism, to destroy the pontificals and the monastic orders, and to establish other power or—which would be still better—by establishing some form of self-government which would render the yoke of the priests odious." But at the very moment when Bonaparte received these instructions he knew, by his private correspondence, that a Cisalpine Republic was beginning in France. Clarke wrote to him: "We have become once more Roman Catholic in France", and explained to him that the help of the pope might perhaps be needed before long to bring the priests in France to accept the state of things resulting from the Revolution. Considerations such as these must have made an impression on a statesman of Bonaparte's house, at about this period, said to the parish priests of Milan: "A society without religion is like a ship without a compass; there is no good morality without religion." And in February, 1797, when he entered the Pontifical States with his troops, he forbade any insult to religion, and showed kindness to the priests and the monks, even to the French ecclesiastics who had taken refuge in papal territory, and whom he might have caused to be shot as émigrés. He contented himself with levying a great many contributions, and laying hands on the treasury of the Santa Casa at Loreto. The first advances of Pius VI to his "dear son General Bonaparte" were met by Bonaparte's threatening that he would not treat. "I am treating with the invariable value of priests [celle prêtre], and for this once Saint Peter will again save the Capitol," he wrote to Joubert, 17 February, 1797. The Peace of Tolentino was negotiated on 19 February: the Holy See surrendered the Legations of Bologna, Ferrara, and Ravenna, and recognised the annexation of Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin by France. But Bonaparte had taken care not to infringe upon the spiritual power, and had not demanded of Pius VI the withdrawal of those briefs which were offensive to the Directory. As soon as the treaty was signed he wrote to Pius VI to express to him "his perfect esteem and veneration"; on the other hand, feeling that the Directory would be displeased, he wrote to it: "My opinion is that Rome, once deprived of Bologna, Ferrara, the Romagna, and the thirty millions we are taking from her, can no longer exist. The old machine will go to pieces of itself." And he proposed that the Directory should take the necessary steps with the pope in regard to the religious situation in France.

Then, with breathless rapidity, turning back towards the Alps, and assisted by Joubert, Masséna, and Bernadotte, he inflicted on Archduke Charles a series of defeats which forced Austria to sign the preliminaries of Leoben (18 April, 1797). In May he transformed Genoa into the Ligurian Republic; in October he imposed on the archduke the Treaty of Campo Formio, by which France obtained Belgium, Corsica, and the whole of the Dalmatian coast of the Adriatic, and the whole of the Istrian peninsula, while Venice was made subject to Austria. The Directory found fault with this last stipulation; but Bonaparte had already reached the point where he could act with independence and care little for what the politicians at Paris might think. It was the same with his religious policy: he now began to think of restoring the popes to France. The pope was restored peace in France. A note which he addressed to the Court of Rome, 3 August, 1797, was conceived in these terms: "The pope will perhaps think it worthy of his wisdom, of the most holy of religions, to execute a Bull or ordinance commanding priests to preach obedience to the Government, and to do all in their power to strengthen the established constitution. After the first step, it would be useful to know what others could be taken to reconcile the constitutional priests with the non-constitutional."

While Bonaparte was expressing himself thus, the Councils of the Five Hundred and the Ancients were preparing a law to recall, annul, and restore to their civil and political rights the priests who had already taken the oath of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. But Directors Barrès, Rewbell, and Laveyrelle-Lépeaux, considering that this act jeopardised the Republic, employed General Augereau, Bonaparte's lieutenant, to carry out the coup d'état of 18 Fructidor against the Council of Five Hundred (4th, 1797), and which was once more a prey to a Jacobin and anti-Catholic policy. These events were immediately echoed at Paris, where Joseph Bonaparte, the general's brother, and ambassador from the Directory, was asked by the latter, to favour the Revolutions party. Disturbances arose: General Duhaut was killed in Joseph Bonaparte's house, and the Directory demanded satisfaction from the Holy See. General Bonaparte had just returned to Paris, where he apparently confined himself to his functions as a member of the Institute (Scientific Section). He was by no means anxious to lead the expedition against Rome, which the Directory was projecting, and contented himself with giving Berthier, who commanded it, certain instructions from a distance. For this expedition for Berthier's entry into Rome and the proclamation of the Roman Republic (10-15 February, 1798), and for the captivity of Pius VI, who was carried off a prisoner to Valence, see Pius VI.

The Campaign in Egypt.—While in Paris, Bonaparte induced the Directory to adopt the plan of an expedition to Egypt. His object was to make the Mediterranean a French lake, by the conquest of
Malta and the Nile Valley, and to menace England in the direction of India. He embarked on 19 May 1798. The taking of Malta (10 June), of Alexandria (2 July), the battle of the Pyramids (21 July), gave Bonaparte the uncontested mastery of Cairo. At Cairo he affected a great respect for Islam; reproached with this later on, he replied: "It was necessary for General Bonaparte to know the principles of Islamism, the government, the spirit of the people, and their relations with Constantinople and Mecca. It was necessary, indeed, for him to be thoroughly acquainted with both religions, for it helped him to win the affection of the clergy in Italy and of the ulamas in Egypt." The French troops in Egypt were in great danger when the naval disaster of Aboukir, inflicted by the English, was followed, from Europe, by the Treaty of London, which took sides with England; in the spring of 1799, Bonaparte made a campaign in Syria to strike both Turkey and England. Failing to effect the surrender of Acre, and as his army was suffering from the plague (May, 1799), he had to make his way back to Egypt. There he re-established French prestige by the victory of Aboukir (25 July, 1799), then, learning that the Second Coalition was gathering an army against the armies of the Directory, he left Kléber in Egypt and returned secretly to France. He landed at Fréjus, 9 October, 1799, and was in Paris seven days later. Besides certain political results, the expedition to Egypt had borne fruit for science: Egyptianology, however, did not arrive from the Institut d'Egypte (Institut d'Égypte) by Bonaparte.

Bonaparte, First Consul.—While Bonaparte was in Egypt, the religious policy of the Directory had provoked serious troubles in France. Deportations of priests were multiplying; Belgium, where 6000 priests were proscribed, was disturbed; the Vendée, Normandy, and Brittany, where the people of the west of France was angry and uneasy. Spurred on by his brother Lucien, president of the Five Hundred, allied with Directors Sieyès and Roger-Ducos, Bonaparte caused Directors Gohier and Mounis to be imprisoned, and broke up the Five Hundred (18 Brumaire; 9–10 November, 1799). The Directorial Constitution was suppressed, and France thenceforward was ruled by three consuls. First Consul Bonaparte put into operation the Constitution known as that of the Year VIII, substituted for the departmental administrators elected by the citizens, others appointed by the Executive Power, and re-organized the judicial and financial administrations. He commissioned the Assembly of the Five Hundred to draw up the "Constitution of the Year XIII", which Vendeans, and authorized the return of the non-juring priests to France on condition of their simply promising fidelity to the laws of the republic. Then, to make an end of the Second Coalition, he entrusted the Army of Germany to Moreau, and, himself taking command of the Army of Italy, crossed the Great St. Bernard (13–16 May, 1800). He was the operation of Desaix, who was mortally wounded, crushed the Austrians (14 June, 1800) between Marengo and San Giuliano at the very spot he had marked on the map in his study in the Tuileries. The Peace of Lunéville, concluded with Austria, 9 February, 1801, extended the territory of France to 102 departments.

Bonaparte spent the years 1801 and 1802 effecting internal reforms in France. A commission, established in 1800, elaborated a new code which, as the "Code Napoléon", was to be promulgated in 1804, to formally introduce some of the "principles of 1789" into French law, and thus to complete the civil results of the Revolution. But it was Napoleon's desire that, in the religious issue of the Revolution, the Church should have a place, and consciences should be set at rest. The Concordat with the Holy See was signed on 17 July, 1801; it was published, together with the Organic Articles, as a law, 16 April, 1802. For these two acts, one of which established the existence of the Church in France, while the other involved the possibility of serious interference by the State in the life of the Church, see CONCORDAT; ARTICLES, THE ORGANIC. Napoleon never said, "The Concordat was the great fault of my reign." On the contrary, years afterwards, at St. Helena, he considered it his greatest achievement, and congratulated himself upon having, by the signature of the Concordat, "erased the fallen altars, put down the icons, obliged the faithful to pray for the Republic, expropriated the scruples of those who had acquired the national domains, and broken the last thread by which the old dynasty maintained communication with the country." Fox, in a conversation with Napoleon at this period, expressed astonishment at "the peace having insinuated upon the marriage of priests"; "I had, and still have, to go elsewhere to speak peace," Napoleon replied, "theological controversies are allayed with water, not with oil." The Concordat had wrecked the hopes of those who, like Mme de Staël, had wished to make Protestantism the state religion of France; and yet the Calvinist Jaoucourt, defending the Organic Articles before the Tribunat, gloried in the definitive recognition of the Calvinist religion by the state. The Jewish religion was not recognized until later (17 March, 1808), after the assembly of a certain number of Jewish delegates appointed by the prefects (29 July, 1806) and the meeting of the Great Sanhedrim (10 February, 9 April, 1807); the State, however, did not take unto itself the powers of the rabbis. Thus did the new master of France regulate the religious situation in that country.

On 9 April, 1802, Caprara was received for the first time by Bonaparte in the official capacity of Pius VII's legate a latere, and before the first consult an oath which, according to the text subsequently published, was subscribed by the "Ministers of Justice, the laws, constitution, the laws, statutes, and customs of the republic, and nowise to derogate from the rights, liberties, and privileges of the Gallican Church. This was a painful surprise for the Vatican, and Caprara declared that the words about Gallican liberties had been interpolated in the "Moniteur". Another painful impression was produced at the Vatican by the attitude of eight constitutional priests whom Bonaparte had nominated to bishoprics, and to whom Caprara had granted canonical institution, and who afterwards boasted that they had never formally abjured their adhesion to the Civil Constitution of the clergy. In retaliation, the Roman Curia demanded of the Pope that he cease to be a formal adherent of the Civil Constitution, but Bonaparte opposed this and when Caprara insisted, declared that if Rome possessed too far the consuls would yield to the desire of France to become Protestant. Talleyrand spoke to Caprara in the same sense, and the legate desisted from his demands. On the other hand, however, Bonaparte was opposed, especially by the allocation of 24 May, 1802, in which Pius VII demanded the revision of the Organic Articles, he ended by allowing it to be published in the "Moniteur" as a diplomatic document. "A spirit of conciliation on both sides tended to promote more cordial relations between the two powers. The proclamation of Bonaparte as consul for life (August, 1802) increased in him the sense of his responsibility towards the religion of the country, and in Pius VII the desire to be on good terms with a personage who was advancing with such long strides towards omnipotence.

Bonaparte took care to gain the attachment of the renewed Church by his favours. While he dissolved the associations of the Fathers of the Faith, the Adorers of Jesus, and the Panarists, which looked to him like attempts to restore the Society of Jesus, he permitted the reconstitution of the Sisters of Charity, the Sisters of St. Thomas, the Sisters of St.
Charles, and the Valletot Sisters, devoted to teaching and hospital work, and made his mother, Madame Léonie Bonaparte, protectress of all the congregations of hospital sisters. He favoured the revival of the Institute of the Christian Schools for religious instruction of boys; side by side with the lycees, he permitted secondary schools under the supervision of the priests, but directed by ecclesiastics. He did not rest content with a mere financial aid; he provided the pecuniary obligations to the Church to which the Concordat had bound the State; in 1803 and 1804 it became the custom to pay stipends to canons and dessevènants of succursall parishes. Orders were issued to leave the Church in possession of the ecclesiastical buildings not included in the new circumcision of property. The State provided that both by the revenue to endow diocesan seminaries, Bonaparte granted the bishopric national estates for the use of such seminaries and the right to receive donations and legacies for their benefit; he even founded, in 1804, at the expense of the State, ten metropolitan seminaries, re-established, with a government endowment, the Lazaret house for the education of missionaries, and placed the Holy Sepulchre and the Oriental Christians under the protection of France. As to the temporal power of the popes Bonaparte at this period affected a somewhat complaisant attitude towards the Holy See. He restored Pesaro and Ancona to the pope, and bought it with the restitution of Bologna and Ferrara, sanctioned by the Court of Naples. After April 1803, Cacault was replaced, as his representative at Rome, by one of the five French ecclesiastics to whom Pius VII had consented to grant the purple late in 1802. This ambassador was no other than Bonaparte’s own uncle, Cardinal Joseph Fesch (q. v.), whose secretaries for a long time was Chateaubriand, recently made famous by his “Le gène du Christianisme”. Most of Bonaparte’s grievances against Cacault was a saying attributed to the latter: “How many sources of his glory would cease if Bonaparte ever chose to play Henry VIII!” Even in those days of harmony Cacault had a presentiment that the Napoleonic policy would yet threaten the dignity of the Holy See.

The idea of a struggle with England became more and more an imperious obsession of Bonaparte’s mind. The Peace of Amiens (25 March, 1802) was only a truce: it was broken on 22 May, 1803, by Mortier’s invasion of Hanover and the landing of the English in French Guiana. Napoleon forthwith prepared for a new campaign, and Decour, as he wished to be called, intended to invade England. The Duc d’Enghien, who was suspected of complicity with England and the French Royalists, was carried off from Ettenheim, a village within the territory of Baden, and shot at Vincennes, 21 March, 1804, and one of Cardinal Fesch’s first acts as ambassador at Rome was to demand the extradition of the French émigré. Welschinger was in the service of Russia, and whom Bonaparte regarded as a conspirator.

Napoleon Emperor. The Coronation.—While the Third Coalition was forming between England and Russia, Bonaparte caused himself to be proclaimed hereditary emperor (30 April–18 May, 1804), and at once surrounded himself with a brilliant Court. He created two princes imperial (his brothers Joseph and Louis), seven permanent high dignitaries, twenty great officers, four of them ordinary marshals, and ten marshals in active service, a number of posts at Court open to members of the old nobility. Even before his formal proclamation as emperor, he had given Caprara a place near him in the entourage to be sent to Reims, like the ancient kings, but at Notre-Dame de Paris. On 10 May, 1804, Caprara warned Pius VII of this wish, and represented that it would be necessary to answer yes, in order to retain Napoleon’s friendship. But the execution of the Duc d’Enghien had produced a deplorable impression in Europe; Royalist influences were at work against Bonaparte at the Vatican, and the pope was warned against crowning an emperor who, by the Constitution of 1804, would promise to maintain “the laws of the Concordat”, in other words, the Organic Articles. Pius VII and Consalvi tried to gain time by dilatory replies, but these very replies were interpreted by Fesch at Rome, and by Caprara at Paris, in a sense favourable to the emperor’s wishes. At the end of June, Napoleon joyfully announced, at the Tuileries, that the pope had promised to come to Paris. Then Pius VII tried to obtain certain religious and political advantages in exchange for the journey he was asked to make. Napoleon declared that he would have no conditions dictated to him; at the same time he promised to give the pope proofs of his respect and love for religion, and to listen to what the pope might have to submit. At last the cleverness of Talleyrand, Napoleon’s minister of foreign affairs, conquered the scruples of Pius VII; he declared, at the end of September, that he would accept Napoleon’s invitation if it were officially addressed to him; he asked only that the ceremony of consecration should not be distinct from the coronation proper, and that Napoleon would undertake not to detain him in France. Napoleon had the invitation conveyed to Pius VII, not by two bishops, as the pope expected, but by a general; and before setting out for France, Pius VII signed a conditional act of consecration, reviving the same provisions as in 1792, should Napoleon prevent his returning to Rome; then he began his journey to France, 2 November, 1804.

Napoleon would not accord any solemn reception to Pius VII; surrounded by a hunting party, he met the pope in the open country, made him get into the imperial carriage,乘车.., and, with his entourage, spent the night, in this fashion took him to Fontainebleau. Pius VII was brought to Paris by night. The whole affair nearly fell through at the last moment. Pius VII informed Josephine herself, on the eve of the day set for the coronation of the empress, that she had not been married to Napoleon in accordance with the rules of religion. To the great annoyance of the emperor, who was already contemplating a divorce, in case no heir were born to him, and was displaying a lively irritation against Josephine, Pius VII insisted upon the religious benediction of the marriage; otherwise, there was to be no coronation. The religious marriage ceremony was secretly performed at the Tuileries, on the evening of 18 December, and the next day, in broad daylight, but at about four o’clock in the afternoon, by Fesch, grand almoner of the imperial household. As Welschinger has proved, Fesch had previously asked the pope for the necessary dispensations and faculties, and the marriage was canonically beyond reproach. On 2 December the coronation took place. Napoleon arrived at Notre-Dame in the hour appointed. Instead of allowing the pope to crown him, he himself placed the crown on his own head and crowned the empress, but, out of respect for the pope, this detail was not recorded in the “Moniteur”. Pius VII, to whom Napoleon granted but few opportunities for conversation, had a long memoranda drawn up by Antonelli and Caprara, setting forth his wishes; he demanded that Catholicism should be recognized in France as the dominant religion; that the divorce law should be repealed; that the religious communities should be re-established; that the Legations should be restored to the Holy See. Most of these demands were to no purpose: the most important of the very few concessions by the emperor was his promise to substitute the Gregorian Calendar for that of the Revolution after 1 January, 1806. When Pius VII left Paris, 4 April, 1805, he was displeased with the emperor.

But the Church of France acclaimed the emperor. He was lauded to the skies by the bishops. The par-
ish priests, not only in obedience to instructions, but also out of patriotism, preached against England, and exhorted their hearers to submit to the conscription. The splendour of the Napoleonic victories seemed, by the enthusiasm with which it inspired all Frenchmen, to blind the Catholic Church to Napoleon's failures, the manner in which their Church should be governed. He had reorganized it; he had accorded it more liberal pecuniary advantages than the Concordat had bound him to; but he intended to dominate it. For example, in 1806 he insisted that all periodical publications of a religious character should be conscripted into one, the "Journal des curés," published under his supervision. On 15 August, 1806, he instituted the Feast of St. Napoleon, to commemorate the martyr Neopolis, or Neopolas, who suffered in Egypt under Diocletian. In 1806 he decided that ecclesiastical positions of importance, such as cures of souls of the first class, could be given only to candidates who held degrees conferred by the university, adding that these degrees might be refused to those who were notorious for their "ultramontane ideas or ideas dangerous to authority." He demanded the publication of a single catechism for the whole empire, in which catechism he was called "the image of God upon earth," "the Lord's anointed," and the use of which was made compulsory by a bull. Napoleon, as King of Italy, took the Iron Crown of Lombardy, he was offended because the pope did not take part in the ceremony. When he asked Pius VII to annul the marriage which his brother Jerome Bonaparte had contracted, at the age of nineteen, with Elizabeth Patterson of Baltimore, the pope replied that the decrees of the bull of 1793 against clandestine marriages applied only where they had been recognized, and the reply constituted one more cause of displeasure for the emperor, who afterwards, in 1806, obtained an annulment from the compliant ecclesiastical authorities of Paris. And when Consalvi, in 1805, complained that the French Civil Code, and with it the divorce law, was infringing on the rights of Napoleon formally refused to make any concession. The great war which the emperor was just then commencing was destined to be an occasion of conflict with the Holy See. Abandoning the preparations which he had made for an invasion of England (the Camp of Boulogne), he turned against Austria, brought about the capitulation of Ulm (20 October, 1805), made himself master of Vienna (13 November), defeated at Austerlitz (2 December, 1805) Emperor Francis I and Tsar Alexander. The Treaty of Pressburg (26 December, 1805) united Dalmatia to the French Empire and the territory of Venice to the Kingdom of Italy, made Bavaria and Wurttemberg vassals of Napoleon, granted Baden, and transformed it into a grandduchy, and reduced Austria to the valley of the Danube. The victory of Trafalgar (21 October, 1805) had given England the mastery of the seas, but from that time forward Napoleon was held to be the absolute master of the Continent. He then turned to the pope the question of the papal See. To prevent a landing of Russian and English troops in Italy, Napoleon, in October, 1805, had ordered Gouvion Saint Cyr to occupy the papal city of Ancona. The pope, lest the powers hostile to Napoleon might some day reproach him with having consented to the employment of a city of the Pontifical States as a base of operations, had protested against this arbitrary exercise of power: he had complained, in a letter to the emperor (13 November, 1805), of this "cruel affront," declared that since his return from Paris he had "experienced nothing but bitterness and sorrow," and threatened to dismiss the French ambassador. But the treaty of Pressburg and the dethronement of the Bourbons of Naples by Joseph Bonaparte and Mascheria (January, 1806), did not increase the Italian situation. From Munich Napoleon wrote two letters (7 January, 1806), one to Pius VII, and the other to Fesch, touching his intentions in regard to the Holy See. He complained of the pope's ill-will, tried to justify the occupation of Ancona, and declared himself the true protector of the Holy See; he was the friend of "the friends of God," concluded: "whenever you consult only your own heart and the true friends of religion." His letter to Fesch was much more violent: he complained of the refusal to annul Jerome's marriage, demanded that there should no longer be any minister either of Sardinia or of Russia in Rome, threatened to send a Protestant as his ambassador to the pope, to appoint a senator to command in Rome and to reduce the pope to the status of mere Bishop of Rome, claimed that the pope should treat him like Charlemagne, and assailed "the pontifical camarilla which prostituted religion." A reply from Pius VII (29 January, 1806), asking for the return of Ancona, was dated 1806. The pope's fury was not appeased. In a letter to Pius VII (13 February), he declared: "Your Holiness is the sovereign of Rome but I am its emperor; all my enemies ought to be yours;" he insisted that the pope should drive English, Russian, Sardinian, and Swedish subjects out of his dominions, and close his ports to the ships of those powers with which France was at war; and he complained of the slowness of the Curia in granting canonical institution to bishops in France and Italy. In a letter to Fesch he declared that, unless the pope acquiesced he would reduce the condition of the Holy See to what it had been before Charlemagne. An official note from Fesch to Consalvi (2 March, 1805) defined Napoleon's demands: the cardinals were in favour of rejecting them, and Pius VII, in a very beautiful letter, dated 21 March, 1806, monstronomed with Napoleon, declared that the pope had no right to embroil himself with the other states, and must hold aloof from the war; also, that there was no emperor of Rome. "If our words," he concluded, "fail to touch Your Majesty's heart, and you are unwilling to conformable to the Gospel, we will accept every kind of calamity as coming from God." Napoleon, more and more irritated, reproached Pius VII for having consulted the cardinals before answering him, declared that all his relations with the Holy See should thenceforward be conducted through Talleyrand, ordered the latter to reiterate the demands which the pope had just rejected, and replaced Fesch as ambassador at Rome with Alquier, a former member of the Convention. Then the emperor proceeded from words to deeds. On 6 May, 1806, he caused Civitá Vecchia to be occupied. Learning that the pope, before recognizing Joseph Bonaparte as King of Naples, wished to cede the Neapolitan sovereignty of the Holy See over the Neapolitan Kingdom, he talked of "the spirit of light-headedness" (esprit de vérité) which prevailed at Rome, remarked that, when the pope thus treated a Bonaparte as a vassal, he must be tired of wielding the temporal power, and directed Talleyrand to tell Pius VII that the pope was past when the pope's replies were not in line. Talleyrand was informed (16 May, 1806) that, if Pius VII would not recognize Joseph, Napoleon would no longer recognize Pius VII as a temporal prince. "If this continues," Napoleon went on to say, "I will have Consalvi taken away from Rome." He suspected Consalvi of having sold himself to the English. Early in June, 1806, he seized Benevento and Pontecorvo, two principalities which belonged to the Holy
See, but which were shut in by the King of Naples.

Yielding before the emperor's wrath, Consalvi resigned his office; Pius VII unwillingly accepted his resignation, and replaced him with Cardinal Consoli. But the first dispatch written by Consoli under Pius VII's dictation confirmed the pope's resistance to the emperor's interference and imperious will. Napoleon, in the presence of the whole court, threatened to dismember the Pontifical States, if Pius VII did not at once, "without ambiguity or reservation", declare himself his ally (1 July, 1806). A like ultimatum was delivered, on 5 July, to Cardinal Consoli at Alquier. Continental affairs were clearer. Napoleon's attention, at the time, was not directed to the pontificate; the only immediate result of his ultimatum was the emperor's order to his generals occupying Ancona and Civitâ Vecchia, to seize the pontifical revenues in those two cities. On the other hand, the constitution of the Imperial University (May, 1806), preparing for a state monopoly of teaching, loomed up as a peril to the Church's right of teaching, and gave the Holy See another cause for uneasiness.

The Confederation of the Rhine, formed by Napoleon out of fourteen German States (12 July, 1806), and his assertion of a protectorate over the same, resulted in Francis II's abdication of the title of emperor of Germany; in its place Francis took the title of emperor of Austria. The emperor's defeat at Austerlitz dealt by Napoleon, that Holy Roman Germanic Empire which had exerted so great an influence over Christianity in the Middle Ages. The pope and the German emperor had long been considered as sharing between them the government of the world in the name of God. Napoleon had definitively annihilated one of these "two halves of God", as Victor Hugo has termed them. Frederick William II of Prussia became alarmed, and in October, 1806, formed, with England and Russia, the Fourth Coalition. The stunning victories of Austerlitz, won by Davoust, and Jena, won by Napoleon (14 October, 1806), were followed by the entry of the French into Berlin, the King of Prussia's flight to Köniaigberg, and the erection of the Electorate of Saxony into a kingdom in alliance with Napoleon. From Berlin itself Napoleon launched a decree (21 November, 1806) by which he organized the Continental blockade against England, aiming to close the whole Continent against English commerce. Then, in a series of bold strokes, he shrewdly induced the fall of the Jacobin republics in the four pontifical Provinces of Macerata, Spoleto, Urbino, and Foligno to be occupied by General Le marrol (October, 1807). Pius VII then revoked Cardinal Bayanne's powers. It was evident that, not only did Napoleon require of him an offensive alliance against England, but that the emperor's pretensions, and those of his new minister of foreign affairs, Champagny, Talleyrand's successor, were now beginning to encroach upon the domain of religion. Napoleon claimed that one third of the cardinals should belong to the French Empire; and Champagny let it be understood that the emperor would soon demand that the Holy See should respect the "Gallican Liberties", that is say, that the pope should give up to the French, or entitled to include the clauses or reservations calculated to alarm consciences and spread divisions in His Majesty's dominions. Henceforth it was the spiritual authority that Napoleon aspired to control. Pius VII ordered Bayanne to reject the imperial demands. Napoleon then (January, 1808) decided that Prince Eugène and King Joseph should place troops at the disposition of General Miollis, who was ordered to march on Rome. Miollis at first pretended to be covering the rear of the Neapolitan army, then he suddenly threw 10,000 troops into Rome (2 February). Napoleon wrote to Champagny that it was necessary "to accustom the people of Rome and the French troops to live side by side", so that the French should act in an insensible way, it might insensibly cease to exist as a temporal power, without anyone noticing the change. Thus it may be said that, in the beginning of 1808, Napoleon's plan was to keep Rome. In a manifesto to the Christian powers, Pius VII protested against this invasion; at the same time, he accepted the news, and on the 3rd, he wrote to Consalvi, with great courtesy. Champagny, on 3 February, again insisted on the pope's becoming the political ally of Napoleon, and Pius VII refused. The instructions given to Miollis became more severe every day; he seized printing presses, journals, post offices; he decimated the Sacred College by having seven cardinals conducted to the frontier, because Napoleon accused
On 10 June Miollis had the Pontifical flag, which still floated over the castle of S. Angelo, lowered. Pius VII replied by having Rome placarded with a Bull excommunicating Napoleon. When the emperor received news of this (20 June) he wrote to Murat: "So the Pope has shown his malice to me. No more half measures; he is a raving lunatic who must be confined. Have Cardinal Pacca and other adherents of the pope arrested." In the night of 5-6 July, 1809, Radet, a general of gendarmerie, by the orders of Miollis, entered the Quirinal, arrested Pius VII and Pacca, gave them two hours to make their preparations, and took them away from Rome at four in the morning. Pius VII was taken to Savona, Pacca to Fenestrelle. Meanwhile Napoleon, completing the work of crushing Austria, had been the victor at Essling (21 May, 1809) and at Wagram (6 July, 1809), and the Peace of Vienna (15 October, 1809) put the finishing touch to the humiliation of Austria by handing over Carniola, Croatia, and Friuli to France, at the same time obliging the Emperor Francis to recognize Joseph as King of Spain. The young German, Staps, who attempted to assassinate Napoleon at Schönbrunn (13 October), died crying: "Long live Germany!"

**Discussions with the Captive Pius VII; Second Marriage: Ecclesiastical Councils of 1809 and 1811.**—The conflict with his prisoner, the pope, was another embarrassment, a new source of anxiety to the emperor. At first he took all possible steps to prevent the public from hearing of what had happened at Rome: the "Moniteur" made not the slightest allusion to it; the newspapers received orders to be silent. He also wished his皇宫 commissary to be ignored; the newspapers must be silent on this point also; but the Bull of Excommunication, secretly brought to Lyons, was circulated in France by members of the Congregation, a pious association, founded 2 February, 1801, by Père Delputte, a former Jesuit. Alexis de Noailles and five other members of the Congregation were arrested by the emperor's command, and his anger extended to all the religious orders. He wrote (12 September, 1809) to Bigot de Préameneu, minister of public worship: "If on 1 October there are any missions or congregations still in France, I will hold you responsible." The celebrated Abbé Fraysinus had to discontinue his sermons; the Lazarists were expelled from Paris; the Jesuits were expelled from France; the pope consulted Bigot de Préameneu as to the expediency of laying the Bull before the Council of State, but abstained from doing so.

It was not long, however, before he had to face an enormous difficulty: there were more than twenty bishoprics vacant, and Pius VII declared to Fesch, to Caprara, and to Maury that, so long as he was a prisoner, so long as he could not communicate freely with his natural counsellors, the cardinals, he would not provide for the institution of the bishops. Thus the life of the Church of France was partially suspended. In November, 1809, Napoleon appointed an "ecclesiastical council" to seek a solution of the difficulty. With Fesch as president, this council, composed of the members Cardinal Maury, Barral, Archbishop of Tours, Duvoisin, Bishop of Nantes, Emery, Superior of S. Sulpice, Bishops Canaveri of Vercelli, Bourlier of Evreux, Mannay of Trèves, and the Barnabite Fontana. Bigot de Préameneu, in the name of the emperor, laid before the council several sets of questions relating to the affairs of Christendom, general and particular, those of France, and lastly to those of Germany and Italy, and to the Bull of Excommunication.

In the preamble to its reply, the council gave voice to a petition for the absolute liberty of the pope and the recall of the cardinals. It declared that if a general council were assembled for the settlement of the religious questions then pending, the pope's presence at the council would be necessary, and that a national
council would not have sufficient authority in ques-
tions affecting the whole Catholic Church. It also
declared that the pope could not complain of any es-
tential violation of the Concordat, that, when he ad-
vanced his temporal spoliation, as one reason for his
refuse to the bishopric, was confounding the temporal order with the
spiritual; that the temporal sovereignty was only an accessory of the
canal authority, that the invasion of Rome was not a violation of the
Concordat, and that the national council would interpose an appeal from the Bull of Ex-
communication either to the general council or to the pope.

The manner in which canonical
institution might be secured for the bishops, if the
pope should continue his resistance, was twice dis-
cussed. Urged by the Government, the council ad-
mitted that, taking the circumstances into considera-
tion, the conciliatory institution given by a metropoli-
tan to his suffragans, or by the senior suffragan to a
new metropolitan, might possibly be recognized by a
national council as provisionally, a substitute for
pontifical Bulls. Emery, thinking the council too
lenient, refused to endorse the answers, which were
sent to Napoleon on 11 January, 1810.

On 17 February, 1810, the Act regulating the Ro-
man territory and future condition of the pope, in-
trusting the Holy See in the person of Pope Pius VI,
was passed unanimously by the senate. The Papal
States, in accordance with this decree, were to form
two departments; from Rome, which was declared the
first city of the empire, the prince imperial was to take
his title of king. The emperor, already crowned once
at Notre-Dame, was to go within ten years to be
crowned at St. Peter's. The measure was so lastingly
unequal of two millions. The empire was to charge itself
with the maintenance of the Sacred Congregation of
Propaganda. The pope, on his accession, must promis-
se to do nothing contrary to the four articles of the
Gallican Church. Another Act of the Senate, of 25
February, 1810, made the Declaration of 1802 a gen-
eral law of the empire. Thus did the pope absolve him-
self that he would reduce the papacy to servitude
and bring Pius VII to live in Paris. He even prepared
a letter to Pius VII in which he told him: “I hold in
execution the principles of the Bonifaces and the
Gregorys. It is my mission to govern the West; do
not meddle with it.” This letter he would have had
to send to Rome by his envoy, who were to give
not to Pius VII that in future the pope must swear alle-
liance to Napoleon, as of yore to Charlemagne, and
and to inform him that he himself would be dispensed
from this obligation, but that he must undertake not
to reside at Rome. Napoleon expected in this way
to bend the pope to his will. Wiser counsellors, how-
ever, prevailed upon him not to send this insulting
letter.

Nevertheless, to carry out his plan of removing
the papal throne from Rome, he ordered Moliès to
compel all the cardinals who were still at Rome to set
out for Paris, and to have the Vatican archives trans-
ported thither. In 1810 there were twenty-seven Ro-
man cardinals in Paris: he lavished gifts upon them,
intimidated them, made them fear the court, in order to
write and urge Pius VII to yield; but, following the
advice of Consalvi, the cardinals refused.

It was in the midst of these bitter conflicts with the
church that, Napoleon desiring an heir, resolved to
divorce Josephine. Ever since the end of 1807 Met-
ternich had been aware of the reports that were cur-
tently about Josephine's activities in her private
(lois concordataires) to divorce Josephine her consent to
this divorce; some time after, Fouc'h had made a similar
attempt with no better success. In December, 1809,
at Fontainebleau, in the presence of Prince Eugène,
Josephine's son, the emperor induced her to consent;
and on 15 December, this was solemnly proclaimed in the
throne room, in the presence of the Court, in an ad-
dress delivered by Napoleon, and another read by the
unhappy Josephine, who was prevented by her tears
from finishing it. The Act of the Senate (16 Decem-
ber), based on a report of Lacêpède, the naturalist,
himself a member of the Senate, ratified the divorce.

This bond the pope alone was competent to dis-
solve; Louis XII had had recourse to Alexander VI;
Henry IV to Clement VIII; but Napoleon, excom-
municated by his prisoner Pius VII, could not apply
to him. Cambacérès, the arch-chancellor, sent for the
diocesan officials of Paris and explained to them
that the marriage of Napoleon and Josephine had been
invalid in consequence of the absence of the parish
priest of the two parties and of witnesses. In vain
did they object that only the pope could decide such a
cause; they were told to commence proceedings, and be
quick about it. On 26 December, the promoter of the
case, Rudemare, begged Cambacérès to submit the
matter to the ecclesiastical council over which Fesch
presided. 18 December 2 was his request to the offi-
cial, Boisleve, for a declaration of nullity of the marriage, alleging, this time, that
there had been absence of consent on Napoleon's part.

On the next day the ecclesiastical council replied that
if the defect of Napoleon's consent could be proved to
the officiality, the marriage would be null and void.

Fesch and Cambacérès, Félix de Duron, Boisleve, and
Berthier as witnesses. The testimony of Fesch was very
confused; he explained that the pope had given him the necessary dispensations to bless
the marriage; that two days later he had given Josephine a marriage certificate; that the emperor had then up-
braided him, declaring to him that he (the emperor) had only agreed to this marriage in order to quiet the
empress, and that it was, moreover, impossible for
him to renounce his hopes of direct descendants. The
other two witnesses told how Napoleon had repeatedly
expressed the conviction that he was not bound by
this marriage and that he regarded the ceremony only
as "a mere concession to circumstances [acte de pure
circumstances] which ought not to have any effect in the
future".

On 9 January the diocesan authorities declared the
marriage null and void, on the ground of the absence
of the lawful parish priest and of witnesses; it pro-
nounced this decision only in view of the "difficulty in
the way of having recourse to the visible head of the
Church, to whom it has always belonged in fact to
pronounce upon these extraordinary cases." The
promoter Rudemare had concluded with the recom-
mandation that the tribunal should at least lay a pre-
cept upon the two parties to repair the defect of form
which had vitiated their marriage; Boisleve, the offi-
cial, refrained from proffering this invitation. Rude-
amre then asked the emperor to his viziers to
pronounce upon these extraordinary cases.

On 12 January, 1810, the official, Lejean, with much
greater complaisance, admitted both the
grounds of nullity advanced by Cambacérès—that is,
not only the defect of form, but also the defect of the
emperor's consent. He alleged that the civil marriage
of Napoleon and Josephine had been annulled by the
decree of the Senate, that he had been consecrated
(lois concordataires) the religious marriage ought to
follow the civil, and that the Church could not now
ask two parties who were no longer legally married to
repair the defects of form in their religious marriage.
Thus, he declared, the marriage was religiously an-
nulled. It may be noted here that the Catholic
Church cannot be held responsible for the excesses
complaisance shown in this matter by the ecclesiasti-
cal council and the diocesan authorities of Paris. On 21 January, 1810, Napoleon resolved to ask for the hand of Marie-Louise. The French ambassador at Vienna, at the request of the Archbishop of Vienna, gave his word to the Tuilerie: he had previously been informed that the sentence pronounced by the diocesan authorities of Paris was legal. At last all the religious obstacles to the celebration of the new marriage were disposed of.

It took place on 1 April, 1810, but thirteen of the cardinals then in Paris refused to be present. These thirteen cardinals were turned away when they presented themselves at the Tuileries two days later; the minister of public worship informed them that they were no longer cardinals, that they no longer had any right to wear the purple; the minister of police forwarded them, two by two, to small country towns; their pensions were suppressed, their property sequestered. "People called them 'the black cardinals'. The bishops and priests of the Roman States were treated with similar violence; nineteen out of thirty-two bishops refused the oath of allegiance to the emperor, and were imprisoned, while a certain number of non-juring parochial clergy were interned in Corsica, and the emperor announced his intention of reducing the number of dioceses and parishes in the Roman States to those of five hundred, to which his ancestors, by the Concordat, had reduced them. In the persecution coincided with fresh outbreaks to his prisoner, the pope, through the Austrian diplomat Lebzeltern (May, 1810). Pius VII's reply was that, to negotiate, he must be free and able to communicate with the cardinals. In July Napoleon sent Cardinals Spina and Caselli to Savona, but they obtained nothings. With his words at the Tuileries king a day he was breaking it in two. Chablé, the pope's custodian, showed him the addresses in which some of the chapters were expressing their submission to the emperor, but Pius VII was inflexible. A commission of jurisconsults in Paris, after discussing the possibility of a law regulating the canonical institution of bishops without the pope's cooperation, ended by deciding that to pass such a law was almost equivalent to schism.

Napoleon was not willing to go so far. He summoned the ecclesiastical council which he had already established and, 8 February, 1811, proposed to it these two questions: (1) All communication between the pope and the emperor's subjects being impossible, should the pope receive any dispensations ordinarily granted by the Holy See? (2) What canonical means is there of providing institution for bishops when the pope refuses it? Fesch and Emery tried to sway the council towards some courses which would save the papal prerogative. But the majority of the council answered: (1) That recourses might be had, putting aside the bishops for the dispensations in question; (2) That a clause might be added to the Concordat stipulating that the pope must grant canonical institution within a stated time; failing which, the right of institution would devolve upon the council of the province; and that, if the pope rejected this amendment of the Concordat, the council would, in respect to the bishops, consider itself as conferring the dispensations in question, and as far concerned bishops. The council added, that if the pope persisted in his refusal, the possibility of a public abolition of the Concordat by the emperor would have to be considered; but that these questions could be broached only by a national council, after one last attempt at negotiation with the pope.

On 16 March, 1811, according to the council, the bishops of the French realm were notified to the Tuileries the members of the council and several of the great dignitaries of the empire; inveighing bitterly against the pope, he proclaimed that the Concordat no longer existed and that he was going to convoke a council of the West. At this meeting Emery, who died on 23 April, boldly faced Napoleon, quoting to him passages from Bossuet on the necessity of the pope's liberty. Pius VII not yielding to a last summons on the part of Chablé, the council was convoked on 25 April to meet on 9 June. By this step Napoleon expected to subdue the pope to his will. In pursuance of a plan outlined by the philosopher Gerando, Archbishop Barral, and Bishops Duvoisin and Mammay arrived at Paris to take possession of the Bulls of institution. They were joined by the Bishop of Faenza, and arrived at Savona on 9 May. At first the pope refused to discuss the matter, not being free to communicate with his cardinals. But the bishops and Chablé insisted, and the pope's physician added his efforts to theirs. They represented that the Church was becoming disorganized. At the end of nine days, the pope, who was neither eating nor drinking anything, being very much fatigued, consented, not to ratify, but to take as "a basis of negotiation" a note drawn up by the four bishops to the purport that, in case of persistent refusal on his part, canonical institution might be given to bishops after six months. The pope then stipulated that the bishops started for Paris with this note; at seven o'clock the pope summoned Chablé and told him.
that he did not accept the note in any definitive sense, for he considered it only a sketch, and that he had made no formal promise. He said that the envoy of the Vatican should be sent after the bishops to warn them of this. The courier bearing this message overtook the bishops at Turin on 24 May. Pius VII warned Chabrol that if the first note were exploited as representing an arrangement definitely accepted by the pope, he would make a noise that should resound through the whole Christian world. Napoleon, in his blindness, resolved to do without the pope and put all his hopes in the council.

Council of 1811 — The council convoked on 9 June, 1811, was not opened at Notre-Dame until 17 June, the opening being postponed on account of the baptism of the King of Rome, just born of Marie-Louise. Paternal pride and the seemingly assured destiny of his throne, rendered Napoleon still more inflexible in regard to the pope. Only since 1905 has the truth about this council been known, thanks to Welshinger's researches. Under the Second Empire, when D'Haussonville wrote his work on the Roman Church and the First Empire (see below), Marshal Villain said in his allusions that he obtained it from the archives of the council. These archivesWelshinger was able to consult. Boulogne, Bishop of Troyes, in his opening sermon affirmed the solidarity of the pope and the bishop, while Fesch, as president of the council, made all its members swear obedience and fidelity to Pius VII. Unluckily, the sermon was not well received, and the pope asked for a second sermon on the evening of 19 June, at Saint-Cloud. The emperor had packed his council in very arbitrary fashion, choosing only 42 out of 150 Italian bishops to mix with the French bishops, with a view to ecumenical effect. A private bulletin sent to the emperor, 24 June, noted that the fathers of the council themselves were divided as to the propriety of their proceedings. The opposition to the emperor was very firmly led by Broglie, Bishop of Ghent, seconded by Aviara, Archbishop of Bordeaux, Dessele, Bishop of Chambray, and Hirn, Bishop of Tournai. The first general assembly of the council was held on 20 June. Bigot de Présaneu and Marescalchi, ministers of public worship for France and Italy, were present and read the imperial message, one draft of which had been rejected by Napoleon as too moderate. The final version displeased all the bishops who had any regard for the papal dignity. Napoleon in this document demanded that bishops should be instituted in accordance with the forms which had obtained before the Council of Trent, to be vacant for a longer time, “more than sufficient time for appointing a new incumbent.” He wished the council to present an address to him, and the committee that should prepare this address to be composed of the four prelates he had sent to Savona. The address, which was prepared in advance by Duvosin, one of these four prelates, was an expression of consent on Napoleon’s wishes. But the council decided to have on the committee besides these four prelates, some other bishops chosen by secret ballot, and among the latter figured Broglie. Broglie discussed Duvosin’s draft and had a number of changes made in it, and Fesch had some trouble in keeping the committee from at once demanding the liberation of the pope. The address, as voted, was nonsensical. It was not what Napoleon expected, and the audience which he was to have given to the members of the council on 30 June, did not take place.

Another committee was appointed by the council to inquire into the pope’s views on the institution of bishops, and to ask the pope to declare against Duvosin, by a vote of 8 to 4, a resolution to the effect that, in this matter, nothing must be done without the pope, and that the council ought to send him a deputation to learn what was his will. Napoleon was furious and said to Fesch and Barral: “I will dissolve the council. You are a pack of fools.” Then on second thought, he informed the council that Pius VII had declared that he had formally promised canonical institution to the vacant bishoprics and had approved a clause enabling the metropolitans themselves in future, after six months’ vacancy of any see, to give canonical institution. Napoleon required the council to issue a note to this effect and send a deputation to thank the pope. First the committee voted as the emperor desired. But on further consideration, suspecting some stratagem on the emperor’s part, it recalled its vote, and, on 10 July, Hirn, Bishop of Tournai, speaking for the committee, proposed to the council that no decision be made until a deputation had been sent to the pope. Then, on the morning of 11 July, Napoleon pronounced the council dissolved. The lone Bishop of Boulogne were imprisoned at Vincennes. The emperor next thought of turning over the administration of the dioceses to the prefects, but presently took the advice of Maury, vis., to have all the members of the council called up, one by one, by the minister of public worship, and their personal assent to the imperial decrees obtained. After five days devoted to conversations between the minister and certain of the bishops, the emperor reconvened the council for 5 August, and the council, by a vote of 80 to 13, passed the decree by which canonical institution was to be given within six months, either by the pope or, if he refused, by the bishops who approved this decree tried to palliate their transgression by saying that they had no idea of committing an act of rebellion, but formally asked for, and hoped to obtain, the pope’s assent. Napoleon believed himself victorious; he held in his hands the means of circumventing the pope and organizing without his co-operation the best administrative machinery of which the pope had brought the Sacred College, the Dataria, the Penitentiary, and the Vatican Archives to Paris, and had spent several millions in improving the archiepiscopal palace which he meant to make the pontifical palace. He wished to remove the Hôtel-Dieu, install the department of the Roman Curia in its place, and make the quarter of Notre-Dame and the Isle de Saint-Louis the capital of Catholicism. But his victory was only apparent: to make the decree of the national council valid, the pope’s ratification was needed, and once more the resistance of Pius VII was to hold the emperor in check.

On 17 August Napoleon commissioned the Archbishop of Toulon and Mechin, the Patriarch of Venice, the Bishops of Evreux, Trier, Feltro, and Piacenza to go to Savona and demand of the pope his full adhesion to the decree of 5 August; and the bishops were even to be precise in stating that the decree applied to episcopal sees in the former Papal States, so that, in giving his assent, Pius VII should by implication assent to the abolition of the temporal power. That Pius VII might not allege the absence of the cardinals as a reason for postponing his decisions, Napoleon sent to Savona five cardinals on whom he could rely (Rovere, Dugnani, Fabrizio Ruffo, Bayanne, and Doria), with instructions to support the bishops. The emperor’s artifice was successful. On 8 September, 1811, Pius VII declared himself ready to yield, and charged Roverella to draw up a Brief approving the Decree of 5 August, and on 20 September the pope signed the Brief. But even then, the Brief as it was, was not what Napoleon wanted: Pius VII abstained from recognizing the council as a national council, he treated the Church of Rome as the mistress of all the others, and did not promise to give canonical institution to the bishoprics of the Roman States; he also required that, when a metropolitan gave canonical institution, it should be given in the name of the pope. Napoleon did not publish the Brief. On 17 October he ordered the deputation of prelates to notify the pope that the
decree applied equally to bishoprics in the Roman States. This interpretation Pius VII then formally repudiated, and announced once more that any further decision on his part would be postponed until he should have with him a suitable number of cardinals. Napoleon first sent his second legate, Monsignor Ghezzo, to Turin, and to Troyes, whom he forced to sign their sees and caused to be deported to various towns, then, on 3 December, he declared the Brief unacceptable, and charged the prelates to ask for another. Pius VII refused.

On 9 January, 1812, the prelates informed the pope, from the emperor, that, if the pope resisted any longer, the emperor would act on his own discretion in the matter of the institution of bishops. Pius VII sent a personal reply to the emperor, to the effect that he (the pope) needed a more numerous council and facility of communication with the faithful, and that he would then do, "to meet the emperor's wishes, all that was consistent with the duties of his Apostolic ministry."

By way of rejoinder, Napoleon dictated to his minister of public worship, on 9 February, an extraordinarily vehement letter, addressed to the deputation of prelates. In it he refused to give Pius VII his liberty or to let the "black cardinals" go back to him; he made known that if the pope persisted in the refusal to govern the Church, they would do without the pope; and he added: "If he refuses to cooperate, he is guilty of sacrilege."

Chabrol, the prefect of Montenotte, read this letter to Pius VII, and advised him to surrender the tiara. "Never," was the pope's answer. Then on 23 February, Chabrol notified the pope, in the emperor's name, that Napoleon considered the Concordats abrogated, and that he would no longer permit the pope to interfere in any way in the canonical discretion of the bishops. Pius VII answered that he would not change his attitude. Mme de Staël wrote to Henri Meister: "What a power is religion which gives strength to the weak when all that was strong has lost its strength!"

The difference between the pope and the emperor naturally reacted upon the feelings of the clergy towards Napoleon, and upon the emperor's policy towards religion. From this time Napoleon refused the seminarians any exemption from military service. He made stricter the university monopoly of teaching, and Broglio, Bishop of Ghent, who, after leaving the prison of Vincennes, had continued to correspond with his clergy, was sent to the Island of Sainte-Marguerite.

**Last Great Wars: Concordat of Fontainebleau.**

At this time Napoleon was absolutely drunk with power. The French Empire had 130 departments; the Kingdom of Italy 240. The seven provinces of Illyria were subject to France. The rigour of the Continental blockade was ruining English commerce and embarrassing the European states. The war would have liked Napoleon, master of the West, to leave him freedom of action in Poland and Turkey; enraged at receiving no such concessions, he approached England. The French armies in Spain were exhausting their strength in a savage and ineffectual war against the seven provinces of Spain, but oppression notwithstanding, Napoleon resolved to attack Russia also. At Dresden, from March to June, 1812, he held a congress of kings, and prepared for war. It was at Dresden, in May, 1812, that, under pretext of satisfying the demands of Francis Joseph for gentler treatment of the pope, Napoleon decided to have Pius VII removed from Fontainebleau; the fact is that he was afraid the English would attempt a coup de main on Savona and carry off the pope. After a journey the painful incidents of which have been related by d'Haussonville, following a manuscript in the British Museum, Pius VII reached Fontainebleau on 19 June. Equipages were placed at his disposal, he was desired to appear in public and officiate; but he refused, led a solitary life in the interior of the palace, and gave not the least indication of being ready to yield to Napoleon's demands.

Napoleon definitely declared war against the tsar on 22 June, 1812. The issue was soon seen to be dubious. The Russians devastated the whole country, and in advance the French suffered many frightful pitched battles as much as possible. The victories of Borodino (7 September, 1812), an extremely bloody one, opened to Napoleon the gates of Moscow (14 September, 1812). He had expected to pass the winter there, but the conflagration brought about by the Russians forced him to retrace his steps westward, and the retreat of the "Grande Armée" so heroically covered by Marshal Ney, cost France the lives of thousands of heroic soldiers. The passage of the Beresina was glorious. As far as Lithuania, Napoleon shared the sufferings of his army, then he hastened to Paris, where he suppressed General Malet's conspiracy and prepared a new war for the year 1813. When he set out for Prussia it was his idea to extend his march beyond that country, through Asia to India, to knock over "the scaffolding of mercantile greatness raised by the English, and strike England to the heart." "After this," he declared, "it will be possible to settle everything and have done with this business of Rome and the pope. The cathedral of Paris will become that of the Catholic world."

If Bossuet were living now, he would have been Archbishops of the French territory, and would still be at the Vatican, which would be much better for everybody, for then there would be no pontifical throne higher than that of Notre-Dame, and Paris could not fear Rome. With such a president, I would hold a Council of Nice in Gaul."

But the failure of the Russian campaign upset all these dreams. The emperor's benevolent attitude towards the Church was now modified. On 29 December, 1812, he wrote with his own hand an affectionate letter to the pope expressing a desire to end the quarrel. Duvoisin was sent to Fontainebleau to negotiate a Concordat. Napoleon's demands were these: the pope must swear to do nothing against the four articles; he must condemn the behaviour of the black cardinals towards the emperor; he must allow the Catholic sovereigns to choose two-thirds of the cardinals, take up his residence in Paris, accept the decree of the council on the canonical institution of bishops, and agree to its application to the bishoprics of the Roman States. Pius VII spent ten days discussing the matter. On 18 January, 1813, the emperor came to Fontainebleau and spent many days in stormy interviews with the pope though, according to Pius VII's own statement to Count Paul Van der Vrekken, on 27 September, 1814, Napoleon committed no act of violence against the pope. On 25 January, 1813, a new Concordat was signed. In it there was no mention either of the Four Articles, or of the nomination of cardinals by the Catholic sovereigns, or of the pope's place of residence: the six suburban dioceses were left at the pope's disposition, and he could moreover provide directly for ten bishoprics, either in France or in Italy — on all these points Napoleon made concessions. But on the other hand, the pope confirmed the decree of the Council of 1811 on the canonical institution of bishops.

According to the very words of its preamble, this Concordat was intended only "to serve as basis for a definitive arrangement." But, on 13 February, Napoleon had published it, just as it stood, as a law of the Empire. This was very much to the emperor's liking; the emperor had no right to convert "preliminary articles" thus into a definitive act. On 9 February the imprisoned cardinals had been liberated by Napoleon; going to Fontainebleau, they had found Pius VII very anxious on the subject of the signature he had given, and which he regretted. With the advice of Consalvi, he prepared to retract the "preliminary articles". In his letter of 24 March to Napoleon he reproached him-
self for having signed these articles and disavowed the signature he had given. Napoleon had failed egregiously. He did not listen to the advice of the Comte de Nassigny, the liberal minister of young age, by no means, expressed the opinion that the pope ought to be set at liberty and sent back to Rome. It has been claimed that Napoleon had said to his ministers of State: "If I don't knock the head off, the shoulders of some of those priests at Fontainebleau, matters will never be arranged." This is a legend; on the contrary, he decided that the removal of public worship to keep secret the letter of 24 March. Immediately, acting on his own authority, he declared the Concordat of Fontainebleau binding on the Church, and filled twelve vacant sees. On 5 April he had Cardinal di Pietro removed from Fontainebleau and threatened to "do the same for Cardinal Paccia.

In the Dioceses of Ghent, Troyes, and Tournai, the chapters regarded the bishops appointed by Napoleon as intruders. The irregular measures of the emperor only exasperated the resistance of the clergy. The Belgian clergy, warned by Count Van der Vrecken of the pope's retraction, began to agitate against the imperial policy. Meanwhile, on 25 April, 1813, Napoleon assumed command of the Army of Germany. The victories of Luitpold (2 March), Bautzen (26 May) weakened the Prussian and Russian troops. But the emperor made the mistakes of accepting the mediation of Austria—only a device to gain time—and of consenting to hold the Congress of Prague (July). A letter from Pius VII, secretly carried in the face of orders given by Van der Vrecken, warned the Congress of Prague that the pope formally rejected the articles of 25 January. Napoleon continued nevertheless to send from his headquarters with the army severe orders calculated to overcome the resistance of the Belgian clergy: on 6 August he caused the director of the seminary of Ghent to be imprisoned, and orders to be taken to Magdeburg; on 4 August he had the canons of Tournai arrested. But his perils were increasing. Joseph had been driven out of Spain. Bernadotte, King of Sweden, one of Napoleon's own veterans, was driving the French troops out of Stralsund. Under Schwarzenberg, Blücher and Bernadotte, three armies were forming against the empire for a total of 500,000. He was victor at Dresden (27 August), but his generals were falling away on all sides. He was deserted by the Bavarian contingents in the celebrated "Battle of the Nations" at Leipzig (19-19 October), the defection of the Wurttembergers and the Saxons was the chief cause of his defeat. The victories of Hanau (30 October) and Königstein (6 November) enabled his troops to get back to France, but the Allies were soon to enter that land.

Liberation of the Pope: End of the Empire.—The liberation of the pope figured on the programme of the Allies. In vain did the emperor send the Marchesa di Brignoli to Consalvi, and Fallot de Beaumont, Archduchess of Austria, for a Papal mission. In vain, on 18 January, 1814, when he learned that Murat had gone over to the Allies and occupied the Roman provinces on his own account, did he offer to restore the Papal States to Pius VII. Pius VII declared that such a restoration was an act of justice, and could not be made the subject of a treaty. Mean- time, Blücher and Schwarzenberg were advancing through Burgundy. On 24 January, Lagorée, the commandant of gendarmes who had guarded Pius VII for four years, announced to him that he was about to take him back to Rome. The pope was conveyed by short stages through southern and central France. Napoleon defeated the Allies at Saint-Dizier and at Val Joux, and had to be satisfied with peace on condition that Napoleon should restore the boundaries of France to what they were in 1792. He refused. As the Allies demanded the liberation of the pope, Napoleon sent orders to Lagorée, who was taking him through the south of France, to let him make his way to Italy. On 10 March the prefect of Montélimar received orders to have the pope conducted as far as the Austrian outpost on the Rhône, and the capture of Piacenza. The captivity of Pius VII was at an end.

The war was resumed immediately after the Congress of Châtillon. In five days Napoleon gave battle to Blücher at Champaubert, Montmirail, Château-Thierry, and Vauchamp, and hurled him back on Chalons; against Schwarzenberg he fought the battles of Quigues, Montmirail, and Méry, thus opening the way to Troyes. But Lyons was taken by the Austrians, Bordeaux by the English. Exhausted as he was, Napoleon beat Blücher again at Craonne (7 March), retook Reims and Epernay, and contemplated cutting off the retreat of Blücher and Schwarzenberg on the Rhine. He caused a general levy to be decreed; but the Allies had their agents in Paris. Marmont and Mortier capitulated. On 31 March the Allies entered Paris. On 3 April the Senate declared Napoleon dethroned. Returning to Fontainebleau, the emperor, determined to try one last effort, was stopped by the defection of Marmont's corps at Bourgogne. On 20 April he left Fontainebleau; on 4 May he was in Elba.

At the end of ten months, learning of the unpopularity of the regime founded in France by Louis XVIII, Napoleon secretly left Elba, landed at Cannes (1 March, 1815), and went in triumph from Grenoble to Paris (20 March, 1815). Louis XVIII fled to Fontainebleau. The Hundred Days. Napoleon desired to give France liberty and religious peace forthwith. On the one hand, by the Acte Additionnel, he guaranteed the country a constitutional Government; on the other hand (4 April, 1815), he caused the Duke of Vicenza to write to Cardinal Pacca, and he himself wrote to Pius VII, letters in a personal spirit, while the Rota was commissioned to treat with the pope. But the Coalition was re-formed. Napoleon had 118,000 recruits against more than 800,000 soldiers; he beat Blücher at Ligny (16 June), whilst Néry beat Wellington at Quatre Bras; next day, at Waterloo, Napoleon was victorious over Bliow and Wellington (18 June). The Rota, more than 30,000 Prussians, under Blücher, resulted in the emperor's defeat. He abdicated in favour of his son, set out for Rochefort, and claimed the hospitality of England. England declared him the prisoner of the Coalition and, in spite of his protests, had him taken to the island of St. Helena. There he remained until his death, which was strictly consigned by the Emperor. The letter of Napoleon to General Auguste, Gourgaud, and Bertrand those "Mémoires" which entitle him to a place among the great writers. Las Casas, at the same time, wrote day by day, the "Mémorial de Sainte-Hélène", a journal of the emperor's conversations. In the first of his captivity, Napoleon complained to Montholon on February 1, 1815, "My soul to hear Mass", he said. Pius VII petitioned England to accede to Napoleon's wish, and the Abbé Vignali became his chaplain. On 20 April, 1821, Napoleon said to him: "I was born in the Catholic religion. I wish to fulfill the duties it imposes, and receive the succour it administers." To Montholon he affirmed his belief in God, read aloud the Old Testament, the Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles. He spoke of Pius VII as "an old man full of tolerance and light", "Fatal circumstances", he added, "embroiled our cabinets. I regret it exceedingly." Lord Rosebery has attached much importance to the paradoxes with which the emperor used to tease his auditors, a necessity he felt from the supremacy of Mohammedanism, Protestantism, or Materialism. One day, when he had been talking in this strain, Montholon said to him: "I know that
le religieux (Paris, 1907); L'ESTRÉT, Histoire de Mgr d'Arvay (Paris, 1947); MÉRIAT, Histoire de M. Brossy (Paris, 1865); DE GRANDMAISON, Napoléon et les Vivarais (1895); CABUTTE, Napoléon Bonaparte (Paris, 1905); J. D. M. MELLERIO, T. D. Napoléon (1865); MARIOTTI, L'anarchie romaine et Napoléon I. L'archevêché d'Aix à Florence en Revue Historique, XXXVI (1894); see also bibliography to Ch. V of 1861; ARTICLES, L'ORGANIC; PISI VII: PISI VII. For a fuller bibliography of the subject, consult KIRCHERRICH, Bibliographie de l'époque de Napoléon et de l'histoire de l'Empire; etudes historiques de la religion française jusqu'en 1908, I (Paris, 1909); Revue Napoléonico (1901 sqq.).

GEORGES GOYAU.

NAPOLÉON III (CHARLES-LOUIS-NAPOLÉON), originally known as LOUIS-NAPOLÉON-BONAPARTE, Emperor of the French; b. at Paris, 20 April, 1808; d. at Chislehurst, England, 6 January, 1873; third son of Louis Bonaparte, King of Holland and Hortense de Beauharnais, daughter of the Emperor Josephine. After the fall of the First Empire, Hortense, who had been separated from her husband, took her two sons to Geneva, Aix in Savoy, Augsburg, and then (1824) to the castle of Arenenberg in Switzerland. Louis Napoleon had for tutor the scholar Le Bas, son of a member of the Convention. The "principle of nationalities" attracted him in youth, and with his brother, he took part in an attempt to release the prisoners arrested by the State of the Church, in 1831. He was on the point of setting out for Poland when he heard that the Russians had entered Warsaw. On the death of the Duke of Reichstadt (1832) he regarded himself as the heir of the Napoleonic Empire. The Republican press, engaged in a struggle with Louis Philippe's government, manifested a certain sympathy for Louis Napoleon. Though Casimir Périer had expelled him from France in 1831, and a few officers from Strasburg attempted, but failed in, a coup de main (1836). In his book, "Idses Napoléoniennes," published in 1838, he appears as the testamentary executor of Napoleon I. He held social and political reforms in his teeth. After his return from the United States, in 1831, he published (in London, 1840) a treatise on the constitution of the United States. In 1842, he was imprisoned for life, notwithstanding his defence by Berryer. While in prison at Ham, he wrote, among other brochures, one on the "Extermination of Pauperism." He escaped from Ham in 1846. After the Revolution of 1848 he returned to Paris, became a member of the Constituent Assembly, and finally was elected President of the Republic by 5,562,834 votes, on 10 December, 1848.

Presidency of Louis Napoleon.—Before his election Louis Napoleon had entered into certain engagements with Montalembert in regard to freedom of teaching and the restoration of Pius IX, who had been driven from Rome by the Roman Senate. In 1849 Oudinot's expedition made its direct attack on the Roman Republic, April, 1849, and the Constituent Assembly passed a resolution of protest (7 May, 1849), a letter from Louis Napoleon to Oudinot requested him to persist in his enterprise and assured him of reinforcements (8 May, 1849); at the same time, however, he also urged him to retreat to Rome to negotiate with Mazzini, an agreement soon after dissuaded. In this way the difficulties of the future emperor reveal themselves from the beginning; he wished to spare the religious susceptibilities of French Catholics and to avoid offending the national susceptibilities of the Italian revolutionists—a double aim which explains many an inconsistency and many a failure in the religious policy of the empire. "The more we study his character, the more nonplussed we are," writes his historian, de la Gorce. Oudinot's victory (29 June, 1849) having crushed the Roman Republic, Napoleon, ignoring the decided Catholic majority in the Legislative Assembly, elected on 18 June 1849 to address to the Codé, a sort of manifesto in which he asked of Pius IX a general amnesty, the secularization of his administration, the establishment of the Code Napoléon, and a Liberal Government. The Legislative Assembly, on
Montalbemb't motion, voted approval of the "Motu Proprio" of 12 September, by which Pius IX promised reforms without yielding to all the president's imperative demands. The president was dissatisfied, and forced the Falloux Cabinet to resign; but he was soon working with all the influence of his position for the passage of the Falloux Law on freedom of teaching—a law which involved a great triumph for the Catholics—while, in the course of his journeys through France, his deferential treatment of the bishops was extremely marked. And when, by the Coup d'Etat of 2 December, 1851, Louis Napoleon had dissolved the Assembly, and by the blicicite appealed to the French people as to the justice of that act, many Catholics, following Montalbemt and Louis Veulliot, decided in its dismemberment of the Eménil 744. The 2015 votes (21 November, 1852). The Dominican Lacroix, the Jesuit Ravignan, and Bishop Dupanloup were more reserved in their attitude. Lacroix went so far as to say: "If France becomes accustomed to this order of things, we are moving rapidly towards the Lower Empire".

Dictatorial Period of the Empire, 1852-60.—The first acts of the new government were decidedly favourable to the Church. By the "Decree Law" of 31 January, 1852, the congregations of women, which previously could be authorized only by a legislative act, were made authorized by simple decree. A great many bishops and priests hailed with joy the day on which Louis Napoleon opened a new day (30 January, 1853) of his marriage with the Spanish Eugénie de Montijo, which seemed to assure the future of the dynasty. At this very time Dupanloup, less optimistic, published a pastoral letter on the liberty of the Church, while Montalbembt began to perceive the forms which made him fear that the Church would not always have reason to congratulate itself on the new order. For some years the Church enjoyed effective liberty: the bishops held synods at their pleasure; the budget of public worship was forthcoming; cardinals sat in the Senate as of right; the civil authorities appeared in religious processions; missions were given; from 1852-60 the State recognized 982 new communities of women; primary and secondary educational institutions under ecclesiastical control increased in number, while, in 1852, Pères Petetot and Gratry founded the Oratory as a Catholic centre of science and philosophy. Catholics like Ségur, Cornouet, Baudouin, Cochon, and the Vicomte de Cavaignac, had viewed the entente between church and state with enthusiasm. Napoleon III was anxious that Pius IX should consent to come to crown him at Notre Dame. This request he caused to be preferred by Mgr de Ségur, auditor of the Rota, and Pius IX explained that, if he crowned Napoleon III, he would also be obliged to go and crown Francis Joseph of Austria, hinting at the same time, that Napoleon IV could come to Rome; and he gave it to be understood that, if the emperor were willing to suppress the Organic Articles, he, the pope, might be able to accede to his request at the end of three months. Pius IX also wished Napoleon III to make the Sunday rest obligatory and abrogate the legal necessity of civil marriage previous to the religious ceremony. After two years of negotiations the emperor gave up this idea (1854), but thereafter his relations with the Church seemed to be somewhat less cordial. The Bull in which Pius IX defined the Immaculate Conception was admitted into France grudgingly, and after some very lively opposition on the part of the Council of State (1854). Bishop Mouffet of Montauban denounced to the Council of State for infringement of the Organic Articles, while the "Correspondant" and the "Univers", having defended the bishop, were rigorously dealt with by the authorities. Lastly, the return to the Cour de Cassation (Court of Appeals) of the former procureur général Dupin, who had resigned in 1852, was looked upon as a victory for Gallican ideas.

The Crimean War (1853-56) was undertaken by Napoleon, in alliance with England, to check Russian aggression in the direction of Turkey. The Fall of Sebastopol (8 September, 1855) compelled Alexander II to sign the Treaty of Paris (1856). In this war Piedmont, thanks to its minister, Cavour, had played a part. But the consequences of the Crimean War were serious for France. Piedmont was treated as one of the Great Powers. After all, the Italian Question interested the emperor more than any other, and upon this ground difficulties were about to arise between him and the Church. As early as 1856 Napoleon knew, through Cavour, that the Piedmontese programme involved the dismemberment of the Empire of Austria, and the depopulation of the French Government the Congress of Paris expressed a wish that the pope should carry out liberal reforms, and that the French and Austrian troops should soon leave his territories. The attempt on the emperor's life by the Italian Orsini (14 January, 1858), set in motion a policy of severe repression ("Law of General Security" and proceedings against Proudhon, the socialist). But the letter which Orsini wrote from his prison to Napoleon, beseeching him to give liberty to twenty-five million Italians, made a lively impression upon the emperor's imagination. Pietri, the prefect of police obtained from Orsini another letter, pledging his political friends to renounce all violent methods, and to see the enfranchisement of Italy was the price to be paid for this assurance. From that time, it was Napoleon's active wish to realize Italian unity. On 21 July, 1858, he had an interview with Cavour at Plombières. It was agreed between them that France and Piedmont should secure for themselves the right to drive the Austrians from Italy, and that Italy should become a confederation, under the rule of the King of Sardinia, though the pope was to be its honorary president. The result of this interview was the Italian War. For this war public opinion had been schooled by a series of articles in Liberal and government organs—the "Sicile", "Presse", and "Patrie"—by Edmond About's articles on the pontifical administration, published in the "Moniteur", and by the anonymous brochure "L'Empereur Napoléon III et l'Italie" (really the work of Arthur de la Guérinière), which denounced the spirit of opposition to reform shown by the Italian governments. Catholics tried to obtain Napoleon's assurance that he would not compromise the papal state, and on 5 July the Representatives (Corps Législatif) the Republican Jules Favre asked: "If the government of the cardinals is overthrown shall we shed the blood of the Romans to restore it?" And the minister, Baroche, made no answer (26 April, 1859). But Napoleon, in the proclamation announcing his departure for Italy (10 May, 1859), declared that he was going to deliver Italy as far as the Adriatic, and that the pope's power would remain intact. The victories of the French troops at Magenta (4 June, 1859) and Solferino (24 June, 1859) coincided with insurrectionary movements against the papal authority. Catholics were alarmed, and so was the emperor; he would not appear as an accomplice of those movements, and on 11 July he signed the treaty of Villafranca. Austria ceded Lombardy to France, and France retroceded it to Sardinia. Venetia was still to belong to Austria, but would form part of the Italian Confederation which would be under the honorary presidency of the king of Sardinia. The pope would produce the indispensible reforms in his state. In November, 1859, at Zurich, these preliminaries were formally embodied in a treaty.

Neither the pope nor the Italians were pleased with the emperor. On the one hand the pope did not thank Napoleon for his hints on the way to govern the Romagna, and an eloquent brochure from the pen of
Dupleix denounced the schemes which menaced the pope. On the other hand it was plain to the Itali-ans that the French would choose the papacy to Italy as far as the Adriatic. Napoleon then dreamed of settling the affairs of Italy by means of a congress, and Arthur de la Guérinière's pamphlet, "Le pape et le congrès," demanded of Pius IX, in advance, the surrender of his temporal power. On 1 January, 1860, Pius IX denounced this pamphlet as a "monument of heresy" and on 10-11 to the bishop wrote a formal refusal a letter from Napoleon advising him to give up the Legations. A few months later, the Legations themselves joined Piedmont, while Napoleon, by making Thouvenel his minister of foreign affairs and by negotiating with Cavour the annexation of Nice and Savoy to France, proved that he was in a position to demand of the pope's temporal power than to the temporal power of the pope. Meanwhile the Catholics in France commenced violent press campaigns under the leadership of the "Univers" and the "Correspondant". On 24 January, 1869, the "Univers" was suppressed. The minister of state, Billault, prosecuted the Catholic publications and press. On March 1, Napoleon, at Baroche, on 2 April, announced in the Corps Législatif, that the French troops would not leave Rome so long as the pope was unable to defend himself. But Napoleon only too anxious to withdraw his troops, at one moment thought of having them replaced by Neapolitan troops, and then proposed to Pius IX, that 3500 of those soldiers of the pope's were a large number of French Legitimists; Lamoricière, their commander, had always been a foe of the imperial regime. Napoleon III was annoyed, and ordered his ambassador at Rome to enter into negotiations for the withdrawal of the French troops: on 11 May, 1860, it was decided that within three months the soldiers given to the pope by Napoleon III should return to France.

In the meantime, however, Garibaldi's campaign in Sicily and Calabria opened. Farini and Cialdini, sent by Cavour to Napoleon, represented to him (28 August) the urgent necessity of checking the Italian revolution, that Garibaldi was about to march on Rome, and that the French, as a consequence of the restoration of order in Italy, for which purpose the Piedmontese must be allowed to cross the pontifical territories so as to reach the Neapolitan frontier. "Faites vite (act quickly)", said the emperor, and himself left France, travelling in Corsica and Algeria, while the Piedmontese troops invaded Umbria and the Marches, defeated the troops of Lamoricière at Castelfidardo, captured Ancona, and occupied all the States of the Church except Rome and the province of Viterbo. Napoleon publicly warned Victor Emmanuel that, if he attacked the pope without legitimate provocation, France would be obliged to oppose him; he withdrew his minister from Turin, leaving instead only a chargé d'affaires, and was a mere spectator of that series of events which, in February, 1861, ended in Victor Emmanuel's being proclaimed King of Italy. The expedition to Syria (1859), in which 50,000 French troops went to the relief of the Maronite Christians, who were being massacred by the Druses with the connivance of the Turks, the two expeditions to China (1856-58), the fall of the Rhétoriciens, the reunion of Italy resulted, among other things, in the restoration to the Christians of their religious establishments, and the joint expedition of France and Spain (1854-62) against the Annamese Empire, which avenged the persecution of Christians on Annam and ended in the conquest of Cochinchina by France, merited for the armies of the Church. Still the attitude of Napoleon III in regard to Italian affairs caused great pain to Catholics. Falloux in an article entitled "Antécédents et conséquences de la situation actuelle", published in the "Correspondant", implied that Napoleon was an accomplice in the Italian revolution. The Catholic associations formed to collect subscriptions for the pope's benefit were suppressed, and Pius IX, in the consistorial allocution of 17 December, 1860, accused the emperor of having "feigned" to protect him.

**Liberal Period of the Empire, 1860-70.**—It was just at this time that the emperor, by the decree of 24 November, 1860, made his first concession to the opposition, and to liberal ideas of independence and power of initiative to the Legislature. But the Liberal opposition was not disarmed, and the Catholic discontent was aggravated by his Italian policy. The emperor replied to Pius IX by publishing la Guérinière's book, "La France, Rome et l'Italie", a violent arraignment of Rome. Then Bishop Pie of Poitiers published his pastoral charge in which the words, "Lavet tes mains, O Pilate (Wash thy hands, O Pilate)", were addressed to Napoleon III. In the Senate, an amendment in favour of the temporal power of the pope was lost by only a very small majority; in the Corps Législatif, one-third of the deputies declared themselves for the pontifical cause. The emperor asserted his Italian sympathies more and more clearly: in June, 1862, he recognized the new kingdom; he sent an ambassador to Turin, and to Rome two partisans of Italian unity; and he used his influence with Russia and Prussia to procure their admission of the Kingdom of Italy. One striking symptom of the emperor's changed feelings towards the Church was the circular of January, 1862, by which Persigny declared all the St. Vincent de Paul societies dissolved. Following upon Garibaldi's blow at the Pontifical States, which had been stopped by his defeat at Aspermonte (29 August, 1862), General Durando, minister of foreign affairs in the Rattazzi cabinet, declared in a circular that "the whole Italian nation demanded its capital". Thus were the Italians proclaiming their eagerness to be installed at Rome. Fearing that at the forthcoming legislative elections the Catholics would revolt from the imperial party, Napoleon suddenly manifested a much colder feeling for Italy. The Catholic influence of the empress gained the upper hand of Prince Napoleon's anti-religious influence. Thouvenel was supplanted by Drouin de Lhuys (15 October, 1862), who was made to give out a curt statement that the French Government had no present intention of taking any action in consequence of the Durando circular, thus bringing about the fall of the Rattazzi cabinet in Italy. A great many Catholics recovered their confidence in Napoleon; but a political alliance between a certain number of Liberal Catholics, devoted to the Royalist cause and members of the Republican party resulted, in
June, 1833, in the return of thirty-five Opposition members to the Chamber, mostly men of great ability. Republicans and Monarchists, Freethinkers and Catholics, they grouped themselves around Thiers, who had been Louis Philippe's minister, and who won the confidence of Catholics by pronouncing unequivocally in favour of the temporal power. But the alliance between Republicans who wanted Napoleon to desist from protecting the temporal power and Catholics who thought he did not protect it enough, could not be very stable. From 1862 to 1864 the emperor did nothing in regard to Italy that could cause Pius IX any uneasiness. He was at that period busy with the early stages of the Mexican War, in which he had very imprudently allowed himself to become involved. Four years before, a democratic riset had arrived in Mexico, and the French troops, early in 1867, and the execution of Maximilian, brother of the Emperor of Austria, whom France had caused to be proclaimed Emperor of Mexico. The impression created by this disaster notably increased the strength of the Opposition in France.

Negotiations between Napoleon III and Italy recommenced in 1864, the Italian Government beseeching the emperor to put an end to the French occupation of the Pontifical States. The Convention of 15 September, 1864, obliged Italy to refrain from attacking the actual possessions of the Holy See and, on the contrary, promised that it would use its influence to hasten the evacuation of Mexico by the French troops, early in 1867, and the execution of Maximilian, brother of the Emperor of Austria, whom France had caused to be proclaimed Emperor of Mexico. The impression created by this disaster notably increased the strength of the Opposition in France.

The speech of Thiers against Italian unity, denouncing the imprudence of the Imperial policy, was loudly applauded by the faithful supporters of the Holy See. Napoleon III, a prey to indecision, no doubt asked himself from time to time whether his policy was a wise one, but the circumstances which he himself had created carried him along. Late in 1864 he thought of negotiating an alliance between the Courts of Berlin and Rome, a policy which Bismarck, son of Venetia, but fearing the serious necessity of arming against France. By the end of 1866 the withdrawal of the French troops which had guarded the pope's palace was complete. But Napoleon at the very time when he was thus carrying out the Convention of 15 September was organizing at Antwerp a legion to be placed at the disposal of the pope; he once more exacted of Italy a pledge not to invade the Papal States; he conceived a plan to obtain from the Powers a collective guarantee of the pope's temporal sovereignty. On 3 November, 1866, he wrote to his friend Francesco Arose: "People must know that I will yield nothing on the Roman question, and that my mind is made up to carry out the guarantee of 15 September, to support the temporal power of the pope by all possible means". But the season of ill-luck and of blundering was setting in for the Imperial diplomacy. None of the Powers responded to Napoleon's appeal. Italy, displeased at the organization of the Antibe Legion and the confidence reposed by the emperor in Rouher, a devoted champion of Catholic interests, complained bitterly: Napoleon answered by complaining of the Garibaldian musters that threatened the pope's territories. When the Garibaldians made an actual incursion, on 25 October, 1867, the French troops which had for some weeks been concentrated at Toulon, embarked for Civitavecchia and helped the papal troops defeat the invaders from Sicily. Cardinal Antonelli asked that the French forces should be directed against those of Victor Emmanuel, but the emperor refused. Menabrea, Victor Emmanuel's minister, though he gave orders for the arrest of the Garibaldians, published in spite of Napoleon, a circular affirming Italy's right to possess Rome. Napoleon would not release him from the coils of the Roman Question; he was still thinking of a European congress, but Europe declined. At the close of 1867, Thiers' speech in support of the temporal power gave Rouher occasion to say, amid the applause of the majority, "We declare it in the name of the French government, Italy shall not take possession of Rome. Never, never will France tolerate such an assault upon her honour and her Catholicity". That never was extremely unpleasant to the Italian patriots. The emperor had offended both the pope and Italy at the same time. When the Vatican Council was convoked the imperial government manifested no antagonism. M. Emile Ollivier, president of the Chamber, and minister of Foreign Affairs, in a speech to the Italian Legation in Rome, 18, July, 1867, that the States ought not to interfere in the deliberations of the council. His colleague Daru instructed Banneville, the French ambassador to Rome, on 20 February, to protest in the name of French Constitutional law against the programme of enactments "De ecclesia", and to try to bring about concerted action. It was in the interests of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, for the reputation of 10 March, Daru confined himself to reiterating his objections in a memorandum (5 April) which Pius IX declined to submit to the council. M. Ollivier, against the requests of certain anti-infallibilist prelates, directed Banneville not to try to meddle in the proceedings of the council.

In 1870 Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern's claim to the crown of Spain brought on a conflict between France and King William of Prussia. A dispatch relating to a conversation which took place at Ems, between William and Napoleon's ambassador, Benedetti, was, as Bismarck himself afterwards confessed, tampered with in such a way as to make war inevitable. The French government repented of the refutation of the charge made by him in the Reichstag (5 December, 1874), that the empress and the Jesuits had desired the war and driven him into it. The German historian Sybel has formally cleared the empress and the Jesuits of this accusation. (On this point, which has provoked numerous polemics, see Dohr, "Jesuitentaufe", 4th ed., Freiburg, 1904, pp. 877-79). Pius IX wrote to Emperor William offering his good offices as mediator (22 July, 1870), but to no purpose. As for the Italian government, on 16 July, 1870, it refused an alliance with France because Napoleon had refused it Rome. On 20 July Napoleon promised that the imperial troops should be recalled from Rome, but no more, and so, as usual, he offended both the pope, whom he was about to leave defenceless, and Italy, whose highest ambitions he was ceasing. The negotiations between France and Italy were continued in August, by Prince Napoleon, who made a visit to Florence. Italy absolutely insisted upon being allowed to take Rome, and, on 29 August, Visconti Venosta, minister of Foreign Affairs, announced that the right of the Italians to have Rome for their capital. The anti-Catholic controversialists of France have often made use of these facts to support their allegation that the emperor would have had the Italian alliance in the War of 1870 if he had not persisted in his demand that
the pope should remain master of Rome, and that Italy’s abstinence entailed that of Austria, which would have helped France if Italy had. M. Welschinger had gathered fellow soldiers, and, no condition to be of material assistance to France. After the surrender of Sedan (2 September, 1870), Napoleon was sent, a prisoner, to Wilhelmshöhe, where he learned that the Republic had been proclaimed at Paris, 4 September, and that the Piedmontese had occupied Rome (20 September). The 14th of November, 1870, by which date, as the Parisian times before, confirmed the emperor’s dethronement. After the Peace of Frankfort he went to reside at Chiselsurt, where he died. His only son, Eugène-ouis-Jean-Joseph-Napoléon, born 16 March, 1856, was killed by the Zulus, 23 June, 1879. Napoleon III left unfinished a ‘Vie de César’, begun in 1865, with the assistance of the historian Dege, and, of which three volumes were published. His history still affords occasion for numerous polemics animated by party feeling. The portrait of him drawn by Victor Hugo’s ‘Les Châtiments’ is extremely unfair. Napoléon was a tender-hearted dreamer, kindness was one of his most evident qualities. As regards his personal reputation, he was faithful to his duties. Much of the censure which his foreign policy has merited is equally applicable to the anticlericals and the Republicans of his time, whose press organs were clamouring for French aid towards the speedy realisation of Italian unity, while their systematic opposition, in 1868, to the Government programme for education was partly responsible for the military weakness of France in 1870.

The works of Napoleon III, including those written before he became emperor, his speeches as president, and his military works were published in 5 volumes, Paris, 1894—57, and 1899; Tiberius, Napoléon III et l’Empire (2 vols., Paris, 1896); DE LA Gorce, Histoire du second Empire (Paris, 1895—92); BLANCHARD (1895), Life of Napoleon III (4 vols, London, 1889); VIOT, Life of Napoleon the Third (London, 1889); WOTERT, Le régime de Napoléon III (Paris, 1891); LEGENDRE, L’Empereur Napoléon III (Paris, 1895—1910); GHIRAUAUD, Napoléon III uniame (Paris, 1896); WELSCHINGER, Le Gare de 1870, causes et responsabilité (3 vols., Paris, 1910). On Napoleon III and the Italian question, see bibliographies to Fallois, Montalembert, Duplaing, Pius IX, Véryl, also GIAICOMETTI, La question italienne (Paris, 1892); IRIAT, L’union italienne (2 vols., Paris, 1898—99); TRONNEL, Le secret de l’empeu (Paris, 1899); CHIALLA, Politique supérieure de Napoléon III et de Cavour in Italy e in Ungheria (Turin, 1899); RENZI, Il regno di Napoléon III, Roma e Napoléon III, Italia (Paris, 1907); BONIFACI, Vita di Francesco Arsen (Turin, 1894); CASTIGLIONE, Un Portrait inedit de Napoléon III et de la question de l’Italie (Paris, 1911). It is true that the honour of characterising the attitude of Napoleon III in Italian affairs.

GEORGES GIOUVA.

Napier (or Napper), GEORGE, VENERABLE, English martyr b. at Holywell, manuscript Oxford, 1580; executed at Oxford 9 November, 1610. He was the son of Edward Napper (d. in 1558), sometime Fellow of All Souls College, by Anne, his second wife, daughter of John Peto, of Chesterton, Warwickshire, and niece of William, Cardinal Peto. He entered Corpus Christi College 5 January, 1565—6, but was ejected in 1568. He ran away in 1570. On 24 August, 1570, 24 years old, a inmate to the English College at Reims, and by December, 1580, he had been imprisoned. He was still in the Wood Street Court, London, on 30 September, 1588; but was liberated in June, 1589, on acknowledging the royal supremacy. He entered the English College, Douai, in 1596, and was sent on the mission in 1603. He appears to have lived with his brother William at How. He was arrested at Kirtlington, Oxford, in 1601, from Woodstock, very early in the morning of 19 July, 1610, when he had on him a pyx containing two consecrated Hosts as well as a small reliquary. Brought before Sir Francis Eure at Upper Heyford (Wood says before a justice named Chamberlain), he was strictly searched, but the constable found nothing but his black thread and thimble. The next day he was sent to Oxford Castle, and indited at the sessions soon after under 27 Eliz., c. 2 for being a priest. The possession of the oils was held to be conclusive and he was condemned, but reprieved. In gaol he reconciled a convent of nuns, and in 1580, but died the next morning. His head according to Wood was set up on Tom Gateway; according to Challoner’s less probable statement on Christ Church steeple. His quarters were placed on the four city gates, but at least some were secretly removed, and buried in the chapel (now a barn) of Sanford manor, formerly a preceptory of Knights Templar.


JOHN B. WINEWRIGHT.

Narbonne. See TOULOUSE, ARCHIDIOCESE OF.

Nardi, Dacapo, Italian historian: b. at Venice, 11 March, 1563. His father, Salvestro Nardi, belonged to an old Florentine family, originally from the suburbs of the city. Jacopo was an earnest follower of Savonarola, whose death he witnessed. He was attached to the Republican party, under which he held various offices in the State, but nevertheless kept on friendly terms with the Medici after their restoration in 1512, and even composed pages for them. Having been concerned in the Republican revolution of 1527, he was banished from Florence in 1530, and took a leading part in the efforts of the exiles to return, pleading their cause against the tyranny of Duke Alessandro before Charles V, in 1536. He finally settled at Venice, where he died in poverty. All his contemporaries bear witness to his upright and noble character. Before his exile, Nardi composed two comedies ‘L’Amicizia’ and ‘I Due Felici Rivali’, together with a few cantis carnascialeschi, or carnival-songs. The later date belongs to the latter. The most important works are translations from Livy and Cicero, and his Life of Antonio Giacomini, an austere soldier of the republic who died in 1517. His ‘Istorie della città di Firenze’ (History of the City of Florence) was written in the last years of his life. It deals with the tragic epoch in Florentine history from 1494 until within a few years of the author’s death, and is especially noteworthy for its high moral tone and its faithful record of the events in which Nardi himself had shared.

Gelli, ed., Istorie della città di Firenze di Jacopo Nardi (Florence, 1888); GARBOLINI, La vita e le opere di Jacopo Nardi (Florence, 1897); PERRILLAT, La vita e le opere di Jacopo Nardi (Florence, 1901).

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

Nardò, Diocese of (NERITONENSIS), in southern Italy. Nardò was already an episcopal see, when, about 761, Greek monks arrived there, fleeing from the persecutions of the Iconoclasts. Paul I assigned to those monks the episcopal palace and the revenues of the see, then vacant, and sponsored the foundation of the Diocese of Brindisi. The monastery became a centre of Greek culture; but, in 990, Urban II put Latin Benedictines there, and Paschal II gave episcopal jurisdiction to the abbots; for a long time the Greek and Latin rites were maintained together at the monastery. In 1388, a bishop was established at Nardo for the antipope Clement VII’s illegitimate sons, as Clement VI had done for Boniface IX, who entrusted the care of the diocese to the Archbishop of Otranto. The latter proposed to
suppress the Greek Rite in the diocese, but, at the instance of the Benedicentes and of King Ladislaus, the pope maintained the repression on the Greek Rite. It is known that the Greek Rite was obtained in sixteen towns of the diocese, and that there was a protopope at Balatonke. The see was re-established in 1413, in favour of Giovanni degli Epifani. Other bishops were Ambrogio Salvi, O.P. (1569), who introduced the reforms of the Council of Trent; Fabio Fornari (1568), who also opposed to abolish the use of the Greek Rite: Lelio Landi (1607), a learned Orientalist, employed by the Congregatio de auxiliis and also in the correction of the Vulgate; Fabio Chigi (1635), who became Alexander VII; Antonio Sanfelice (1707), founder of a public library and of a workhouse for girls. The diocese is directly dependent on the Holy See. It has 16 parishes, with 70,500 inhabitants, 2 houses of Franciscans, and 4 religious houses of women, 2 schools for boys, and 4 for girls.

**Narni and Terni, United Dioceses of (Narniere et Ternensi), in Central Italy.** Narnia is the ancient town of the Sabines; in 300 B.C. and 299 n. c., it was besieged by the Romans, who destroyed the city and sent there a Latin colony, changing the name to Narnia. Luitprand captured the town in 726, but Pope Zacharias persuaded him to restore it to the Duchy of Rome in 742, after which it remained under pontifical rule. From 1198 to 1214, Narnia was ruled against Innocent III, who temporarily suppressed its episcopal see. The churches of this city contain many paintings of the ancient Umbrian school. This town is the birthplace of the Blessed Lucia of Narnia, a tertiary of St. Dominic, who died in 1544, and of the condottiere Erasmo Gattameleata. Narnia is celebrated by its first bishop the Martinianus, who died in the second half of the fourth century; St. Maximus, who was bishop in 425, was succeeded by his two sons Heracles and Pancratius; St. Gregory the Great shows that, at Narnia, at that time, there were still pagans to be converted; Bishop John I (940) was succeeded by his son, the bearded John XIII; among other bishops were: William, a Franciscan, whom Urban V employed against the Fraticelli (1367); and Raimondo Castelli (1565), founder of the seminary.

In 1908, the sees of Narnia and of Terni were united. Terni is on the Nerina, in its confluence with the Velino; the magnificent cascade of the latter is well-known through the noble description by Lord Byron in "Childe Harold". Terni is the ancient Interamna Nahars of the Umbrians, and its former splendour is witnessed to by the ruins of an amphitheatre in the garden of the episcopal palace, a theatre, and baths near the church of St. Nicholas. The cathedral and other churches, are built on the sites of pagan temples. After the Lombard invasion, Terni belonged to the Duchy of Spoleto, and with the latter, came into the Pontifical States; it was at this town that Pope Zacharias entered into the agreement with King Luitprand for the restitution of the cities of Bieda, Orte, Bomarzo, and Amelia to the Duchy of Rome. It is believed that the gospel was preached at Terni by St. Peregrinus, about the middle of the second century. The townspeople have great veneration for St. Valentinus, whose basilica is outside the city, and was, probably, the meeting-place of the first Christians of Terni. There were other martyrs from this city, among them, the first Bishop of Terni, the holy virgin Agape. In the time of Totila, the Bishop of Terni, St. Proculus, was killed at Bologna, and St. Domnina and ten nuns, her companions, were put to death at Terni itself. After the eighth century Terni was without a bishop until 1217, in which year the diocese was re-established. Among its bishops since that time, were Ludovico Massacio III (1460), who governed the diocese for fifty years; Guido Manucci (1625), who gave the high altar to the cathedral, and Francesco Rapaccioli (1646), a cardinal who restored the cathedral. The united sees are immediately dependent upon Rome; they have 57 parishes, with 66,600 inhabitants, 3 religious houses of men, and 1 of women.

**Nashville, Diocese of,** comprises the entire territory of the State of Tennessee. From its inland location and peculiar civil history, it has not profited much from the tide of immigration. Its present development has been chiefly due to its own internal work. There is little need of consulting any historical references as to the growth of the Church in Tennessee since no such work of any importance exists. This is chiefly due to the fact that heretofore the diocese was in an embryo state and those who could write its history had neither time nor opportunity to do what was so much needed. Up to twenty years ago, or in the decade of 1880-90, much of the diocesan history could have been learned from the early pioneers of Catholicity, or their children, who were then living. The Diocese of Nashville was established 28 July, 1857, having been separated from the Diocese of Bardstown (now Diocese of Louisville) and the first Bishop of Nashville was Rt. Rev. Richard Pius Miles, consecrated at Bardstown, 16 Sept., 1838. Before this date there is no authentic record of any ecclesiastical missionary work in what is now the State of Tennessee, except in sporadic efforts. The earliest records attainable are two letters in the archives of Baltimore, dated 1793, from Father Pichon, concerning an offer from John Sevier, the first governor of Tennessee, that Father Badin might arrange for the immigration of at least one hundred Catholic families for whose maintenance the governor guaranteed sep-
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The offer of the warrior-statesman was not accepted; however, although many dozen Catholic names are to be found today among the inhabitants of east Tennessee, probably due to the fact that the insurgents of Ireland were sold into a species of slavery by the English government to the American colonists. That they or their children have fallen from the old faith of their fathers can be accounted for by the fact that the exiles had then neither church nor priests, nor Catholic schools. For a good many years the present writer has been seeking information as to early Catholic settlers and Catholic work, but must confess the evidence very doubtful as to whether the first priestly ministrations were in the neighbourhood of Nashville or Knoxville. Civic history and geographical position seem to give them the preference.

The first authentic records of a priest in Tennessee are contained in the archives of St. Mary's cathedral, Nashville, when Father Abell came (1820) from Bardstown to attend the few Catholics then living in Nashville. Shortly after his arrival, Father Abell undertook the building of the first church in Tennessee, at Nashville, a small building on what is now Capitol hill. The State Capitol now occupies the site. Father Abell visited Nashville as a mission for four or five years, and then (1849) Father Durbin took charge, and about the following year he was assisted by Father Brown who made Ross Landing (now Chattanooga) his headquarters, and near that place, in 1853 and 1855, Bishop Miles. After a difficult journey on horseback and in a canoe from Bardstown, Ky., Bishop Miles took possession of his diocese and early in 1839, began his first episcopal visitation of Tennessee. At the end of his journey he declared that he did not find more than three hundred Catholics in Tennessee. In 1840, he left the Cincinnati Sisters at the first church, under the management of Father McEler; it has since been rebuilt as St. Peter's by the Dominicans. In 1844 he laid the corner stone of St. Mary's cathedral, Nashville. In addition mission churches were established in outlying stations so that in 1847 Bishop Miles was able to report to Rome that he had 8 priests, 6 churches, 8 chapels, and a Catholic population of about 1500.

In 1849 a church was erected at Jackson; in 1852 one at Chattanooga; in 1854 one at Knoxville; in 1856 one at McEwen; in 1857 one at Edgefield (now east Nashville); in 1858 one at Shelbyville (later discontinued); and in 1859 one at Nashville (church of the Most Sacred Heart). In 1860 the Bishop of Memphis for the territory of Missouri, Iowa, and Illinois, at the outbreak of the Civil War, and he was succeeded by Bishop Whelan. His diocese became the greatest theatre of war; his cathedral was converted into a hospital; his flock scattered. The burden proved too great for his strength, and in 1863 he was forced to resign. Two years later Bishop Feehan succeeded him. Under his direction, new priests were added to the diocese, new churches were built, especially St. Patrick's (1866), St. Bridget's (1870), and St. Joseph's (1875), all at Memphis. In 1881 St. Columba's church in East Nashville was built, to replace the old St. John's church, which was burned down a few years previously. In the decade 1870–80, mission churches were erected at Humboldt, Belbuck, and Lawrenceburg; Bishop Feehan reported to Rome (1860) that his diocese had 30 churches of which 18 had resident priests, besides numerous stations. This was a rapid growth, when we consider the ravages of pestilence which visited the people during 1873, 1878, and 1879, and which buried from the ranks of the Catholics in Memphis alone in the early years of the Missouri mission. Though some 2000 families strong in the seventeenth century, they have dwindled at the present day to some 1500 adherents living on the Shat-el-Arab near the Persian Gulf. It is the only Gnostic sect that has survived and the sacred writings of which are still extant; a few
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remnants excepted, the writings of the so-called Christian Gnostics have perished. I Names, II Doctrines, III Discipline and Ritual, IV History.

I Names. Mandean (ܡܕܝܢܐ) is a Babylonian-Aramaic word in dialectic form, meaning: Gnostic, gnōstikos, "those who are good at knowing". The Hebrew word for knowledgeתְנֵי Madda is of the same root and is the main adjective from which the noun Mandaya is derived. It is the name adopted by the sect itself, being employed in their sacred books, and is characteristic of their worship of the מַדְיָןָא תְנֵי the φοινική or "knowledge of life". Another name also found in their sacred books is that of Sabians (ˠsʔbjan) which means Baptists (βαπτιστεῖς) to baptize with water. The name is identical with the Mohammedans (sing. Sābi, pl. fr. SUB'U) from the Koran (Sure V, 73; II, 59; XXII, 17) in which Christians, Sabians, and Jews are enumerated as religions which can be tolerated by Islam. It is based on the prominence of frequent baptism in their religious discipline and hence they are no doubt referred to as the Fathers as Hemerobaptists ἡμεροβάπτισται i.e., practising daily baptism. The name w6b6lu was even known in Greek writers. The name, however, most frequently used in their sacred literature is that of Nasoreans, ܢܣܘܪܝܢ which is also the usual Arabic (sing. Nasr, pl. Nasrā) for Christians. The conclusions concerning the sects and beliefs or the Manicheans have no leaning towards Christianity, but rather contempt and hatred for it; nor do their doctrines betray any approximation to Christian beliefs, except perhaps in that of the existence of a saviour, although some of their ceremonies bear a superficial resemblance to Christian mysteries. If, however, we remember that the Manicheans in Europe perished as the true Christians, though their system has but the use of half a dozen terms in common with Christianity, and that some Gnostic sects had barely any similarity with the Church of Christ, though self-styled Christians, it becomes less strange that even Mandean should have styled themselves Nasoreans. The term Kristiānā, as translatation of the Greek word, they reserve for the followers of Jesus Christ. Christianity was no doubt a name to conjure with, but the absence of any reason for the adoption of the title remains a mystery. It is suggested by some that the name is only given to the most perfect amongst them, but this seems contrary to fact. The name “Christians of St. John in the East” or “Christians or Nasoreans” has an extraordinary veneration for St. John the Baptist, who figures largely in their mythology. This veneration, together with the similarity of their rites to Christian sacraments, led the first missionaries from Europe to regard them as descendants of the Christians baptized only with the baptism of St. John. The conjuration against the Nationale at Paris and have been published by Petermann (Thessaurus s. Liber Magnus, vulgo Liber Adami, etc., Berlin, 1867) in Nasorean script and language. The form is not unlike Estrangela with vowels added in the modifications of the consonants, and the latter closely resembles that of the Aramaic in the Talmud. The text of the Manichean gnostic free Latin translation was published by Norberg (London and Goth, 1817). Selections from the Gensis (about one fourth) have been translated into German by Brandt. This book is arbitrarily divided into two sections, called the Right and the Left Gensis from the curious Nasorean custom of writing these two portions in one volume but in inverted positions, the left being used at funerals and being written for the benefit of the dead. The Gensis is a collection of writings from all ages and sources, some dating even after the Mohammedan conquest. Another sacred book is the Kolosta, or "Summa" or practical vademecum containing hymns, liturgies, rites for marriages, etc. (published as Qoleta by Euting, RVD, 1867). The Sidé de de la mort i.e. the "Lectures of the Kings" was published in 1905 by Litzbarski and translated with commentary by Ocher in 1905. The Diwan, a priestly ritual, was published by Euting (1904), but the Aṣfar Malwaše, a astrological work on the signs of the Zodiac, is not yet published. In recent years many Nasorean inscriptions on pottery have added to our knowledge of their popular superstitions (Poin, "Une incantation en Mandâitê", Paris, 1892; "Inscriptions Mand." Paris, 1898-9; Litzbarski, "Ephem f. Sem. Epigr.", Giessen, 1900).

These sources show Nasoreanism to be a form of Gnosticism which stands towards late Babylonian and Platonism somewhat as Neo-Platonism stands towards the Greek and Roman Pantheon. It is an attempt to allegorize the ancient myths as being phases of man's creation and salvation, though Nasoreanism never rides it by itself of fantastic Eastern imagery. Probably through Nabataean commerce these southern Gnostic ideas reached the Jordan, and the east of the Jordan and developed a worship of St. John the Baptist. Their daily baptism is however earlier than St. John's practice and is probably the cause of their belief regarding St. John rather than the effect of it. They likewise absorbed a great deal of Indian and Parsee philosophy till they developed their doctrine of the Light-King, which is similar to the Manichean concept of the universe, though without an absolutely rigid dualism. No religion therefore bears a nearer resemblance to Nasoreanism than that of Mani, who himself was an eastern Baptist in his youth. Finally, through contact with the monothéism of Jews, Christians, Mohammedans, and later Parsees, they gradually drifted towards the acceptance of one God. Their worship of the Light-King is one of singular beauty and elevation. Their eschatology is extremely intricate; the cosmic is called by the mystical name Utara (ܐܘܛܪܐ) which means: Riches or Potencies; Hebrew עָלָה. It will suffice to mention a few prominent ideas. Pira Rabbâ is the source and origin of the universe; and a mistake in her is called the sin of the Carmelite Ignatius a Jesus, who lived some years in Bassa and wrote a description of the sect (1652).

II. Doctrines. These are to be gathered from a voluminous compilation called Genza or "The Treasure", and sometimes Sidra Rabbâ or "The Great Book", of which copies dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are in the Bibliothèque nationale at Paris and have been published by Petermann (Thessaurus s. Liber Magnus, vulgo Liber Adami, etc., Berlin, 1867) in Nasorean script and language. The form is not unlike Estrangela with vowels added in the modifications of the consonants, and the latter closely resembles that of the Aramaic in the Talmud. The text of the Manichean gnostic free Latin translation was published by Norberg (London and Goth, 1817). Selections from the Gensis (about one fourth) have been translated into German by Brandt. This book is arbitrarily divided into two sections, called the Right and the Left Gensis from the curious Nasorean custom of writing these two portions in one volume but in inverted positions, the left being used at funerals and being written for the benefit of the dead. The Gensis is a collection of writings from all ages and sources, some dating even after the Mohammedan conquest. Another sacred book is the Kolosta, or "Summa" or practical vademecum containing hymns, liturgies, rites for marriages, etc. (published as Qoleta by Euting, RVD, 1867). The Sidé de de la mort i.e. the "Lectures of the Kings" was published in 1905 by Litzbarski and translated with commentary by Ocher in 1905. The Diwan, a priestly ritual, was published by Euting (1904), but the Aṣfar Malwaše, a astrological work on the signs of the Zodiac, is not yet published. In recent years many Nasorean inscriptions on pottery have added to our knowledge of their popular superstitions (Poin, "Une incantation en Mandâitê", Paris, 1892; "Inscriptions Mand." Paris, 1898-9; Litzbarski, "Ephem f. Sem. Epigr.", Giessen, 1900).

These sources show Nasoreanism to be a form of Gnosticism which stands towards late Babylonian and Platonism somewhat as Neo-Platonism stands towards the Greek and Roman Pantheon. It is an attempt to allegorize the ancient myths as being phases of man's creation and salvation, though Nasoreanism never rides it by itself of fantastic Eastern imagery. Probably through Nabataean commerce these southern Gnostic ideas reached the Jordan, and the east of the Jordan and developed a worship of St. John the Baptist. Their daily baptism is however earlier than St. John's practice and is probably the cause of their belief regarding St. John rather than the effect of it. They likewise absorbed a great deal of Indian and Parsee philosophy till they developed their doctrine of the Light-King, which is similar to the Manichean concept of the universe, though without an absolutely rigid dualism. No religion therefore bears a nearer resemblance to Nasoreanism than that of Mani, who himself was an eastern Baptist in his youth. Finally, through contact with the monothéism of Jews, Christians, Mohammedans, and later Parsees, they gradually drifted towards the acceptance of one God. Their worship of the Light-King is one of singular beauty and elevation. Their eschatology is extremely intricate; the cosmic is called by the mystical name Utara (ܐܘܛܪܐ) which means: Riches or Potencies; Hebrew עָלָה. It will suffice to mention a few prominent ideas. Pira Rabbâ is the source and origin of the universe; and a mistake in her is called the sin of the Carmelite Ignatius a Jesus, who lived some years in Bassa and wrote a description of the sect (1652).
This female monster of chao5 Nasoreans called the Holy Ghost, the Deceiver (spirit is feminine in Aramaic) or Ruha, no doubt to spite the Christians. This Ruha has a son called Ur, the prince of devils. Manasseh, a son of Adanadam, claimed the "existence of God" is without motion. With the help of Abel, Seth, Enos, and Adakas there is breathed into him the spirit of life. The seven planets, however, and the twelve signs of the Zodiac constitute an evil influence in the world, which is continually being overcome by the Manda de Hayye. With the doctrine of the Light-King, the Father of the sons, begets Manda de Hayye or Protanthropos, Adam as the First man. This Manda de Hayye becomes incarnate in Hibil the Glorious or Hibil Ziva (חִבִּיל הָיוֹם). Kessler pointed remarks that if Manda is the Christ then Hibil is the Jesus Christ of Nasoreanism. Hibil's descent from Adam now plays a great role in their theorizing. Hibil is the Saviour and the Prophet of the man of God. He is Marduk attempting to displace Jesus of Nazareth. A last emanation of the Light-King was John the Baptist, who with Hibil, Seth, and Enos are brethren of the Manda de Hayye. Frequent mention is made of heavenly Jordans, being streams of living waters from the transcendental realm of light. Hibil Ziva was baptized in 360,000 of them before his descent to the nether world.

III. Discipline and Ritual.—The Nasoreans strongly repudiate all ideas of celibacy and asceticism; they have a true Semitic contempt for the unmarried and repeatedly inculcate the precept "incest is a sin to all the human family" and turn it into denial as useless and unnatural, and if they observed the Mohammedan facts at least in outward appearance it was only to avoid trouble and persecutions. They are the reverse of Manicheans; there may be much evil in this world but man is bound to make the best of it. No wonder Mani left them. They observe no days of fasting, no weeks of mourning, no Lent, no Easter, no Christmas, no Thanksgiving, no Independence Day. Their food is not consecrated to them, they eat no game or anything which is strangled or forbidden to them, all food prepared by strangers, and even food bought in the market, must be washed. They have no special hours for prayer except that they must only pray when it is light, no prayer is heard as long as it is dark. Not the Mohammedan Friday, or the Jewish Sabbath, but the Christian Sunday is their weekly holy day. This, however, is not a conscious imitation of the Christians, whose "Carpenter-god" they hate as a son of the devil. The religious observance of other holidays seems of more recent origin, though no doubt their civil observance, as in the case of New Year's day (first day of Wintermonth; their months have thirty days with five intercalary days) of Paskas Lanksin, is sufficient evidence, being a festival of ancient Babylonia. They observe Ascension day (of Hibil Ziva returning from Hades) on the eighteenth of first Springmonth, the Great Buddhist Festival on the intercalary days, the Feast of the Egyptians apparently drowned in the Red Sea under Pharaoh (they were not really drowned, but crossed to the west) in the feeds expressly Nasoreans), and a few other feasts. They possessed a hierarchical priesthood to whom they paid a profound veneration. Their patriarch is the Rash Amma, chief of the people, but they seem but rarely to have had such a dignitary; legend says only one before and one after John the Baptist. A kind of bishops, priests, and deacons form the hierarchy; they are called Ganzivra, Tarmidha, and Shecandha, or Tresa-

ner, Disciple, and Messenger. The ordination to the priesthood is preceded by a so-called retreat of sixty days during which the candidate submits to many quaint rules and baptisms. The Shecanda is only an assessor, but the priest's privilege is the power to baptize; the bishop is the actual ruler of the community. They possess three great sacramental rites, Masbutha or baptism; Pehta and Mabuha or communion, really morsel (bread) and draught (water); and Kusta or troth, a handshake and plighting of troth. Baptism, always in flowing or living water of rivers, is the greatest of all the rites. Children are baptized as soon as they can bear total immersion. Self-baptism is frequent; the priest when baptizing used originally the formula: Thou art signed with the sign of life: The Name of the Life and the Manda de Hayye is named over thee. Baptism takes place on Sunday and on many other occasions when forgiveness of sins is required. It is followed by a kind of anointing with moist sesame. Communion is given in thin unleavened cakes kept in the priest's house and a handful of water. Kusha is a solemn sign of fellowship with brother Nasoreans. "Breadths of the flesh pass away, Kusha brethren remain forever", says the proverb. The history of the Nasoreans is unknown. The Gensa contains a Book of Kings of a pseudo-historical character, but the utter confusion of their historical reminiscences makes it difficult to find a kernel of truth. The Nasoreans were lost to history till Ignatius a Jesuit brought the news of their existence. They have been a prominent religion, as they were classed with Christians in the eyes of the Mohammedans. It is often held that they once actually dwelt in Palestine near the Jordan and immigrated into Chaldea. Their bitter hatred of all that is Jewish or Christian (for Moses is a false prophet, Jesus, the Great Deceiver, whom Enos justly brings to the cross), together with their extensive use of Biblical names, would seem to indicate that through their "theology" is Indian-Babylonian they were once historically connected with Jewish Christians.

Brandt, Die mithráische Religion (Leipzig, 1889); Idem, Das Schicksal der Seele nach dem Tode etc. in Jahrbuch. der prot. Theol. (1892); Idem, Mandäische Schriften (Göttingen, 1893); Kessler, an extensive article in Realencycl. für prot. Theol, (1903), s. v. Mandäer; Iadem, Mandäer in Encyclop. Brit.; Occurn, Seda d'Nimtama (Book of Souls), cf. Zeitchrift d. deut. morgenl. Gesell. (1907) de Morgan, Testes Mandatianos in Missionei Scientifiques en Chine (Paris, 1908); Wells and Smith, The Mandaeans (Paris, 1880); Vandel, Les Mandatians in Annales des Philos. Chré. (1881); Fetzermann, Reisen im Orient (Leipzig, 1861); Nöldeke, Mandäische Grammatik (Leipzig, 1875).

J. P. Arendzen.

Natal, Vicariate Apostolic of.—The history of the Catholic Church in South Africa goes back to 1806, when a Priest in the Cape was appointed. But they were saved from the wreck of the Marichal near the Cape of Good Hope. But they were only allowed to land, and no permission was given them to minister to the few Catholics who were already in Cape Town. It was not until 1803 that a Catholic priest was permitted to say Mass in Cape Colony. Fathers were only allowed to reside with permission. When the French Prinsen landed at Cape Town in 1803; the following year they were expelled. Pius VII by letters Apostolic dated 8 June, 1818, appointed the Rt. Rev. Edward Bede Slater, O.S.B., the first vicar Apostolic of the Cape of Good Hope and the neighbouring islands, Mauritius included. Bishop Slater on his way to Mauritius in 1820, and a year before the French took over Cape Town in charge of the Catholics. In 1826 Rev. Theodore Wagner became resident priest. He was succeeded by Rev. E. Rishton in 1827. On 6 June, 1837, Gregory XVI established the Vicariate of the Cape of Good Hope, separate from Mauritius, and from that time Cape Colony had its own bishops.

South Africa, comprising the country between Cape Agulhas and the tenth degree of south latitude and
between the tenth and fortieth degrees of east longitude, was too much for one bishop. On 30 July, 1847, Pius IX raised a new diocese for the eastern portion of Cape Colony. This new vicariate included first the eastern district of Cape Colony, Natal, and the Orange Free State (Orange River Colony since the late South African war). The same pontiff on 15 November, 1830 separated Natal and the Orange Free State from the Eastern Vicariate. The first bishop appointed by Rome to take charge of the Eastern Vicariate was the Rt. Rev. Aidan Deveraux, D.D. He was consecrated bishop at Cape Town, 27 December, 1847 by the Right Rev. Dr. Griffith. When Pius IX erected the Vicariate of Natal, on 15 November, 1830, the area of the new vicariate comprised all the portion of South Africa extending outside the then existing dioceses of Cape Town and Grahamstown. Apostolic was the Right Rev. Dr. Allard, O.M.I. He landed at Port Natal with five missionaries of the same French order. The name of this colony dates from Vasco da Gama, the Portuguese voyager, who sighted its headlands on Christmas Day, 1497, which suggested the name of Terra Natalis. In 1760 the British had a settlement on the present harbour of Durban, speedily abandoned; and more than a hundred years passed before Natal was again visited by Europeans.

After several wars between Dutch, British, and natives, Natal was declared a British colony in 1843. Nine years later, Dr. Allard and his five companions landed at Port Natal, and found that the priest had been residing in Natal. The country had been occasionally visited by a priest from Cape Colony. The first missionary who ministered to the Catholics of Natal was Rev. Father Murphy, sent by Bishop Deveraux. Its area is about 35,371 square miles, and it is bounded on the north by Transvaal Colony, on the west by Griqualand East and the Indian Ocean; on the south by Cape Colony (Pondoland); and on the west by Cape Colony (Griqualand East), Basutoland, and Orange River Colony from which it is separated by the Drakensberg Mountains. At the time of the advent of the first missionaries, the white element of the population was almost insignificant. Agriculture was practically unknown. Industry, at present a source of wealth, was altogether ignored.

The Catholic population was then composed of about two hundred in Durban and three hundred in Pietermaritzburg; it comprised only the white element, immigrants from England and especially from Ireland. To this are added schools: at Pietermaritzburg, Zululand, and the Transkei, which districts formed a portion of the Vicariate of Natal, was altogether uncivilized. The agents of the London Missionary Society had organized some missionary work for the civilization of natives. But they came out rather as officials of the Government, and therefore were not altogether ready to go through the hardships of missionary life. Besides the Europeans and natives, there was the scattered Dutch population. Natives and Dutch were not prepared to receive the Catholic faith. Among the former, superstitions, a sickening immorality, and polygamy, and among the latter, prejudices, and hatred against the Church of Rome, rendered for many years all the efforts of the missionaries apparently fruitless. However disheartening was the result of their work, the pioneers remained at their post. For seven years they had not the consolation of registering one soul for the Catholic Church, yet the intrepid and courageous Dr. Allard wanted push further his expeditions against paganism.

He for his part, unhesitatingly went among the natives, to whom the missionaries wished to devote themselves altogether, and he called the new mission St. Michael. Here they were destined to battle against many obstacles, privation of the necessities of life, difficulty of communication, and poverty, which drove the missionaries to the verge of starvation. The address of the Eastern Vicariate to Dr. Allard to found missions as far as Basutoland. Religious increase was slow, owing to the small number of missionaries and the degradation of the population. Communication was extremely slow and difficult, and was generally either by wagons drawn by oxen, or on horseback; during the rainy season travel was very dangerous, owing to the swollen rivers. Amidst such hardships and privations Dr. Allard felt that his life was drawing to a close. He retired to Rome, where he died soon after. Under his successor, Rt. Rev. Dr. Charles Jolivet, O.M.I. appointed 30 Nov., 1874, the Vicariate of Natal has made rapid progress in the way of Christianity and civilization. New missions were founded all over this immense vicariate, and new chapels and schools for Europeans and natives were opened. Many obstacles which in the beginning had rendered the missionary work very difficult were removed. Communication became easier, owing to the new railways and roads laid out across the country by the Government of Natal. Missionaries and their work has been distinctly beneficial to the natives on a very large scale, owing to the advent of some Trappists into the Colony of Natal, who afterwords were organized into the "Congregation of the Missionaries of Mariannhill". They have devoted themselves entirely to the evangelization of the natives, and as statistics show, their efforts and labours have been crowned with success. The native population has increased, and hampered much the missionary work in this vicariate, but the consequences of this war have practically disappeared. Through the treaty agreed to by the British and the Boers, the Districts of Utrecht, Vryheid, and Waskerkerst were ceded to Natal and have been added to this vicariate, which now comprises the three previously described districts, Natal proper, Transkei, Swasiland, and Zululand.

The present bishop (1910) is Rt. Rev. Henri Delalle, O.M.I., appointed in 1904. The white population of the vicariate is estimated to be about 100,000; natives, Indians, and Malays, 1,000,000; the Catholic population is 25,737 (whites, 7,458; natives, 15,227; coloured, 3,052). Priests: Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 38; Missionaries of Mariannhill, 46; secular priests: Europeans, 4, natives, 3. There is a seminary, with eleven theological students. Lay brothers: Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Europeans, 4, native, 1; Missionaries of Mariannhill, 305; Marist Brothers, 7. Number of churches, 59; missions, 49. Number of schools: 1st degree, 533, 395 native and coloured, 62, pupils, 1864; for coloured, 10, pupils, 472; most of the schools are conducted by nuns. Orders of women: Sisters of the Precious Blood, 324; Sisters of the Holy Cross, 55; Sisters of Nazareth, 12; Sisters of the Holy Family, 92; Dominicans, 138; Augustinians, 67; Franciscans, 12; Sisters of Kermaria, 13. Two schools for the whites, 13, and 24 for coloured, and 1 orphanage for coloured children are under the management of the Augustinian Sisters; and a house for orphans and aged is under the care of the Sisters of Nazareth House, with about 260 inmates. At the Bluff the Sisters of the Holy Family have an orphanage for European children; they have a novitiate at Bellair, with 10 novices. The Dominican Sisters have their mother-house at Oakford, and have also schools at Noodsberg, Generasso, Dundee, and Newcastle. At Ladysmith and Pietermaritzburg, there are 2 hospitals, and 2 sanatoriums of the Augustinian Sisters.

Besides the numerous boarding-schools established in different parts of the vicariate, there are many Sunday schools under the control of the Government, and receive a subsidy proportioned to the number of pupils.
Natal Day.—Both the form natalis (sc. dies) and natalicium were used by the Romans to denote what we call a birthday, i.e. the anniversary of the day when a man was born. Also the Greek words γενέσθαι and γενέσθησαι were similarly employed. But in both Greek and Latin a certain extension of this primitive use seems to have taken place even in pre-Christian times. In Latin natalis apparently came, at least sometimes, to mean little more than “anniversary” and it was used of the accession day of the emperor as well as of his birthday. Moreover we know that the games celebrated on an emperor’s birthday during his life, were often continued after his apotheosis upon the anniversary of his birthday as if he were still living. In Greek γενέσθαι came to be used in a similar way. It goes on “which day is observed as a memorial of a dead person by sacrifices and other rites (cf. Herodotus IV, 26). This commemoration is said to have taken place not upon the anniversary of the day of death but upon the actual birthday of the defunct person (C. I. G. 3417, and Rhode, “Psyche”, 4th ed., I, 230). When, therefore, the Christians of Smyrna about 150 A.D. wrote to describe how they took up the bones of St. Polycarp “which are more valuable than precious stones and finer than refined gold, and laid them in a suitable place, where the Lord will permit us to gather ourselves together, as we are able, in gladness and joy and to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom” (Eusebius, “Hist. Eccl.”, v. 24, 31), it is not easy to say how far they were influenced by pre-existing pagan usages. This phrase “the birthday of his martyrdom” certainly seems to indicate the commemoration of the day on which he died, and all the subsequent history of the Church confirms the practice of keeping this as the usual feast of any saint on whose day a martyr’s death occurred. That the Greeks also commonly celebrated what they called απόλογος, (commemorative sacrifices), on the anniversary of the death of parents, it would seem that the faithful of the early Church did little more than Christianize a pagan custom. This they accomplished, first by offering the holy sacrifice of the Mass in honour of their deceased brethren instead of the blood or flesh of animal victims, and secondly by giving to this commemoration of a true believer’s passage to another life the name γενέσθησαι, or in Latin natalis, rather than to the day upon which he had been born into this world.

One cannot however entirely eliminate the doubt whether the celebration of Christianity γενέσθαι and natalis had not already come to mean little more than “anniversary” or “commemoration rite”. Tertullian says “oblationes pro defunctis pro natalicis annuis die facimus” (De Corona, cap. 3), which seems to mean “we offer Masses for the dead on their anniversary as a commemoration rite”.

Similarly the Chronographer of 354 refers at the beginning of his calendar against 22 February, “VIII Kal. Martias Natale Petri de cathedra”; where natale clearly signifies anniversary rather than birthday. Indeed where we find the Fathers emphasizing the etymology of the word, their language rather suggests that they expected the primary meaning of “birthday” to pass unnoticed. In any case the sense of anniversary alone fits a wide range of phrases which met us in the calendars and other documents of the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. Avitus of Vienne (d. 518) and Eligius of Noyon (d. c. 650) both refer to Maundy Thursday under the name “natalis calicis” (the commemoration of the chalice), a reference, of course, to the institution of the Eucharist, 1 Cor. 11:24, 25. After this there the feast appears under the same name in the calendar of Polemius Silvius of 448. Again in the Leonian Sacramentary we have the phrase “in natali episcoporum”, which the context shows to mean the anniversary of a bishop’s consecration (cf. Proboet, “Die ältesten röm. Sacramentarien”, 124 and 247, and Paulinus of Nola, “Ep. 20”), while the Gelasian Sacramentary uses such expressions as “natale consecrationis disiconi”, etc. So also in the Hieronymian Martyrology (c. 590), besides the constantly recurring natale applied to the festivals of martyrs we have, e.g. on 2 Aug., “In Antiochia natalis reliquiarum Stephani protomartyris et disiconi. None the less a certain stress seems to be laid on the Christian origin and in mos- tary inscriptions upon the idea that the day of a man’s death was his birthday to a new life. Thus St. Ambrose (Serm. 57, de Depos. St. Eusebii) declares that “the day of our burial is called our birthday (natalis), because, being set free from the prison of our crimes, we are born to the liberty of the Saviour”, and goes on “who says that this day is observed as a great celebration, for it is in truth a festival of the highest order to be dead to our vices and to live to righteousness alone.” And we find such inscriptions as the following:

Parente filio mercurio pecce
Runt qui vixit annv et mesenes vll
Natus in pace id febb

Where “natus in pace” clearly refers to eternal rest. So again Origen had evidently some similar thought before him when he insists that “of all the holy people in the Scriptures, no one is recorded to have kept a feast or held a great banquet on his birthday. It is only sinners and sinning souls who have great rejoicings over the day on which they were born into this world below” (Origen, “in Levit.”, “Hom. VIII.”, in Migne P. G., XIII, 495). Naturally a certain amount of confusion resulted from this use of the same word natalis sometimes to signify natural birth, sometimes the passage to a better life. The former was consequently often distinguished as “natalis in carnale genuinum”, “natalis de nativitate”, the latter as “natalis passionis” or “de passione”, sometimes abbreviated as N. P.


Hermann Thurston.

Natalis Alexander. See Alexander, Natalis.

Natches, Diocese of (Natchezensis) established 28 July, 1837, comprises the State of Mississippi. Catholic missionary work in this territory began with the expeditions of Marquette, La Salle, and Iberville. Iberville planted a colony in 1699 to the east of the Natchez, and Marquette, on his return from the Illinois in 1706, founded the Mississippian mission on a site near Savanne, Rossalie, on a site within the present city of Natchez. Capuchin, Jesuit, and secular priests laboured in this field, having missions at Biloxi, Natchez, and Yazoo. Early in the history of the missions, Fathers St. Cosme and Foucault, seculars, were martyred by the Indians, as were the Jesuits Du Poisson, Souart, and Senat. In 1757 three priests from Salamanca, Fathers McKenna, White, and Savage, settled at Natchez and erected promising missions there and in the vicinity. When the territory passed from Spain to the United States, these missions were practically abandoned. Much valuable property was lost to the Church, and the efforts made to recover it were in vain. For many years the Catholics of Natchez depended upon chance visits of priests.

The first Bishop of Natchez, John Mary Joseph Chanche, was b. 4 Oct., 1795, at Baltimore, whither his parents had fled from San Domingo. He joined the Sulpiians, and was president of Mount St. Mary’s when appointed Bishop. He was consecrated 14 Nov., 1840, at Buffalo, by the Bishop of the Diocese of the Missouri, the only priest in the state. Father Brogad, who was there but temporarily. Taking up the rôle of a simple missionary, he began to collect the Catholics and organize a diocese. In 1842 he laid the corner stone of the present beautiful cathedral, and opened an acad-
emy for girls. In 1848 he invited the Sisters of Charity to Natchez. At the First Plenary Council, in 1852, Bishop Chanche was chief promoter. He died shortly after, and the see of the Council of Natchez, Md., leaving his diocese with 11 priests, 11 churches erected, and 13 attendant missions. James Oliver Van de Velde was transferred from Chicago to Natchez, 29 July, 1853. He served the diocese but two years. On 23 Oct., 1853, he broke his leg, and a fever set in which quickly developed into yellow fever; he died 13 Nov., 1855.—(See Chicago, Archdiocese, by W. Charles; Rev. John Van de Velde was succeeded by William Henry Elder (q. v.).) The next bishop, Francis Janssens, was b. at Tillburg, North Brabant, Holland, studied at Louvain, and was ordained 21 Dec., 1867. In 1870, he was rector of the cathedral at Richmond, Va., and later vicar-general of that dioce of under Bishops Gibbons and Keough. He was consecrated Bishop of Natchez, 1 May, 1881, and promoted to be Archbishop of New Orleans, 7 August, 1888. Thomas Heslin was b. in County Longford, Ireland, 1847, and on the completion of his classical studies, came to America at the invitation of Archbishop Odin. He entered the seminary of Bouligny, New Orleans, was ordained in 1868, and was appointed to the See of Michael's, New Orleans, when he received his appointment as Bishop of Natchez. He was consecrated in 1889.

The religious institutes represented (1910) in the diocese are: Lazarist Fathers; Josephite Fathers (three charges); Fathers of the Society of the Divine Word (three charges); Brothers of the Sacred Heart, (six houses); Sisters of the Holy Child (two houses); Sisters of Charity (Nasareth); Sisters of the Perpetual Adoration; Sisters of St. Francis; Sisters of St. Joseph; Sisters of Mercy; School Sisters of Notre Dame; Sisters Marianne of the Holy Cross; Sisters of the Holy Ghost. There are 39 secular and 7 regular priests; 53 churches with resident priests, 42 missions, 31 parochial schools, 1 college preparatory school, 2 academies (for girls; 32 parochial schools, 5 ecclesiastical students, 2 orphans' asylums (158 inmates). Total of young people under Catholic care, 4,988; total Catholic population, 25,701.

Catholic Directory (1910); Sura, Defenders of Our Faith: The Catholic Church in the U. S. Brother Charles.

Natchitoches, Diocese of, former title of the present Diocese of Alexandria (Alexandrinensis), which comprises all the northern part of Louisiana above 31° N. lat., with an area of 22,212 square miles. The Venerable Antonio Margil (q. v.), whose canonization is in process, was the first priest to minister within the territory now forming the diocese. From the Aya Indians, west of the Sabine river, Father Margil heard of the Adaves Indians, and in March, 1717, he located them near Spanish Lake, in what is now Sabine county, La. He founded the mission of San Miguel de Linares and built there probably the first church in Louisiana, for, according to the historian Martin, who visited Natchitoches in 1725, he found there "about 100 cabins, two or three dwelling houses, and a miserable storehouse which had been at first occupied as a chapel, a shed being now used for that purpose." Leaving Father Gusman in charge, Father Margil journeyed on foot to Natchitoches to minister to the French Catholics there, and then went back to Spain. In 1718, during the brief war with Spain, St. Denis, the French Commandant at Natchitoches, invaded the Adaves mission, plundered it, and carried away church vestments. Father Margil heard of it, and in 1721 came back, hunted up the Adaves who had taken refuge in the forests for fear of the French, rebuilt their church, which he dedicated to St. Isidore, and remained there for the rest of his life. For many years afterwards the Adaves mission was attended from San Antonio by the Franciscans, who attended also the missions of Nacogdoches and St. Augustine, Texas. In 1725 there were 50 Catholic families at Natchitoches. In 1728 Father Maximin, a Capuchin, was stationed in the diocese. There is no record to show how the eastern portion of the diocese was evangelized; the Catholic names, however, given to villages and lakes contiguous to the Mississippi, show that priests must have visited that country, probably the Jesuits, who in the eighteenth century had charge of the Indians along the Mississippi under the Bishop of Quebec. The records show that in 1829 Father Martin of Ayovelles attended the Catholics on the Red, Black, and Ouachita rivers; that, in 1840 and after, Father J. Timon, afterwards Bishop of Buffalo, made regular trips from Texas to attend the north Louisiana missions, and that Father O'Brien, a Dominican from Louisville, attended yearly the Catholics along the Mississippi. The Catholics located on the rivers of the state often drifted to New Orleans on barges to have their marriages blessed and their children baptized, and came back cordelling their boats.

In 1852 the Fathers of the First Council of Baltimore recommended to the Holy See the division of the Archdiocese of New Orleans, the formation of the Diocese of Natchitoches and the appointment of Father Martin, parish priest of Michael's, New Orleans, when he received his appointment as Bishop of Natchitoches. He was consecrated in 1889.

Bishop Augustus M. Martin (1802-1875), born in Brittany, inherited the deep faith of the Bretons. A protégé of Abbé Jean-Marie de Lafayennais, as a seminarian, he was encouraged by Bishop de la Haye to come to France in Paris under Cardinal Prince de Troy and Vicar-General J.-M. de Lafayennais. There he came in contact with Montalembert and other disciples of Félicité de Lafayennais, and acquired the polished manners that never left him. In 1839, while chaplain of the royal college in Rennes, he met Bishop de la Haye, who became his sponsor and friend. He was ordained for six years was vicar-general. His health failing, he came to Louisiana, and in 1852 was vicar-general of Mgr Blanc of New Orleans. Bishop Martin left a collection of unpublished letters that tell interestingly the history of his diocese, his struggles with poverty, his many trips to France to recruit his clergy. A fluent writer, his letters to the provincial chapter of the diocese were inserted in the "Annals"; the bishops of the Second Council of Baltimore and those of the provincial Council of New Orleans delegated him to write letters of thanks to the directors of the Propagation of the Faith for their generous contributions. Both letters were reproduced in "Les Missions Catholiques." Bishop Martin left an organized diocese with 20 priests, the Sisters of the Sacred Heart with one convent at Natchitoches, and the Daughters of the Cross with their mother-house and several convents in the diocese.

He was succeeded by Bishop F. X. Lerat, also a Breton, the hero of seven yellow fever epidemics, and founder of the Sisters of Mercy in Louisiana. He remained in Natchez only two years, being selected as coadjutor to the Archbishop of New Orleans. He died in 1887.

Bishop Anthony Dubuis succeeded him. Born near Lyons, France, he came to this country in 1855, was pastor in New Orleans for 26 years, and one of the theologians of the Second Council of Baltimore. Consecrated in 1885, he died in 1904, having finished the cathedral and built an episcopal residence at Natchitoches.

The present bishop is Right Rev. Cornelius Van De Ven, born at Oirschot, Holland, 16 June, 1865. He studied in the diocesan seminary of Bois-le-Duc, was ordained 31 May, 1885. He served a year. After filling important posts in the Archdiocese of New Orleans, he was consecrated Bishop of
Nathanael, one of the first disciples of Jesus, to whom He was brought by his friend Philip (John, i, 43–51). It is generally held that Nathanael is to be identified with the Apostle Bartholomew of the Synoptic writers. The latter make no mention of Nathanael, but in their lists of the Twelve, one, Bartholomew, is always designated by his family name Bar-Tolmaï (son of Tolmaï), and this it is he whom the author of the Fourth Gospel designates by his personal name Nathanael. The main reasons on which this assumption rests are: (1) that the circumstances under which Nathanael was called do not differ in solemnity from those connected with the call of Peter, whence it is natural to expect that he as well as the latter was numbered among the Twelve; (2) Nathanael is mentioned as present with other Apostles after the Resurrection in the scene described in John, xxii; (3) Nathanael was brought to Jesus by Philip (John, i, 45), and thus it seems significant that Bartholomew is always mentioned next to Philip in the lists of the Twelve given by the Synoptists (Matt., x, 3; Mark, ii, 18; Luke, vi, 14).


James F. DRISCOLL.

Nathinites, of Nathineans (NATHINEANS, the given ones; LXX generally of Nathaneús, once [I Chron., ix, 2] of δῆδωμεν), an inferior class of Temple servants. The name occurs in seventeen passages of the O. T., and the Vulgate renders it always by the adapted transcription Nathaneús, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathaneel, Nathanael, Nathanael, Nathanael, Nathanael, Nathanael, Nathanael, Nathanael). In this instance Nathanael served the interests of the country as well as those of David and Solomon by averting a civil war. He is credited by the Chronicler with having written a part of the history of David, together with Samuel the seer and Gad the seer (I Chron., xxix, 29; II Chron., xxix, 25). The tiempo Nathanael's death is not given, but his name is mentioned in Ecclus., xlvi, 1.

(2) NATHAN, son of David and Bethsheba (II Kings, v, 14; I Chron., iii, 5, xiv, 4). The name Nathan augmented by the theophorous prefix or suffix is borne by other members of the family of David. Thus one of his brothers was Nathanael (I Chron., ii, 14), and one of his nephews, Jonathan (II Kings, xxxi, 21).

(3) NATHAN, father of Azarias and Zabud, important functionaries of the court of Solomon (III Kings, iv, 5). By some scholars he is identified with Nathan the prophet (1), and by others with Nathan the son of David (2). These two persons are merely conjectural. His son Zabud is designated as the son of Nathan by the Chronicler (I Chron., ii, 36), and by others by the name of Zabud (4). This indication, among many others, that the functions of the priesthood were not at that period exercised exclusively by the descendants of Aaron.

(4) NATHAN, son of Ethel and father of Zabud (1 Chron., ii, 30), of the tribe of Judah and of the branch of Caleb. His grandfather Jeraa was an Egyptian slave to whom Seeman gave one of his daughters in marriage (1 Chron., ii, 34–55).

(5) NATHAN, one of the prominent Jews of the time of the Captivity, chosen by Esdras together with several others to find levites for the temple service when the Jews were camped on the banks of the Ahava preparing to return to Palestine (I Esdr., vii, 16). See also, NATHAN, one of the men of one of four classes mentioned in I Esdr., x, 39. He was among those who, at the command of Esdras, put away the foreign wives they had married.

James F. DRISCOLL.

Nathan, (נַתַּן, God-given), name of several Israelites mentioned in the Old Testament.

(1) NATHAN, successor of Samuel and prophet in the time of David and Solomon. No indication is given as to his origin, and he appears in the narrative for the first time when David is contemplating the erection of a house to the Lord (II Kings, vii). He assures the monarch of the Lord's support and of the divinely ordained establishment of his kingdom for all time, but dissuades him from the idea of building a temple stating that this honour is reserved for his son and successor (II Kings, vii, 13; I Chron., xvii, 1–15). Nathan appears later to reproach David in the name of the Lord for his crime of adultery and murder narrated in II Kings, xi, and, after skillfully proposing the allegory of the poor man's little ewe lamb, warns the king with the words: "Thou art the man!" He then declares the anger of the Lord and the punishments that are to fall upon David, although in view of the latter's repentance his sin is pronounced forgiven, for his crimes had given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme (II Kings, xii, 1–15). The prophet next appears on the scene when it is question of securing to Solomon the succession to the throne of his father.

Adonias, betrothed to Joab and the high priest Abia-thar, made an attempt to have himself proclaimed king. The plan was frustrated by Nathan who, first through Bethsaida and later in a personal interview, informed David as to the doings of Adonias, and persuaded the aged monarch to confirm his promise in favour of Solomon, his heir (I Kings, i, 3–17). He stands proclaimed king by the fountain of Gihon (III Kings, i, 8–45). In this instance Nathan served the interests of the country as well as those of David and Solomon by averting a civil war. He is credited by the Chronicler with having written a part of the history of David, together with Samuel the seer and Gad the seer (I Chron., xxix, 29; II Chron., xxix, 25). The timing of Nathan's death is not given, but his name is mentioned in Ecclus., xlvi, 1.

(2) NATHAN, son of David and Bethsheba (II Kings, v, 14; I Chron., iii, 5, xiv, 4). The name Nathan augmented by the theophorous prefix or suffix is borne by other members of the family of David. Thus one of his brothers was Nathanael (I Chron., ii, 14), and one of his nephews, Jonathan (II Kings, xxxi, 21).

(3) NATHAN, father of Azarias and Zabud, important functionaries of the court of Solomon (III Kings, iv, 5). By some scholars he is identified with Nathan the prophet (1), and by others with Nathan the son of David (2). These two persons are merely conjectural. His son Zabud is designated as the son of Nathan by the Chronicler (I Chron., ii, 36), and by others by the name of Zabud (4). This indication, among many others, that the functions of the priesthood were not at that period exercised exclusively by the descendants of Aaron.

(4) NATHAN, son of Ethel and father of Zabud (I Chron., ii, 36), of the tribe of Judah and of the branch of Caleb. His grandfather Jeraa was an Egyptian slave to whom Seeman gave one of his daughters in marriage (I Chron., ii, 34–55).

(5) NATHAN, one of the prominent Jews of the time of the Captivity, chosen by Esdras together with several others to find levites for the temple service when the Jews were camped on the banks of the Ahava preparing to return to Palestine (I Esdr., vii, 16). See also, NATHAN, one of the men of one of four classes mentioned in I Esdr., x, 39. He was among those who, at the command of Esdras, put away the foreign wives they had married.

James F. DRISCOLL.
Though not of the Jewish race, it is probable that the Catholicae learned and practised the Jewish religion. Nehemias (II Esd., x, 29) classses them with those who were separated from the people to serve the law of God, but according to the Talmud they were a despised class and were debarred from contracting marriage with Jewish women. They were carved out in captivity with the others by Nahumodonosor, and according to Esdras, 612 of them including those called "the children of the servants of Solomon") returned to Palestine: 392 with Zorobabel (I Esd., ii, 43-58; II Esd., vii, 47-60), and 220 with Esdras eighteen years later (I Esd., viii, 20). After the return the Catholicae were placed in a middle class of the hierarchy, and they were especially the lot of the monasticism in the Latin Church. At the period when they were not detailed for service in the Temple, the others in Jerusalem, where, as Nehemias informs us (I Esd., iii, 26, xi, 21), they inhabited the Ophel quarter, i.e., the southeast part of the city, and near the gate leading to the fountain now known as the Fountain of the Virgin. From this they drew the water of which copious use was made in the sacrificial and other sacred functions. They had officers chiefly chosen from among their own ranks (II Esd., xi, 21; cf. I Esd., ii, 43; II Esd., vii, 47). Like the priests and levites they were exempted from taxation. The Catholicae are mentioned in the New Testament. 

James P. Driscoll.

National Union, Catholic Young Men's.—This association was organized on 22 February, 1875, at a meeting held in Newark, New Jersey, at the call of Very Rev. George H. Doane, who became its first president. It includes about one hundred organizations, representing an estimated aggregate of about 30,000 persons and extends as far west as Mankato, Minnesota. Its objects are the furtherance of practical, religious, and physical advancement of Catholic youth, and the development of better citizens and Catholics. The means principally relied upon are: the conscientious practice and profession of the Catholic religion; the establishment and promotion of Catholic libraries, reading-rooms, and gymnasia; fraternal unity between all organizations aiming in whatever way at the promotion of the Union's objects; mutual assistance and enlightenment; maintenance and conduct of an athletic league giving special attention to boys of the parochial schools; dissemination of selected courses in reading among Catholic libraries; courses of lectures to Catholic young men's associations, and securing to organizations of the National Union the privilege of having their members received as guests by the other organizations of the Union. Originally, delegates met annually, and did little in the interim but enlist the co-operation of other organizations in its works. At the present time, it is engaged in other educational works, which are conducted largely through diocesan unions performing the National Union's functions within their respective districts.

In 1878 the National Union inaugurated the movement for obtaining appointments of a greater number of Catholic chaplains to the army and navy—a movement which was entirely successful. At about the same time, it began the agitation to secure recognition of the religious rights of the Indians. At the convention of 1879, the establishment of coloured literary societies, free night-schools, the fostering of a more general activity among young men in teaching Sunday-school, and the establishment of a lecture bureau were among the questions discussed; by 1883 much had been done along these lines. In 1883 the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, in the Pastoral Letter of the Bishops and Archbishops, says of the work of the National Union: "We consider as worthy of particular encouragement associations for the promotion of useful social union among Catholics, and especially those whose aim is to guard the young men against dangerous influences, and to supply them with the means of innocent amusement and mental culture. And in order to acknowledge the great amount of good that the Catholic Young Men's National Union has already accomplished, to promote the growth of the Union, and to stimulate its members to greater efforts in the future, to spiritually bless their aims and endeavours, and we recommend the Union to all our Catholic young men."

The Catholic Summer School at Plattsburg, New York, is a direct outgrowth of the National Union. Plans for its establishment having been discussed and approved at the conventions, and carried into effect by Warren E. Mosher, the secretary of the National Union at the time, and the founder of the Summer School. The National Union has also furthered the cause of education by contributing to the endowment funds of the Catholic University of America.

At the convention of 1886, held in New York City, a committee was appointed to prepare a plan of regulations for the school. It met at the convention of 1897 held at Elizabeth, New Jersey. Under the original organization it had always been required that the president and first vice-president should be clergymen: this was now changed, the various departments of the Union were organized on a business basis, the athletic work was systematized by establishing the Catholic Amateur Athletic League, a branch of the National Union with complete control over all athletic affairs of the Union, and a complete and efficient literary and lecture system was instituted.

It was only in this year that a proper plan was drawn for the continuation of the activity of the Union between conventions. The reorganization also created the office of the spiritual director, who is practically the senior officer of the National Union, and is supreme in all matters affecting faith and morals. The National Union has always been conducted by voluntary effort, but its activities have now grown to such an extent that they require an efficient paid force, for which purpose an adequate endowment fund is now being raised.

W. C. Sullivan.

Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Feast of the.—The earliest document commemorating this feast comes from the sixth century. St. Romanus was the great ecclesiastical lyrst of the Greek Church, composed for it a hymn (Card. Pitra, "Hymnogr. Graeca", Paris, 1876, 191) which is a poetic sketch of the apocryphal Gospel of St. James. St. Romanus was a native of Emesa in Syria, deacon of Berytus and later on at the Blachernae church in Constantinople, and composed his hymns between 630 and 638 (P. Masis in "Byzant. Zeitschrift", 1906). The feast may have originated somewhere in Syria or Palestine in the beginning of the sixth century, when after the Council of Ephesus, under the influence of the "Apocrypha", the cult of the Mother of God was greatly intensified, especially in Syria. St. Andrew of Crete in the beginning of the eighth century preached several sermons on this feast (Lucius-Anrich, "Anfänge des Heiligenkultus", Tübingen, 1906, 468). Evidence is wanting to show why the eighth of September was chosen for its date. The Church of Rome adopted it in the seventh century from the East; it is found in the German (seventh cent.) and the Gregorian (eighth to ninth cent.) Sacramentaries. (622; 366) It prescribed a litany and procession for this feast (P}
L., xxxviii, 897 sqq.). Since the story of Mary's Nativity is known only from apocryphal sources, the Latin Church was slow in accepting this oriental festival. It does not appear in many calendars which contain the Assumption, e.g. the Gotho-Gallican, that of Luxeuil, the Tolcedan Calendar of the tenth century, and the Menologion of Basil II. But this feast was later substituted by historical proofs. The feast is found in the calendar of Sonnatius, Bishop of Reims, 614–31 (Kellner, "Heerology", 21). Still it cannot be said to have been generally celebrated in the eighth and ninth centuries. St. Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres (d. 1028), speaks of it as of recent institution (P. L., xxi, 320, sqq.); the three sermons he wrote are the oldest genuine Latin sermons for this festival (Kellner, "Heerology", London, 1908, 230). The octave was instituted by Innocent IV (a. 1243) in accordance with a vow made by the cardinals in the concil of the autumn of 1241, when they were kept prisoners by Frederick II for three months. In the Greek Church the apostasia (separation from Christ, fear of God, etc.) is a center of the feast and the solemnity of the Exaltation of the Cross, 13 and 14 Sept. The Copts in Egypt and the Abyssinians celebrate Mary’s Nativity on 1 May, and continue the feast under the name of "Seed of Jacob" 33 days (Anal. Juris Pont., xxi, 403); they also commemorate it on the first of every month (priv. letter from M. G. A. M., Alkemade). The Church of the Copts has adopted the Greek feast, but keep it 10 Sept. (Nilles, "Kal. man.", II, 696, 706). LUCIUS-ANTH., Anfänge des Heiligenkalubs (Tübingen, 1904); HOLMECK, Fasti Mariani (Freiburg, 1894), 118 sqq. FREDERICK G. HOLMECK.

Naturalism is not so much a special system as a point of view or tendency common to a number of philosophical and religious systems; not so much a well-defined set of positive and negative doctrines as an attitude or spirit pervading and influencing many doctrines. As the name implies, this tendency consists essentially in looking upon nature as the one original and fundamental source of all that exists, and hence the only one in which any being can find its being. The limits of nature are also the limits of existing reality, or at least the first cause, if its existence is found necessary, has nothing to do with the working of natural agencies. All events, therefore, find their adequate explanation within nature itself. But, as the term means (q. v.) and natural are themselves used in more than one sense, the term naturalism is also far from having one fixed meaning. (I) If nature is understood in the restricted sense of physical, or material, nature, naturalism will be the tendency to look upon the material universe as the only reality, to reduce all laws to mechanical uniformities and to look upon the universe of spirit and matter. Mental and moral processes will be but natural phenomena, or the results of matter rigorously governed by its laws. (II) The dualism of mind and matter may be admitted, but only as a dualism of modes or appearances of the same identical substance. Nature includes manifold phenomena and a common substratum of the phenomena, but is beyond its ultimate and proper definition, it requires no principle distinct from itself. In this supposition, naturalism denies the existence of a transcendent cause of the world and endeavours to give a full account of all processes by the unfolding of potencies essential to the universe under laws that are necessary and eternal. (III) Finally, if the existence of a transcendent First Cause, or personal God, is admitted as the only satisfactory explanation of the world, Naturalism claims that the laws governing the activity and development of irrational and of rational beings are never interfered with. It denies the possibility, or at least the fact, of any transitory intervention of God in nature, and of any revelation and permanent supernatural order for man.

These three forms are necessarily exclusive; what the third denies the first and the second, a fortiori, also deny; all agree in rejecting every explanation which would have recourse to causes outside of nature. The reasons of this denial — i.e., the philosophical views of nature on which it is based — and, in consequence, the extent to which explanations within nature itself are held to suffice, vary greatly and constitute essential differences between them.

I. Materialistic Naturalism asserts that matter is the only reality, and that all the laws of the universe are reducible to mechanical laws. What theory may be held concerning the essence of matter makes little difference here. Whether matter be considered as continuous or as composed of atoms distant from one another, as being exclusively extension or as also endowed with an internal principle of activity, or even as being only an aggregate of centres of energy without any real extension (see Atomism; Dynamism; Mechanism), the attitude of Naturalism is the same. It claims that all realities in the world, including the proofs of consciousness, are but manifestations of what we call matter, and obey the same necessary laws. While some may limit their materialistic account to nature itself, and admit the existence of a Creator of the world, or at least leave this question open, the general tendency of Materialism is towards Atheism and exclusive Naturalism. Early Greek philosophers and atomists produced nature to unity by pointing to a primordial element out of which all things were composed. Their views were, implicitly at least, Animistic or Hylomorphic rather than Materialistic, and the vague formative function attributed to the Nous, or rational principle, by Anaxagoras was but an exception to the prevailing naturalism. Pure mechanism was developed by the Atomists (Democritus, Epicurus, Lucretius), and the soul itself was held to be composed of special, more subtle, atoms. In the Christian era materialism in its exclusive form is represented especially by the French school of the latter half of the eighteenth century and the German school of the latter half of the nineteenth century, but its real source and whatever takes place in the world is the result of material causes and must be explained by physical antecedents without any teleology. Life is but a complex problem of physics and chemistry; consciousness is a property of matter; rational thought is reduced to sensation, and will to instinct. The mind is a powerless accompaniment or epiphenomenon of certain forms or groupings of matter, and, were it suppressed altogether, the whole world would still proceed in exactly the same way. Man is a conscious automaton whose whole activity, mental as well as physiological, is determined by material antecedents. What we call the human person is but a transitory phenomenon of the material arrangement of elements, giving rise to special mental results; and it goes without saying that in such a system there is no room for freedom, responsibility, or personal immortality.

II. Pantheism in its various forms asserts that God, the First Reality, World-Ground, or Absolute, is not transcendent and personal, but is the universal world, and that the real nature of nature are only manifestations of this one common substance. For the Stoics, He is the immanent reason, the soul of the world, communicating everywhere activity and life. According to Scotus Erigena, "God is the essence of all things, for He alone truly is" (De divisione naturæ, 11); nature includes the totality of beings and is divided into (1) uncreated and creating nature, i.e., God...
as the origin of all things, unknowable even to Himself; (2) created and creating nature, i.e., God as controller and exectorial of all things; (3) created and not-creating nature, i.e., the world of phenomena in space and time, all of which are participations of the Divine being and also theosophy, or manifestations of God; (4) neither created nor creating nature, i.e., God as the end of all things to whom all things ultimately return. Giordano Bruno also professes that God and the finite determinations of the infinite substance. As absolute substance, God is natura naturans; as manifesting himself through the various modes of phenomena, he is natura naturata. To-day Monism reproduces essentially the same theories. Mind is not reduced to a property, or epiphenomenon, of matter, but both matter and mind are like parallels; they are both as phenomena or substances the same ultimate reality. What is this reality? By some, explicitly or implicitly, it is rather conceived as material, and we fall back into Materialism; by others it is claimed to be nearer to mind than to matter, and hence result various idealistic systems and tendencies; by others, finally, it is declared to be strictly unknown and thus Monism comes into close contact with Agnosticism (q.v.). Whatever it may be ultimately, nature is substantially one; it requires nothing outside of itself, but finds within itself its adequate explanation. Either the human mind is incapable of any knowledge bearing on the question of origins, or this question itself is meaningless. Nature and natural knowledge are eternal. The simultaneous or successive changes which occur in the world result necessarily from the essential laws of nature, for nature is infinitely rich in potencies whose progressive actualization constitutes the endless process of inorganic, organic, and mental evolution. The evolution and differentiation of the one substance according to its own laws and without the guiding agency of a transcendent intelligence is one of the basic assumptions of Monistic and Agnostic Naturalism. Nor is it possible to see how this form of Naturalism can consistently escape the consequences of Materialistic Naturalism. The supernatural is impossible; at no stage can there be an essential or accidental manifestation or mode of the common substance, including in himself the twofold aspect of matter and consciousness. Moreover, since God, or rather "the divine", as some say, is to be found in nature, with which it is identified, religion can only be reduced to certain feelings of admiration, awe, reverence, fear, etc., caused in man by the phenomena of nature, its laws, beauties, energies, and mysteries. Thus, among the feelings belonging to "natural religion", Haeckel mentions "the astonishment with which we gaze upon the starry heavens and the microscopic life in a drop of water, the awe with which we trace the marvelous working of energy in the motion of matter, the reverence with which we grasp the universal dominance of the law of substance throughout the universe" ("Die Welträthsel", Bonn, 1899, V, xviii, 396-97; tr. McCabe, New York, 1900, 344).

III. For those who admit the existence of a transcendent First Cause of the universe, naturalism constitutes an undue limitation of God's omnipotence in the world. God is only Creator, not Provider. He cannot, or may not, interfere with the natural course of events, or He never did so, or, at least, the fact of His ever doing so cannot be established. Even if the soul of man is regarded as spiritual and immortal, and if, among human activities, some are exempted from the determinism of physical agents and recognized as the free action of man, that action must be due to a transcendent nature in which includes the laws governing spirits as well as those governing matter. But these laws are sufficient to account for everything that happens in the world of matter or of mind. This form of naturalism stands in close relation with Rationalism and Deism. Once established by God, the order of nature is unchangeable, and man is endowed with all that is required even for his religious and moral development. The consequences are clear: miracles, that is, effects produced by God himself and transcending the forces of nature, must be rejected. Prophecies and so-called miraculous events either are explainable by the known, or hitherto unknown, laws of nature or, if they are not that unexplainable, their nature must be denied, and the belief in their reality attributed to faulty observation. Since, for religious and moral, as well as for scientific truths, human reason is the only source of knowledge, the fact of a Divine Revelation is rejected, and the contents of such supposed revelation can be accepted only so far as they are rational; to believe in Divine prophecy is to believe in natural destiny, man needs no supernatural means—neither sanctifying grace as a permanent principle to give his actions a supernatural value nor actual grace to enlighten his mind and strengthen his will. The Fall of Man, the mysteries of the Incarnation and the Redemption, with their implications and consequences, are, to natura naturata, impossible. Prayers and sacraments have only natural results explainable on psychological grounds by the confidence with which they inspire those who use them. If man must have a religion at all, it is only that which his reason dictates. Naturalism is directly opposed to the Christian Religion. But even within the fold of Christian thinkers, of whom those who are exponents of Rationalism and a supernatural order, several naturalistic tendencies are found. Such are those of the Pelagians and Semipelagians, who minimize the necessity and functions of Divine grace; of Baius, who asserts that the elevation of man was an exigency of his nature; of many sects, especially among Liberal Protestants, who fall into more or less radical Rationalism; and of others who endeavour to restrict within too narrow limits the divine agency in the universe.

IV. General Considerations.—From the fundamental principles of Naturalism are derived some important consequences in esthetical, political, and ethical sciences. In esthetics Naturalism rests on the assumption that beauty and harmony are inherent in natural forms, without the necessity of idealization, and without any regard for the laws of morality. Social and political Naturalism teaches that "the best interests of public society and civil progress require that in the constitution and government of human society no more attention should be given to religion than if there were no religion at all, or at least that no dishonor should be made between true and false religion" (Pius IX, Encyc. "Quanta cura", 8 Dec., 1864). Leo XIII lays it down that "the integral profession of the Catholic Faith is in no way consistent with naturalistic and rationalistic opinions; the sum and the substance of which is to do away altogether with Christian institutions, and, disregarding the rights of God, to attribute to man the supreme authority in society" (Encyc., "Immortale Dei", 1 Nov., 1885). Moreover, like individual organisms, social organisms obey fatal laws of development; all events are the necessary results of complex antecedents, and the task of the historian is to record them and to trace the laws of their sequences, which are as strict as those of sequences in the physical world.

In ethics, the vague assumption that nature is the supreme guide of human actions may be applied in many different ways. Already the principle of
Stoics, formulated first by Zeno, that we must live consistently or harmoniously with nature (τὸ ἰδιαγομένου τῷ φύσει τῷ φύσεω ὑπομένον) and stated more explicitly by Cleanthes as the obligation to live in conformity with nature (τὸ ἰδιαγομένου τῷ φύσεω) gave rise to several interpretations, some understanding nature exclusively as human nature, others as the whole universe. Moreover as man has many natural tendencies, desires, and appetites, it may be asked whether it is moral to follow all indiscriminately; and when they are conflicting or mutually exclusive, so that a choice is to be made, on what ground must certain activities be given the preference over the others? Before the Stoics, the Cynics, both in ancient Greece and in its practice, had based their rules of conduct on the principle that nothing natural can be morally wrong. Opposing customs, conventions, refinement, and culture, they endeavoured to return to the pure state of nature. Rousseau, likewise, looks upon the social organization as a necessary evil which contributes towards developing conventional standards of morality. Man, according to him, is naturally good, but becomes depraved by education and by contact with other men. This same theme of the opposition of nature and culture, and the superiority of the former, is a favourite one with Tolstoi. According to Nietzsche, the current standards of virtue are against nature, and, because they favour the poor, the weak, the indolent, the incapable, the injurious as charity, compassion, pity, humility, etc., they are obstacles in the way of true progress. For the progress of mankind and the development of the "Superman", it is essential to return to the primitive and natural standard of morality, which is energy, activity, strength, and superiority; the most powerful and not the most refined.

If ethical naturalism is considered in its relation with the three philosophical views explained above, it sometimes means only the rejection of any duties based on a Divine Revelation, and the assumption that the only source of right and wrong is human reason. Generally, however, it means the more radical tendency to treat moral science in the same manner as natural science. There is freedom nowhere, but absolutely everywhere. All human actions, as well as physical events, are necessary results of antecedents that are themselves necessary. The moral law, with its essential distinction of right and wrong conduct, is not a fact, but a more subjective result of associations and instincts evolved from the experience of the useful and agreeable, or of the harmful and painful, consequences of certain actions. It is, nevertheless, a motive that prompts to act in certain directions, but the effectiveness of which is strictly determined by the degree of its intensity in a given individual compared with the resistance it encounters on the part of antagonistic ideas. Thus, the science of ethics is not normative: it does not deal with laws existing antecedently to human actions, and which these ought to obey. It is genetic, and endeavours to do for human actions what natural science does for physical phenomena, that is, to discover, through an inference from the past, the rules of human conduct, the laws to which it happens to conform.

It is impossible to state in detail the attitude of the Catholic Church towards the assumptions, implications, and consequences of Naturalism. Naturalism is such a wide and far-reaching tendency, it touches upon so many points, its roots and ramifications extend in so many directions, that the reader must refer to the cognate topics treated in other articles.

In general it can only be said that Naturalism contradicts the most vital doctrines of the Church, which rest essentially on Supernaturalism. The existence of a personal God and of Divine Providence, the spirituality and immortality of the soul, human freedom and responsibility, the fact of a Divine Revelation, the existence of a supernatural order for man, are so many fundamental teachings of the Church, which, while recognizing all the rights and exigencies of nature, rises higher, to the Author and Supreme Ruler of nature.

C. A. DUBRAY.

NATURAL LAW. See LAW, NATURAL.

NATURAL RIGHT. See Right.

Nature etymologically (Latin natura from nasci, to be born, like the corresponding Greek γένος from γενέω, to bring forth) has reference to the production of things, and hence generally includes in its connotation the ideas of energy and activity. It will be convenient to reduce to two classes the various meanings of the term nature according as it applies to the natures of individual beings or to nature in general.

1. In an individual being, especially if its constitutive elements and its activities are manifold and complex, the term nature is sometimes applied to the collection of distinctive features, original or acquired, by which such an individual is distinguished from other beings. Thus it may be said it is the nature of one man to be taller, stronger, more intelligent, or more sociable than another. This meaning, however, is superficial; in philosophical terminology and even in ordinary language, nature refers to something deeper and more fundamental. These features are manifestations of a man's nature; they are not his nature. Nature properly signifies that which is primitive and original, or, according to etymology, that which a thing is at birth, as opposed to that which is acquired or added from external sources. But the line that divides the natural from the artificial cannot be drawn with precision. The terms of being never change except under the influence of external agencies, and in the same circumstances, their mode of activity is uniform and constant. Organisms present a greater complexity of structure, power of adaptation, and variety of function. For their development out of a primitive germ they require the co-operation of many external factors, yet they live without them. The principle of activity by which external substances are elaborated and assimilated. In any being the changes due to necessary causes are called natural, whereas those produced by intentional human activity are called artificial. But it is clear that art supposes nature and is but a special adaptation of natural aptitudes, capacities, or activities for certain aesthetic and useful purposes. Stars, rivers, forests, are works of nature; parks, canals, gardens, and machines are works of art. If necessary conditions are realized, where the seed falls a plant will grow naturally. But the seed must be placed purposefully amid certain surroundings, the growth of the plant may be hastened, its form altered, and, in general, the mode of natural activity may be modified. By training the aptitudes of an animal are utilized and its instincts adapted for specific ends. In such cases the final result is more or less natural or artificial according to the mode and amount of human intervention.

In scholastic philosophy, nature, essence, and substance are closely related terms. Both essence and substance imply a static point of view and refer to constituents or mode of existence, while nature implies a dynamic point of view and refers to innate tendencies. Moreover, substance is opposed to accidents, whereas we may speak of the nature and essence not only of substances but also of accidents like colour, sound, intelligence, and of abstract ideals like virtue or duty. But when applied to the same
substantial being, the terms substance, essence, and nature in reality stand only for different aspects of the same thing, and the distinction between them is a mental one. Substance denotes the thing as requiring no support, but as being itself self-existent; essence properly denotes the intrinsic constitutive elements by which a thing is what it is and is distinguished from every other; nature denotes the substance or essence considered as the source of activities. "Nature properly speaking is the essence (or substance) of things which have in themselves as such a principle of activity (or self-movement)," (Metaphysics, 1015a, 13). By a process of abstraction the mind arises from individual and concrete natures to those of species and genera.

A few special remarks must be added concerning human nature. This expression may mean something concrete, more or less different in various individuals, or more generally something common to all men, i.e., the abstract human nature by which mankind as a whole is distinguished from other classes of living beings. In both cases it is conceived as including primitive and fundamental characteristics, and as referring to the source of all activities. Hence nature, as the internal principle of action, is opposed to the externality of coercion which are external principles of action and prevent the normal play of human faculties. It is opposed also, but less strictly, to education and culture which at times may be the checking of natural tendencies, at times also their development and perfection. Education, physical and mental, is not a primitive endowment; it must be acquired and is built upon nature as on its foundation. In this sense habit has been termed a second nature. But although education is due largely to external causes and influences acting on the mind and the organism, from another point of view it is also the unfolding of innate aptitude, and hence partly nature.

As between nature in general and art, so between human nature and education there is no clear dividing line. Natural is also frequently contrasted with conventional; language, style, gestures, expressions of feelings, etc., are called more or less natural. This opposition becomes more acute in the theories of Hobbes and Rousseau who lay stress on the antithesis between the primitive or natural state of man and the present social condition due to the contract by which men agreed to surrender their rights into the hands of the common authority.

From the theological point of view the distinctions between nature and person and between the natural and the moral order are as old as human existence. The former arose from the dogma of the Trinity, i.e., of one Divine Nature in three persons, and chiefly from that of the Incarnation i.e., of the two Natures, Divine and human, in the one Divine Person in Christ. The Human Nature in Christ is complete and perfect as nature, yet it lacks that which would transform it, viz., the union of the human with the divine, which constitutes the positive character of the human existence as negative, as Scotists hold, namely the mere fact that a nature is not assumed by a higher person, or, as Thomists assert, some positive reality distinct from nature and making it incomunicable.

The faculties of man are capable of development and perfection, and, no matter what external influences may be at work, this is but the unfolding of natural capacities. Even artificial productions are governed by the laws of nature, and, in man, natural activities, after they are perfected differ not in kind but only in degree, from those that are less developed. The supernatural order is above the exigencies and capacities of all human nature. It consists of an end to which the whole of man's life is directed, and to which, in a certain sense, the intuitive vision of God in heaven—not the mere discursive and imperfect knowledge which is acquired by the light of reason—and of the means to attain such an end, namely, a principle which must be added to natural faculties so as to uplift them and make them capable of knowing and reaching this higher destiny. More specifically it includes an enlightenment of the intellect by a positive revelation of God manifesting man's spiritual end and the conditions for obtaining it; it also implies for every individual the indispensable help of Divine grace both actual, by which God illumines and strengthens human faculties, and sanctifying, by which human nature is elevated to a higher mode of activity. Hence theologians oppose the state of purity in which God manifestly has placed man, to the supernatural state to which in fact man was raised.

II. Nature is frequently taken for the totality of concrete natures and their laws. But here again a narrower and a broader meaning must be distinguished. Nature refers especially to the world of matter, in time and space, governed by blind and necessary laws, and thus excludes the mental world. Works of nature, opposed to works of art, result from physical causes, not from the actual adaptation by human intelligence. This signification is found in such expressions as natural history, natural philosophy, and in general, natural science, which deals only with the constitution, production, properties, and law of material entities, and is all-inclusive, embracing mind as well as matter; it is our whole world of experience, internal as well as external. And frequently nature is looked upon as a personified abstraction, as the one cause of whatever takes place in the universe, endowed with qualities, tendencies, efforts, and will, and with aims and purposes, and it is arrived at as a reality.

The problems to which the philosophical study of nature has given rise are numerous. All however centre around the question of the unity of nature: Can all the beings of the world be reduced to one common principle, and if so what is this principle? The first Greek philosophers, who were the first philosophers of nature, endeavoured to find some primitive element out of which all things were made; air, water, fire, and earth were in turn or all together supposed to be this common principle. The problem has persisted through all ages and received many answers. Aristotle's primary matter, for instance, is of the same nature in all things; and to-day ether, or some other substance or energy is advocated by many as the common substratum of all material substances. After static unity, dynamic unity is looked for, that is, all the changes that take place in the universe are referred to the same principle. Dynamism (q. v.) admits forces of various kinds which, however, it tries to explain in terms of one or several primary forces, the only one form of energy manifesting itself in different ways. Mechanism (q. v.) holds that everything is explainable by the sole assumption of movement communicated from one substance to another. Teleological views give to final causes a greater importance, and look upon the ends of various beings as subordinated to the one end to which the universe tends to realise.

If nature includes both mental and physical phenomena what are the relations between these two classes? On this point also the history of philosophy offers many attempts to substitute some form of Monism for the Dualism of mind and matter, by reducing mind to a special function of matter, or matter to a special appearance of mind, or both to a common substratum.

Finally, is nature as a whole self-sufficient, or does it require a transcendent ground as its cause and principle? Is the nature naturans one and the same with the nature naturata? By some these expressions are understood in a particular sense, the one denotes all primary natures, the other all phenomena; by others the natura naturans, as first cause, is held to be really distinct from the natura naturata, as effect. This is the question of the existence
and nature of God and of his distinction from the world. Here the question of the possibility of miracles is suggested. If nature alone exists, and if all its changes are absolutely necessary, everything takes place according to a natural determination. On the contrary, God exists as a transcendent, intelligent, and free cause of nature and its laws, not only nature in all its details depends ultimately on God's will, but its ordinary course may be suspended by a miraculous intervention of the First Cause. (See Arts; Naturalism; Supernatural; Grace.)

C. A. Dubray.

Naturism, the term proposed by Réville to designate the worship of nature. It differs from Naturalism, which is not a religion, but a system of atheistic philosophy, and from natural religion, which sets forth those truths about God and man attainable by the native power of human reason and forming the prolegomena to Revelation, e. g., the existence of God, the spiritual and immortal nature of the human soul, the moral order. As a theory of religion Naturism exhibits two phases: I. Ethical Naturism. II. Philosophic Naturism. III. Science-Naturism.

I. Ethnographic Naturism.—According to Réville, Naturism is the primitive form of religion, the basis and source of all existing forms. This is the thesis of comparative mythology, which is said to reveal a primitive nature worship. Its foundation is a tangible assumption that (1) the nature of the products of evolution, which maintains that man is a development by slow and successive stages from the animal; hence the corollary advanced by Spencer and Thomas as the first principle in the evolutionary history of religion, viz., that primitive man was a creature of emotion, not of intelligence which is the product of more advanced culture; (2) the ethnographic assumption that primitive man existed in the savage state, a condition and mode of life akin to that prevailing among the non-civilized races of to-day, e. g., Tylor, Lubbock, Tiele, Réville, and Spencer.

The core and essence of nature-worship is that nature is associated with God. When we say that, Réville is in touch with de Brosses and Comte, who claim that Fetishism is the primitive religion and by Fetishism understand the primitive tendency to conceive external objects as animated by a life analogous to that of man. He differs from Tylor, who specifies the cause of the animation, e. g., spirits or souls, and Comte, 1805-1857, who holds that the primitive animation in its initial stage is not Fetishism, but becomes so when in process of development the spirit or soul is distinguished from the object. Thus with Réville, the Animism of Tylor and Spencer is the intermediate link between Naturism and Fetishism. Tylor, however, considers nature-worship as the common foundation of all religious conceptions. Admitting the stages of this process defy any more accurate definition. Giddings follows Tylor in holding that religious ideas are of two groups: animistic interpretation of the finite, and animistic interpretation of the infinite ("Induct. Sociol.", New York, 1901). In like manner Blackmar teaches that nature-worship was nothing more than spirit-worship localized in the worship of nature of nature (Elem. of Sociology, New York, 1905). On the other hand Guynn calls Naturism, Physiolyatri, of which zoalatr, i. e., worship of animals, is a department (The Non-Religion of the Future, New York, 1907). Hadden holds that primitive folk do not draw a sharp distinction between this kind of animalism and pantheism (The Study of Man, New York, 1898). Jastrow says that the savage and primitive man does not differentiate between such an object of nature as the sun and its personification as a being possessing life in some form, and teaches that it is an axiom of primitive man's science to ascribe life to all things (The Study of Religion, London, 1902). Schrader says the common basis of the ancient Indo-European religion of the Aryan peoples is the transference to anthropomorphic deities of the commonest objects of the world, and attempts his "Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples", tr. by Jevons, London, 1899). Hence the discovery of the soul or spirit as distinct from the object is the origin of Animism. This theory was sometimes called personification of natural forces, but only in the sense that nature is conceived as living, as vital with creative and preserving powers. Personification, in the strict sense of investing material things with the attributes of a person is far above the power of early man and appears only in later forms of developed belief. Hence, according to Réville, there is first the naive cult of natural objects as possessing life and in some way supposed to influence man; this is followed by Animism and Fetishism; and finally the third stage known as the natural mythologies founded on the dramatization of nature, e. g., the historic polytheisms of China, Egypt, Babylonia, of the Teutonic, Greek, Latin, and Vedic mythologies.

Primitive man faces the world about him in childlike wonder. The succession of the seasons, of night and day, of storm and cloud, the growth of living things, exhibit nature in constant and varied changes. He views natural phenomena as the effects of causes beyond his comprehension and control. Consciousness of his own agency, though unable yet to distinguish soul from the parts of the body, he attributes agency like his own to the objects which surround him. Awe and delight possess him. Having no idea at all of God, writes Keary, he makes the things themselves gods by worshipping them ("Early Relig. Develop." in Nineteenth Cent., Aug., 1878). Hence Brinton writes that nature is known to man only as the thing which manifests itself in change (The Religious Sentiment, New York, 1876). Ratzel explains this craving for causality in an animistic sense as tending to vivify all the higher phenomena of nature by attributing to them a soul, and applies the word Polytheism to all the religious conceptions of mankind, except the Oriental ("Hist. of Mankind", tr. Butler, London, 1896). With Réville the phenomena of change exhibit a vital principle analogous to man's own and this principle of life vaguely conceived by primitive man but strongly felt is the origin of religion; in a later stage of development Vitalism passes into Animism (The Tree of Life, Paris, 1903). Brinton holds that the difference between Naturism and Spiritism is largely a difference of emphasis, because neither can be excluded from the interpretation of a primitive which as yet has made no sharp separation between subject and object. Hence the worshippers of nature seems to ally himself with external objects which, as he surveys them anthropomorphically, seems to support and mirror of his own fleeting fancies. The natural object is not conceived by primitive man as either friendly or inimical to him. In the particular view of Fetishism the physical and psychical further appears. Thus Shaw in the primitive Naturism resulting from the contact of man with the phenomena of the external world, attempts to reconcile the psychological theories of fear as set forth by Hume, Clode, Tiele, and even the desire either natural with Brinton or morbid by Feuerbach.

Pfeiderer holds that nature is animated throughout, that this view was just as natural for the childlike fancy of the primitive man as it is still to-day for the adult. Pfeiderer thus assumes that the peculiar novelty in the idea of nature is not to be explained by the fact that the primitive man only compared natural phenomena...
with living beings or even that he thought of them as a domicile or operation of spirits of human origin. Such a view would suppose a definite distinguishing of the sense element and of the supersensible element; but this distinction only appeared later, whereas, for the original mythological notion, the sense element and the object of worship were not distinguished as one. He says the real sources of religion are external nature and the soul of man; for the prehistoric belief in spirits, out of which developed the belief in God, cannot yet be properly called religion; it only contained the germs of religion. Tylor teaches animation of nature, but, as with him the soul or spirit and the object of worship were not distinguished, it is only under the concept of Fetishism. De la Saussaye objects to this view on the ground that nature-worship bears the strongest impress of originality, and therefore is not a phase of Fetishism, which is not original. Darwin seems to combine the ascension of life to natural objects, dreams, and fears (Descent of Man, I, p. 65). Thomas says that, while theoretically separable, magic religion, belief in ghosts and in nature-worship practically run into one another and become inseparably mingled; therefore it is idle to attempt to establish a priority in favour of any one of them (Social Origins, Chicago, 1899).

De la Saussaye confesses that it is equally difficult to distinguish the germs of nature-worship in the opposite direction. The classification of religions shows how wide an area it covers. Thus Tiele divides the religions of the world into nature-religions and ethical religions, and holds that the latter developed from the former. Caird keeps the same division, but uses the terms "objective" and "subjective," and says they unite in Christianity. He adds, "It is not without a reason to the classification of Tiele, that the higher nature-religions contain ethical elements. Hegel holds the primitive religion was an immediate nature-religion, which betrays its features in various primitive peoples and in a more advanced form in Chinese, Pali, and Sanskrit culture. The transition from the lowest stage to the next higher, according to him, is effected by means of the Persian dualism, the Phoenician religion of pain, and the Egyptian religion of mystery. De la Grassière (Des religions comparées, Paris, 1899) says Naturism is at the origin of religions. He distinguishes a lesser Naturism and a greater Naturism. The former Naturism passes in animism, which in turn develops into Fetishism, Idololatry, and Anthropomorphism. With its earlier forms the object is adored in its concrete reality; at a later period, the soul or spirit is separated from the object and becomes the real object of worship. Lesser Naturism embraces the primitive gods, e. g., those which personify the woods, mountains, and rivers. It has many forms, e. g., worship of the one God in Greek and Egyptian mythology, worship of trees, e. g., laurels of Apollo, myrtle of Venus, worship of groves as with Druids, worship of stones, water, springs, lakes, mountains, the elements. Hence it embraces the mythological naiads, fauns, dryads, fairies, and sirens.

A great many naturalists refer to the gatherings of objects and especially heavenly bodies, e. g., sun, moon, stars. This he says is the basis of the Vedic religion, e. g., Varuna, i. e., heaven at night, Mitri, i. e., heaven at day, Indra, i. e., rain, Agni, i. e., fire, and survives in Sabeism. This Naturism is at the origin of Greek and Latin mythology, e. g., Zeus, i. e., the Heaven, Aurora, i. e., the dawn, Apollo, i. e., light, Hephaestus, i. e., the maker. In Oriental states, Tiele holds that the religions of the Red degraded and negroes are just as much nature religions as the Babylonian, the Vedic, and Greek, though he admits a great difference exists between the former and the latter. Von Hartmann designates the lowest stage of religion as "naturalistic henotheism." Jastrow holds that man's consciousness of his own weakness and the temptation of the overwhelming strength of nature furnishes the motive for seeking support from certain powers of nature and to accomplish this he must make them favourably disposed to him. He says this theory can be variously put, hence can furnish a starting point for pessimistic views, e. g., Von Hartmann, and of still closer relations, for instance, in the universe, and it appeals to minds in sympathy with religion as to those, e. g., Feuerbach, who regard religion as an illusion.

Thus Naturism teaches that man originally was destitute of religion, and that ignorant awe in face of natural forces was the cause of his earliest faith. But this theory cannot be accepted. (1) It bases, viz. that man has evolved from an animal state, is false. "We know now," writes Max Müller "that savage and primitive are very far indeed from meaning the same thing" (Anthrop. Relig., 150). Talcott Williams shows the necessity of revising and limiting the confidence with which the modern savage has been used to explain a nobler past (Smithsonian Report of 1896). Müller and Kuhn refute Mannhardt and Meyer by showing that popular beliefs of modern folk-lore are fragments of a higher mythology. (2) It does not explain how man gained the predicate God, which is the real problem of religion. Jastrow says mere personification of nature lacks a certain spiritual element which appears to be essential to genuine religious feeling in man. Hence, he adds, Müller postulated "the preception of the Infinite" (Hibbert Lectures, 1878), and Tiele appeals to "man's original unconscious innate sense of infinity" (Elem. of the Scienc. of Rel., II, 233). Thus Fairbairn says, "the constitutive element is what mind brings to nature, not what nature brings to mind" (Sound of the Philos. of History and Religion, New York, 1876).

(3) The theory is defective, for it does not explain all the facts of early religious consciousness. If nature were the only source of religion, man would express Ideas of God in terms drawn from nature alone. Now the science of language shows that primitive man expresses his idea of God: (a) In terms drawn from physical nature, e. g., Dyaus Pitar of the Indo-Europeans; Zeus pater of the Greeks; Jupiter of the Latins; Tiet, i. e., heaven, of the Chinese; the Persian Dāvā; the Cēliche Dīa from the Sanscrit root Div, i. e., to shine. (b) By moral and metaphysical concepts: thus, e. g., Jahweh, the one living, e. g., the living one; El, i. e., the powerful shown in Elohim, Allah, Babylonia; Shaddai, i. e., the mighty; Bel, i. e., the lord; Molech, i. e., king; Adonai, i. e., lord. Such concepts are found with barbarous peoples, e. g., Unkulu of the Zulus, i. e., father; Papang of the Australian, i. e., father; the Mongolian Teng-wi; and Hannish Tanzi, i. e., lord of the sky. Further more the earliest Indo-European conception of God is Dyaus Pitar, i. e., the heaven-father. Hence the idea of paternity is characteristic of their primitive consciousness. Such a concept is too sublime and elevated to be explained on the principles of Naturism; which is utterly unable to account for the second and subsequent ideas of God.

The main support for the theory of Naturism is the Vedic religion. It is true that traces of nature-religion are found in the Vedas. But to say that the Vedic gods are nothing more than nature personified or that nature-worship is the primitive type of Indian religion is to betray the superficial observer. The moral and spiritual conceptions are older than the physical faith. It is not that the Aryan view of nature as active is not ground to hold that for this reason they worshipped nature. We express ourselves after this fashion in ordinary conversation. The great truth shown by the Vedas is the fact of degeneracy.

II. PHILosophic naturism.—This phase is based on the philosophic unity of animated nature. The ancient cosmogonies represent the efforts of the bu-
man mind to attain a unity amid the multiplicity of external things. In the Stoic conception of God as the one and all, it is set into juxtaposition with the intellect for the purpose of giving scope to the exercise of the religious emotions. Hence it was that these philosophers could look with indulgent tolerance upon the religious practices of the common people. The basic principle with both was the same, e.g., the worship of animated nature. To the cultured Romani the identity of Spirit was conceived as a philosophic unity; to the ordinary mind it was viewed in manifold forms and activities which were the source and explanation of their countless nature-deities. Pantheism in its various forms exhibits the same thought. This is especially true of modern Pantheistic theories. The substance of Spinoza, the synthesis of all that is, the identity of Substance, the absolute nature of Hegel is at basis the same conception. Its religious significance is twofold: (a) the more spiritual and metaphysical form appears in Neo-Hegelianism which teaches the unity of human and Divine consciousness. This reflects the nature-philosophy of Hegel which exhibits the idea, i.e., God in its finitude. (b) The idealism of Buddhism, in which the idea of the Absolute is deified, is also a form of transcendentalism. To Emerson as to Goethe, God was the soul of the world. Emerson seems to consider religion as the delight which springs from a harmony of man and nature. Emerson taught that the universe is composed of the soul, not of the mind, and its final end is the not me, i.e., physical nature; art, other man, and his own body. Hence in germ the worship of humanity is contained in Emerson's teaching, just as it is latent in Neo-Hegelianism, and appears in the Hegelian evolution of the idea, i.e., the Absolute or God, when viewed from its human side, i.e., as a human product.

III. SCIENCE-NATURISM.—This is the religion of the science-philosophy and appears under two forms: (a).

The religion of humanity was first presented in systematic form by Comte, and contains the principles of the humanitarian theories so prevalent a generation ago. God does not exist or at least cannot be known, therefore mankind calls forth the sole and supreme expression of our veneration and service. (b). Cosmic religion, a title invented by Fiske, and designated the homage of reason to forces of nature or the awe of phenomena which suggest mysterious and destructive power. Spencer speaks of the emotion resulting from the contemplation of the unknowable into which as in Swedenborg's vision, questions resolved themselves. Comte develops this thought and makes the essence of religious emotion very largely consist in the sense of mystery. To Fiske the unknowable manifests itself in a world of law and is yet conceived to be in itself something beyond these manifestations. Hence worship is ever the dark side of the shield of which knowledge is the bright side. The Maitre Sienna, Pâ Students of religion as morality touched by emotion becomes with Tyndall poetry and emotion in face of matter instinct with mind. Cosmism, according to Fiske, is, however, more than a mere sentiment. He says the fundamental principle of religion is obedience to the entire requirements of nature. This is righteousness, just as sin is a wilful violation of nature's laws.

Science-Naturism finds its most complete delineation in Sceley's "Natural Religion." He uses the term "Natural Religion" in contrast with the supernatural. In rejecting supernaturalism and submitting to science is presented a theology to which, he says, all men do actually agree, viz., nature in God, and God in nature. Hence there is no power beyond or superior to nature nor anything like a cause of nature. Whether we say God or prefer to say nature, the important thing is that our minds are filled with the sense of a power, to all appearance infinite and eternal, a power to which our own being is inseparably connected, in the knowledge of whose existence we have a natural conviction of which we find a beatific vision. Religion begins with nature-worship which in its essence is admiration of natural objects and forces. But natural mythology has given place to science, which sees mechanism where will, purpose, and love had been suspected before and drops the name of God, to take up instead the less awful name of Nature. Nature is the name comprehending all the uniform laws of the universe as known in our experience. It is the residuum that is left after the elimination of everything supernatural, and comprehends man with all his thoughts and aspirations not less than the forms of the material world.

Science, according to Seeley, we have the kernel of Christianity and the purified worship of natural forms, i.e., the higher paganism. He holds that this is not Pantheism, for not the individual forms of nature are the objects of worship, but nature considered as a unity. Art and science as well as morality, form the substance of religion, hence culture is the essence of religion. Culture is his form of religion. From the view of his church, in his view, in the individual is identified with culture, in its public aspect is identified with civilization. For Seeley the Church is the atmosphere of thought, feeling, and belief that surrounds the State; it is in fact its civilization made more or less tangible and visible. His universal Church is universal civilization. And as science is the nucleus of the system, so, as science is not only the truth and truth, so the term civilization expresses the same threefold religion, shown on a larger scale in the characters, institutions, and customs of nations. (Cf. Animism; Deity; Fetishism; Totemism; Transcendentalism.)

JOHN T. DRIESEL.

NAUSEA (Latinized from the German Grau). FREDERIC, Bishop of Vienna, b. c. 1480 at Waischenfeld (Blancanтиun) in Frisonia; d. 6 Feb., 1552, at Trent. He was the son of a wagonmaker and received his early education at Bamberg and probably at Nuremberg under John Cochlaus; with Paul of Schwartzberg, canon of Bamberg, he pursued humanitarian, juristic, and theological studies at Pavia, Fadus, and later at Salzburg, there obtaining degrees in Law and Divinity. Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio, Archbishop of Bologna and papal legate in Germany, employed him as secretary and as such Nausea was at the Diet of Nuremberg (1524), at the convention of Ratisbon, at the Diet of Olm, and for a time at Rome. In 1538 he accepted the parst of St. Bartholomew at Frankfurt-on-the-Main and the dignity of canon, but was soon obliged to leave on account of the intrigues of the Lutherans who even excited popular riots against him. He came to Aschaffenburg and (1526) to Mainz as preacher of the cathedral. He attended the Diet of Speier (1529) and was chosen counsellor and preacher (1529). At the room of King Francis (1536), he was made rector to John Faber, Bishop of Vienna, succeeding him in 1541. Nausea laboured zealously for the reunion of the Lutherans with the Catholics, and together with other prelates, asked Rome to permit the clergy to marry and the laity to
use the communion cup. He also advised Cologne or Ratibon as the place for holding the General Council. He was prevented from being present at the opening of the Council of Trent by contrary orders from the king, but met Paul III at Parma (1546) and there gave to him his “Sylvae Synodales”. When the Council was reopened at Trent in 1551, he was present, taking an active part in its deliberations, especially on the Sacraments. Only a short attendance was granted him, for he died there of a fever. His body was brought to Vienna and buried in the cathedral.

In the Acts of the Council Naeusa is praised for his great knowledge, his exemplary virtues, and his ecclesiastical learning. “In the year in which the congregation met,” says the “Trid.”, “I. Zagreb, 1874, 652.” Among his writings are: “Dictichs” on the works of Lactantius; “Ars Poetica”; sermons and homilies on evangelical subjects, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the life of a true Christian; “Catechismus cath.” (Cologne, 1843); “Pastoralium inquisitionum elenchi tres” (Vienna, 1547); “On the Resurrection of Christ and of the dead” (Vienna, 1551); etc. For full list see Metaner.

FRANCIS MERRSHAM.

Navajo Indians, numbering about 20,000, constitute the largest group of Indians belonging to the Athapaskan or Déné stock. Other groups of the same stock are the Apaches (Ndé), Lipanes (Lipa Ndé), Hupas of California, and various Déné tribe inhabiting British Columbia and Alaska (see Déné). This post is a minor group of the Navajo, who come from the extreme north. They themselves have a vague tradition of “Diné Nahodloni”, i.e., “other Navajos”, living far away. According to their myths they emerged from lower worlds somewhere in the San Juan Mountains in south-western Colorado. At present they occupy an extensive reservation in the north-east corner of Arizona and the north-west corner of New Mexico; but many of them live beyond its borders, especially towards the south. Formerly their habitat extended somewhat farther to the north-east.

They are first mentioned in the writings of Zuist-Salmerón in 1626, as Apaches de Navabo. In 1630, a Franciscan, Alonso Benavides, went to the King of Spain mentions the “Province of the Apaches of Navajo” and adds that “these of Navajo are very great farmers, for that is what Navajo signifies—great planted fields”. Consequently the word “Navajo” may be derived from the Spanish race meaning “plain, or field”. The Navajos call themselves Diné, that is, have its origin at between the treaty of peace he concluded between the Navajo and Pueblo Indians at Santa Clara in 1630. Previous to this date, as Benavides states, and subsequently, till 1862, an almost continuous guerilla warfare existed between the Navajo and the Pueblo Indians and Mexicans. The number of Navajo captives in Mexican families in 1802 had been taken to 1500 and 3000. In 1846 Colonel Doniphan made an expedition into the Navajo country, in 1849 Colonel Washington, in 1854 General Sumner. In 1859 war again broke out, and in 1860 the Navajos attacked Fort Defiance. Colonel Miles and Colonel Bonneville and General Canby made campaigns against them. When the war broke out, all the troops were withdrawn from the Navajo country, whereupon the Navajos rode over the country rough-shod. In 1862 General Carleton sent Colonel Kit Carson with a force against the Navajos. He subdued them, and, mainly by killing their stock and destroying their crops, forced them through starvation to surrender, whereupon about 7300 were transferred to Fort Sumner in south-eastern New Mexico. About 1500 never surrendered; about 400 fled from Fort Sumner to their old homes. On 1 June, 1868, General Sherman concluded a treaty with them by which they were permitted to return.

Ever since they are a peaceful, pastoral people, living by, with, and off their herds and sheep and goats. Though the arid character of their country prevented them from grazing purposes only—forces them to lead a nomadic life, yet most of the families have one abode for their main home, generally in a well-watered valley, where they raise corn, beans, potatoes, melons, oats, alfalfa, etc. The Navajo women weave the famed Navajo blankets of genuine wool, of superb durability, beauty and variety of design, and careful execution, whilst a number of the men are clever silversmiths, making silver necklaces, belts, bracelets, wristlets, rings, buttons, etc., of rare beauty, out of Mexican silver dollars. They have always been self-supporting. They have little of the sullen, reticent disposition attributed to Indians generally; and are cheerful, friendly, hospitable, and industrious. Their government is democratic; there is no chief of the whole tribe, and their local chiefs are men of temporary and ill-defined authority, whose power depends largely upon their personal influence, their eloquence, and their reputation for wisdom and justice. The tribe is divided into about 38 families, or gens, each one of the several original or nuclear clans. Exogamous marriages with Mexicans, Utes, Apaches, but more especially with the neighbouring Pueblo Indians, captured or enslaved and eventually adopted into the tribe, are responsible for a number of clans. In consequence there is nothing like a pronounced or prevailing Navajo type. Every variety of form and figure can be found among them. Marriage is contracted early in life. Polygamy and divorce are still prevalent. Their marriage ceremony is only permissible at the marriage of a virgin. The vows of abortion, infanticide, race suicide, are practically unknown among them.

The elaborate system of pagan worship, expressed in chants, sacrifices, sand paintings, dances, ceremonies, some of which last nine days, make the Navajo appear intensely religious. Though they have no conception of one supreme being, their anthropomorphic deities are numerous and strikingly democratic. The ideas of heaven and hell being unknown to them, they are Mencheros, or, of course, happy with the life of happiness with the peoples of the lower worlds. They are firm believers in witchcraft and charms. Their pathology is largely mythological. Diseases are attributed to evil beings, to malign influences of enemies, and to various occult agencies. Their remedies are largely magical and constitute an integral part of their religion. The superstitions, ceremonies, and customs are diligently kept alive by an extraordinary large number of medicine-men who wield a powerful influence among them. Though Protestant missionaries have been among the Navajos since the early Eighties, and have at present (1910) eleven different missions, an hospital, and three small schools, the work of their adherents is very limited. After the unsuccessful attempt of Fray Benavides in 1630 to Christianize the Navajos, Padre Menchero, in 1746, induced several hundred to settle at Cebolleta, now a Mexican town north of Laguna; but the enterprise soon came to an end. In 1749 Padre Menchero made another attempt, re-establishing the Cebolleta mission and the attempt was renewed in 1769, now a Laguna village; but on 24 June, 1750, the Indians abandoned them to return to their wilderness. On 13 October, 1897, the Franciscans of Cincinnati, Ohio, accepted the Navajo mission at the request of Mgr. Stephan, Director of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, and of Mother Drexel. The missionaries took charge at St. Michael's, Arizona, on 7
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October, 1898. On 3 December, 1902, an industrial boarding-school for the Navajos, erected by Mother Drexel, was opened at St. Michael's, and has since been conducted by her community, the Sisters, of the Blessed Sacrament. At present (1910) the school is attended by 150 Navajo pupils. A church mission was established at Chin Lee, Arizona, in 1905, and a chapel built at Lukachukai, Arizona. 231 children and adults have been baptized at St. Michael's, and 78 have made their first Holy Communion. The way has been prepared; the Navajos are well-disposed towards the Catholic missionaries and give found hopes for an abundant harvest of pupils. A branch mission was established at Chin Lee, Arizona, in 1905, and a chapel built at Lukachukai, Arizona. 231 children and adults have been baptized at St. Michael's, and 78 have made their first Holy Communion. The way has been prepared; the Navajos are well-disposed towards the Catholic missionaries and give found hopes for an abundant harvest of pupils.

Much attention has been given by the Franciscans to the study and construction of the Navajo language. In 1910 they published "An Ethnologic Dictionary of the Navajo Language", and also "A Navajo English Catechism of Christian Doctrine for the Use of Navajo Children"; other works are in preparation.

MATTHEWS, Navajo Legends (Boston, 1897); IDEM, The Moun-

ANECEL WEBER.

NAVARE.—The territory formerly known as Na- vare now belongs to two nations, Spain and France, according as it is south or north of the Western Pyrenees. Spanish Navare is bounded on the north by French Navare, on the north-east by the Province of Huesca, on the east and south-east by the Pyrenees of Saragossa, on the south by the Provino of Logroño, and on the west by the Basque Provinces of Guipus- coa and Alava. It lies partly in the mountainous region of Navarre and partly in the plain of Navarre. The principal city, Donajou, or St. Jean-Pied-de-Port, stands on the River Nive, in the Arrondissement of Bayonne.

HISTORY.—The history of the two divisions of the country is identical until the year 1512, when Spanish Navare was conquered by Ferdinand the Catholic, the northern part remaining French. Little is known of the history of the country, but it is said that neither the Romans nor the Visigoths nor the Arabs ever succeeded in permanently subjugating the inhabitants of the Western Pyrenees, who had always retained their own language. The capture of Pam- plona by Charlemagne in 778 was not a lasting victory; in the same year the Basques and Navarrese defeated his forces. The successive occupations of Pamplona seems to have been again taken by the Franks. When, however, the Frankish emperors, on account of difficulties at home, were no longer able to give their attention to the outlying borderlands of their empire, the country, little by little, entirely withdrew from their allegiance, and about this time began the formation of a dynasty which soon became very powerful. The first King of Pamplona of this dynasty was Eneco Arista (839), his elder brother, Garcia Somen, having received as a dukedom Vas- conia, the original NAVARE. After the death of Eneco Arista (852), the two territories were united and Semen Garcia, the eldest son of the Count of Navarre, who was chosen king. In 910, the Pame- nrese and Navarrese gave the Crown to the son of Arista, Garcia II Eneco, who zealously defended his country against the encroachments of Islam, but was killed at Aybar (882) in a battle against the Emir of Cordova. He was succeeded by his eldest son Fortun Garcia, who was held a prisoner for fifteen years by the infidels, and who, after a reign of twenty-two years, became a monk at Leyra, the oldest convent in Navare, to which no less than seventy-two other con- vents were subject.

The choice of the Navarrese now fell upon his son Sancho Garcia I, surnamed Abarca (905—925), who fought against the Moors with repeated success and joined Ultra-Puertos, or Basse-Navarre, to his own dominions, extending its territory as far as Najera. As a thank-offering for his victories, he founded, in 924, the convent of Albeda. Before his death, all Moors had been driven from the country. His suc- cessor, Garcia Sanchez (925—70), surnamed El Temblm (the Trembler), who had the support of his ege- neral and diplomatic abilities, was engaged in a number of conflicts with the Moors. Under the sway of his son, Sancho el Mayor (the Great)—970—1033, the country attained the greatest prosperity in its history. He seized the country of the Pisuerga and the Céa, which belonged to the Kingdom of Leon, conquered Castile, and ruled from the boundaries of Galicia to the Pyrenees. At his death the unfortu- nately divided his possessions among his four sons, so that the eldest, Garcia, received Navare, Guipuscoa, Vizcaya, and small portions of Bearn and Bigorre; Castile and the lands between the Pisuerga and the Céa went to Fernando; to Gonzalo were given Sobrarbe and Ribagorza; the Countship of Aragon was divided between his sons. The country, which had never been again united: Castile was permanently joined to Leon, Aragon enlarged its territory, annex- ing Catalonia, while Navare could no longer extend its dominions, and became in a measure dependent upon its powerful neighbours. Garcia III (1035—54) was succeeded by Sancho III (1054—70), who was murdered by his erstwhile vassals.

In this period of independence the ecclesiastical affairs of the country reached a high state of development. Sancho the Great was brought up at Leyra, which was also for a short time the capital of the Dio- cese of Pamplona. Beside this see, there existed the Bishopric of Oca, which was united in 1079 to that of Pamplona. In 1035 Sancho the Great re-established the See of Palencia, which had been laid waste at the time of the Moorish invasion. When, in 1045, the city of Calahorra was wrested from the Moors, under whose dominion it had been for more than three hundred years, a see was also founded here, which in the same year was united to the See of Najera and, in 1088, that of Alcanena, under which it was to remain at least as long as that of the present diocese of Vitoria. To Sancho the Great, also, the See of Pamplona owed its re-establishment, the king having, for this purpose, convoked a synod at Leyra in 1022 and one at Pam- plona in 1023. These synods likewise instituted a re- form of ecclesiastical life with the above-named con- vers as a centre.

After the murder of Sancho III (1076), Alfonso VI, King of Castile, and Sancho Ramires of Aragon, ruled jointly in Navare; the towns south of the Ebro to- gether with the Basque Provinces fell to Castile, the remainder to Aragon, which retained them until 1134. Sancho Ramires (1078—94) and his son Pedro Sanchez (1094—1104) conquered Huessa; Alfonso el Batallador (the Fighter) (1104—1134), brother of Pedro Sanchez,
secured for the country its greatest territorial expansion. He wrested Tudela from the Moors (1114), reconquered the entire country of Bureia, which had been lost to Navarre in 1042, and advanced into the Province of Burgos; in addition, Roja, Najera, Logroño, Calahorra, and Alfaro were subject to him, and, for a short time, Bayonne, while his ships-of-war lay in the port of Guipuzcoa. The issue (1134), Navarre and Aragon separated. In Aragon, Alfonso’s brother Ramiro became king; in Navarre, García Ramírez, a grandson of Sancho the Great, who was obliged to surrender Rioja to Castile in 1136, and Tarragona to Aragon in 1157, and to declare himself a vassal of King Alfonso VII of Castile. He was utterly dependent upon the revenues of churches and convents. His son, Sancho García el Sabio (the Wise—1150–94), a patron of learning, as well as an accomplished statesman, fortified Navarre within and without, gave charters (fueros) to a number of towns, and was never defeated in battle. The reign of his successor, the last king of the race of Sancho the Great (1194–1224), Sancho el Fuerte (the Strong), was more troubled. He appropriated the revenues of churches and convents, granting them instead important privileges; in 1198 he presented to the See of Pamplona his palaces and possessions in that city, this gift being confirmed by Pope Innocent III on 20 January, 1198. While he was absent in Africa, to which he had been induced to go on an adventurous expedition, the Kings of Castile and Aragon invaded Navarre, and as a consequence, the Provinces of Alava and Guipuzcoa were lost to him.

The greatest glory of Sancho el Fuerte was the part he took in the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa, where, though through his valour, the victory of the Christians over the Calíf En-Nasir was made decisive. When in 1234 he died in retirement (el Encerrado), the Navarrese chose to succeed him Thibault de Champagne, son of Sancho’s sister Blanca, who, from 1234 to 1253, made of his Court a centre where the poetry of the Troubadours was welcomed and fostered, and whose reign was peaceful. His son, Theobald II (1253–70), married Isabel, the second daughter of St. Louis of France, and accompanied the saint upon his crusade to Tunis. On the homeward journey, he died at Trapani in Sicily, and was succeeded by his brother, Henry I, who had already assumed the reins of government in his absence for seven years (1271–74). His daughter Juana not yet being of age, the country was once more invaded from all sides, and the queen mother, Blanca, sought refuge with her daughter at the court of Philip the Bold of France, whose son, Philip the Fair, had already married Juana in 1284. In 1276, at the time of the negotiations for this marriage, Navarre was under French domination, and, until 1285, was subject to Kings Philip the Fair (d. 1314), Louis X Hutin (1314–16), his brother, Philip the Tall (1316–22), and Charles the Fair (1322–28). As Charles died without male issue, and Philip of Valois became King of France, the Navarrese declared themselves independent and called to the throne Joanna II, daughter of John Hutin, and her husband Philip of Evreux (1328–1343), surnamed the Wise. Joanna waived all claim to the throne of France and accepted for the counties of Champagne and Brie those of Angoulême, Longueville, and Mortain.

Philip devoted himself to the improvement of the laws of the country, and joined King Alfonso XI of Castile in battle against the Moors (1343). After the death of his mother (1349), Charles II assumed the reins of government (1349–57), and, on account of his deceit and cruelty received the surname of the Wicked. His eldest son, on the other hand, Charles III, surnamed the Noble, gave the land once more a peaceful and happy government (1357–1425), exerted his strength to the utmost to lift the country from its degenerate condition, reformed the government, built canals, and made navigable the tributaries of the Ebro flowing through Navarre. As he outlived his sons, he was succeeded by his daughter Blanca (1425–42) and her husband John II (1429–79), son of Ferdinando I of Aragon. As John II ruled Aragon in the name of his brother Charles (Charles of France), and the little Prince Carlos (Charles), in Navarre, only with the rank of governor, whereas Blanca had designed that Charles should be king. In 1450, John II himself repaired to Navarre, and, urged on by his ambitious second wife, Juana Enríquez of Castile, endeavoured to obtain the succession for their son Fernando (1452). As a result a clever stratagem of war was built round the family of the Agramonts supported the king and queen, and that of the Beaumonts, called after their leader, the chancellor, John of Beaumont, espoused the cause of Charles; the highlands were on the side of the prince, the plains on that of the king. The unhappy prince was defeated by his father at Aybar, in 1451, and held a prisoner for two years, during which he wrote his famous Chronicle of Navarre, the source of our present knowledge of this subject. After his release, he sought in vain the assistance of King Charles VII of France and of his uncle Alfonso V of Naples; in 1460 he was again imprisoned at the instigation of his step-mother, and the Catalans rose in revolt at this injustice, and he was succeeded by his brother named governor of Catalonia. He died in 1461, without having been able to reconquer his kingdom; he named as his heir his sister Blanca, who was, however, immediately imprisoned by John II, and died in 1464. Her claim descended to her sister Leonor, Countess of Ampurdans and Pelfría, and after her death and that of John II, which occurred almost simultaneously, to her grandson, Francis Phobus (1479–83). His daughter Catharine, who, as a minor, remained under the guardianship of her mother, Madeleine of France, was sought by Ferdinand the Catholic as a bride for his eldest son; but she gave her hand (1494) to the French Count of Perigord, Jean d’Albret, a man of vast possessions. Nevertheless, Ferdinand the Catholic did not relinquish his long-cherished designs on Navarre. As Navarre refused to join the Holy League against France, declared itself neutral, and would have prevented the passage through the country of Ferdinand’s troops, the latter sent his general Don Francisco de Béjar to besiege the strongholds of St. Jean-Pied-de-Port, and the priors of Saint-Pierre-d’Urbist, and Haro. Meanwhile, the administration was united with that of France; it was still called a kingdom. After Henry IV, the kings of France bore also the title King of Navarre. The Basque language is still spoken in most of the provinces.

NAVARRETE, ANDREW L. See New Guinea, Vicariate Apostolic of.

NAVARRETE, DOMINGO FERNÁNDEZ, Dominican missionary and archbishop, b. c. 1610 at Peñafiel in Old Castile; d. 1689 at Santo Domingo. He received his education there and on completion of his studies was offered the chair of Thomistic theology in several Spanish universities. He preferred, however, to devote his life to the conversion of the heathen, and in 1646 with twenty-seven of his brethren left his native land and proceeding by way of Mexico, arrived in the Philippine Islands, 23 June, 1648. He taught theology in the Dominican University of St. Thomas, Manila. In 1657 with several of his brethren he went to China and, after learning the language, took up missionary labour chiefly in the province of Po-ki-en. The persecution which broke out in 1665 brought disaster to the missions. Forbidden to preach, he occupied himself with the care of the sick and with prayer and fasting on the faith. Being harmered too much he went in 1673 as prefect of the Dominican mission to Rome to lay before the authorities there the question of Chinese Rites which had reached an acute stage between the Jesuits on one side and the Dominicans and Franciscans on the other. He was highly esteemed by Innocent XI, who wished to make him bishop of the Chinese missions. He refused the honour, but on his return to Spain in 1677 the pope, at the suggestion of Charles II, forced him to accept the Archdiocese of Santo Domingo, where he laboured with zeal and fidelity till his death. While on the question of Chinese Rites he was opposed to the Jesuits, sometimes attacking them very severely; in his diocese he entertained the highest regard for them. In his letters to the viceroy and to the king, requesting them to permit the fathers of the Society to establish a college in his residential city, he pays them a glowing tribute.

Among his principal works may be mentioned "Tratados históricos, políticos, éticos y religiosos de la monarquía de China" (Madrid, 1676); "Catecismus, lingua sinica", 2 vols.; "De mirabilibus Dei nominibus, lingua sinica", 2 vols.; "Preceptor ethnicus ex optimis quibusque Sinensium libris extractus, ex eorumdem sententias concinnatus, lingua sinica." Quoted in "Immanuel, S. Ord. Pred., II, 720-33; Touron, Hist. dell'Ordine di S. Dominico, V, 627-38."

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

NAVARRETE, JUAN FERNÁNDEZ DE, a Spanish navigator and writer, b. at Avalos (Logroño), 8 November, 1765; d. at Madrid, 8 October, 1844. He received his early education partly in his native town and partly at the seminary of Vergara. At the age of fifteen he entered the navy and a little later in 1782 served with distinction in the unsuccessful operations against Gibraltar. The war was ended in 1783, and he was discharged and joined the Mediterranean fleet. He served in various capacities and among the documents he discovered were the diaries of the first and third voyages of Columbus. Having been cleared of all charges and retired from public life rather than recognize the claims of Joseph Bonaparte who had been seated upon the Spanish throne. In 1814, he was made secretary of the Academy of St. Ferdinand, and from 1824 until his death, was a director of the Academy of History. Several times he was elected to represent his province, but the lower house termed the name of "the Spanish Titian." He returned to Spain a painter of repute, and travelled extensively in his native country, leaving works in his hand from his important cities. In 1658 he was made painter to Philip II, received a salary of two hundred ducats, "besides just payment for his work," and was commissioned to decorate the Escorial. In 1575 he completed a "Nativity," wherein are three dominant lighted candles, one from St. Joseph's candle, one from the glory above, and the most radiant of all from the divine Child as in Correggio's "Notte." In one "Holy Family" he painted such strange accessories, a cat, a dog, and a cartridge, that the king made his promise never again to put "such indecent things in a holy picture." Though called "the Spanish Titian," Navarrete was not an imitator of any Italian; he was an original and he painted rapidly, freely, and spontaneously. His composition, especially in groups of figures, was masterly and was excelled only by that of Velásquez. "He spoke by his pencil with the brusura of Rubens without his coarseness." Navarrete's work greatly influenced the development of Spanish art and after his death Lope de Vega wrote: "No countenance he painted was dumb." Despite the artist's inimitability he was an agreeable companion, played cards, read, and wrote much, was broad-minded and generous. When his patron ordered Titian's "Last Supper" to be cut because it was too large for a place in the refectory of the Escorial, it was el Mudo who protested most. In the refectory at Estrella, where he received his first instruction in painting are some of Navarrete's best pictures. The following works may be mentioned: "Holy Family," at Weimar; "St. John in Prison," at St. Petersburg; "St. Jerome," in the Escorial; "Holy Family," in the Escorial.

los viajes y descubrimientos que hicieron para mar los espacios desde el fin del siglo XV (Madrid, 1825, 37), los cuales han sido publicados en ensayos, y ha sido bien leído y citado. Entre sus obras se encuentra "Don Quijote" y "Coleción de documentos inéditos", publicadas en colaboración con otros investigadores. "Disertación sobre la historia de la náutica" y "Bibliotheca maritima española" son dos obras que fueron publicadas después de su muerte, en 1846 y 1851 respectivamente.

**VENTURA FUENTES.**

Navé, arquitecturalmente la central, espacio abierto de una iglesia, que está dividido en el coro y el altar, y separado del público por una barandilla. En general, está decorado con columnas, pilares, o pilares, es conchero con columnas en arcada, y usualmente está sobre el nivel del suelo de la nave que sirve para el lugar de reposo y para los lectores. Luminosamente, el término es usado para indicar que el coro de una iglesia para los devotos, y que incluye el coro y el altar, separados por arcos y columnas. La nave está compuesta de latín, un tipo, posiblemente con algún referente a la "nave" o "santuario" del "Arco de Noah". El término se usa para designar todos los beneficios, ya sea en el siglo Romanes, o en los siglos siguientes, que tienen ventanas y paredes altas, para la iluminación. Durante los siglos III y IV de la Edad Media, este espacio fue el lugar de reunión de los fieles. En el caso de la Edad Media, los fieles tenían que estar en la nave para el servicio y no en el coro. La nave se hizo mayor para poder albergar más fieles y para poder albergar más eventos. La nave se hizo mayor para poder albergar más fieles y para poder albergar más eventos. La nave se hizo mayor para poder albergar más fieles y para poder albergar más eventos. La nave se hizo mayor para poder albergar más fieles y para poder albergar más eventos.
NAZARETH

crease. All were daughters of pioneer settlers (see KENTUCKY, Religion); their zeal and capacity for good works formed their only dowry. They taught the children, spun wool or flax, and wove it into cloth or into cloth of which they fashioned garments for themselves and for Father David's seminarians, who, on their side, found time in the intervals of study to fell trees, hew logs, and build the seminary and convent. The first log house occupied by the sisters received from Father David the name of Nazareth. This name the mother-house has preserved, and thence the sisters are popularly called "Sisters of Nazareth", being thus distinguished from other Sisters of Charity.

Mother Seton could not spare sisters from Emmettsburg to train the new community, as Bishop Flaget had requested, but she sent him the same copy of the Rule of St. Vincent de Paul which he himself had brought her from France, and Father David carefully attended to the training of the novices. In February, 1816, he found the first sisters sufficiently prepared to take the vows. The little body was fairly organized, and its work was fast extending. Miss Eleanor O'Reilly (Sister Ellen), a scholarly woman and experienced teacher, came to them from Baltimore, and to her the early success of the educational work of Nazareth is largely due. The reputation of Nazareth Academy was soon established, and students, even from a distance, crowded the classrooms, although it was not until 1829 that the Legislature of Kentucky granted its charter to the "Nazareth Literary and Beneficial Institution". Sister Ellen prepared others to assist her, establishing what was virtually a normal school for the sisters, which has been zealously maintained ever since. In 1822 the mother-house was removed to a farm purchased for the purpose near Bardstown. Both the convent church and the academy building were completed in 1825. The sisters, at the same time, never lost sight of their primary work of succouring the sick and the poor. In each of their houses destitute children were cared for. St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum was opened in Louisville, after the cholera epidemic, in 1834. Thenceforth schools, hospitals, and asylums grew apace.

Besides the mother-house, the congregation now has sixteen branch academies and high schools modelled upon it. The sisters teach about 15,000 children in parochial schools, and care for more than 5000 sick in their hospitals and infirmaries. On petition of the present superior, Mother Eutropia McMahon, the congregation received the formal approbation of the Holy See, 3 September, 1910, nearly 98 years after its first foundation.

Marie Menard.

Nazareth, the town of Galilee where the Blessed Virgin dwelt when the Archangel announced to her the Incarnation of the Word, and where Christ lived until the age of thirty years, unknown, and obedient to Mary and Joseph. In the manuscripts of the New Testament, the name occurs in a great orthographical variety, such as Nαζαριν, Nαζαρέω, Nαζαρός, Nαζαρειας, Nαζαρινιας, and the like. In the time of Eusebius and St. Jerome (Onomasticon), its name was Nazara (in modern Arabic, en Nasirah), which therefore, seems to be the correct name: in the New Testament we find its derivatives written Ναζαρην, or Ναζαρίως, but never Ναζαρειας. The etymology of Nazara is nazer, which means "a shoot". The Vulgate renders this word by flos, "flower", in the Prophecy of Isaiah (xi, 1), which is applied to the Saviour. St. Jerome (Epist. xlvii, "Ad Marcellam") gives the same interpretation to the name of the town.

Nazareth is situated in the most southerly hills of the Lebanon range, just before it drops abruptly down to the plain of Esdraelon. The town lies in a hollow plateau about 1200 feet above the level of the Mediterranean, between hills which rise to an altitude of 1610 feet. The ancient Nazareth occupied the triangular tract that extends from the mountain on the north, having its point turned to the south. Its northwestern boundary is marked by several Jewish tombs which have been discovered on the slope of Jebel es Likh. The southeastern limit is the small valley that descends from the beautiful spring called St. Mary's Well, which was, no doubt, the chief attraction for the first settlers. In the last fifty years the population has increased rapidly, and amounts at the present day to more than 7000 souls. The modern houses, white and clean, run up all along the hillsides, especially on the north. Spread out in the shape of an amphitheatre, set in a green framework of vegetation, Nazareth offers to the eye a very attractive picture.

History.—The town is not mentioned in the Old Testament, nor even in the works of Josephus. Yet, it was not such an insignificant hamlet as is generally believed. We know, first, that it possessed a synagogue. Neubauer (La géographie du Talmud, p. 190) quotes, moreover, an elegy on the destruction of Jerusalem, taken from ancient Mishnaic Scripture, according to this document, Nazareth was a home for the priests who went by turns to Jerusalem, for service in the Temple. Up to the time of Constantine, it remained exclusively a Jewish town. St. Epiphanius (Adv. Hæreses, I, ii, her, 19) relates that in 339 Joseph, Count of Tiberias, told him that, by a special order of the emperor, "he built churches to Christ in the towns of the Jews, in which there were none, for the reason that neither Greeks, Samaritans, nor Christians were allowed to settle there, viz., at Tiberias, at Diocesarea, or Sepphoris, at Nazareth, and at Capharnaum". St. Paula and St. Sylvia of Aquitaine visited the shrines of Nazareth towards the end of the fourth century, as well as St. Theodosius about 530; but their short accounts contain no description of its monuments. The Pilgrim of Piacenza saw

St. Mary's Well, Nazareth

Besides the historical works referred to under KENTUCKY and LOUISVILLE, see Spalding, Sketches of Kentucky (1844); Barton, Angel of the Battlefield (1897); Annals of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth; A Brief Historical Sketch of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Kentucky (1908).
there about 570, besides "the dwelling of Mary converted into a basilica", the "ancient synagogue". A little treatise of the same century, entitled "Liber nomenclum locorum ex Actis", speaks of the church of the Annunciation and of another erected on the site of the house "where our Lord was brought up". In 970 Arculf gave Adamnan an interesting description of the basilica of the Annunciation and of the church of the "Nutrition of Jesus".

The toleration which the Moslems showed towards the Christians, after conquering the country in 637, did not last long. Willibald, who visited Nazareth about 725, found only the basilica of the Annunciation, "which the Christians", he says, "often redeemed from the Saracens, when they threatened to destroy it". However, in 808 the author of the "Commemoratorium de casis Dei" found twelve monks at the basilica, and eight at the Precipice, "a mile away from the town". The Greek emperor, John Zimisces, reconquered Galilee from the Arabs in 920, but, five years afterwards, he was poisoned by his eunuchs and his soldiers abandoned the country. The basilica, finally ruined under the reign of the Calif Hakem (1010), was rebuilt by the crusaders in 1101, as well as the church of the Nutrition, or St. Joseph's House. At the same time the Greeks erected the church of St. Gabriel near the Virgin's Well. The archiepiscopal See of Scythopolis was also transferred to Nazareth. After the disastrous battle of Hattin (1187), the crusaders, with the European clergy, were compelled to leave the town. On 25th March, 1254, St. Louis and Queen Marguerite celebrated the feast of the Annunciation at Nazareth; but nine years later, the Sultan Bibars completely destroyed all the Christian buildings, and Nazareth soon declined down to a poor village.

In the fourteenth century a few Franciscan Friars established themselves there, among the ruins of the basilica. They had much to suffer during their stay, and many of them were even put to death, especially in 1385, in 1448, and in 1548, when all the friars were driven out of the country. In 1620 Fakher ed Dtn, Emir of the Druses, allowed them to build a church over the Grotto of the Annunciation; but it was ruined some years later by the Bedouins. The Franciscans nevertheless remained near the sanctuary, and in 1730 the powerful Sheikh Daher el Anwar paid them to erect the church which is still to be seen.

In the fourth century, local tradition indicated the house of the Virgin at the top of the southern point of the hill, which rises some 30 feet over the plain. The dwelling consisted of a little building with a grotto in the rear. Even now, Constantine's baths are to be found in Nazareth. Explorations made in 1909, beneath and around the present church, brought to light the whole plan of the ancient basilica of Constantine. It was built from west to east, divided into three naves by two rows of syenite columns, and the grotto was in the north nave. The church followed the same plan, and even kept the two rows of columns; they only added new pillars and gave to the façade, as well as to the apse, the appearance and solidity of a fortress. The Franciscans erected their church across the ancient building, so as to bring the grotto beneath the central nave. The crypt was always three or four feet below the pavement of the church. Since 1730 there have been fifteen steps leading down to the Chapel of the Angel, and two more to the Grotto itself. The chapel is the traditional site of the house, properly so-called, of the Virgin; at the north end of it, the mosaic pavement is well preserved, and is adorned with an inscription in Greek letters which undoubtedly dates from the sixth century. A beautiful altar dedicated to the mystery of the Annunciation occupies the Grotto. On the left are two columns, apparently certainly placed there in the fourth century.

About 300 paces northeast of the basilica of the Annunciation, "the church of the Nutrition" marked the traditional site of St. Joseph's dwelling, where, after the war of the Angel (Matt., i, 20), he received Mary his spouse with the ceremonial prescribed by the law for matrimony. After his return from Egypt, Joseph came back to Nazareth and, with the Virgin and the Divine Child, again occupied his own house. There Jesus was brought up and dwelt till he left the town at the beginning of His public life. Two documents of the fourth century allude to this place, and two others of the sixth and seventh mention the church of the Nutrition, built over it. Excavations carried on in 1909 brought to light the lower layers of a fine church of the twelfth century, from which a staircase hewn in the rock descends to an irregular grotto excavated beneath the sanctuary. Several interesting details answer to the description given by Arculf in 676. The Franciscans are about to rebuild it.

The mountain "whereon the city is built" ends in a row of hills that overlook the town. On the south,
one mile and a half away, the chain of hills terminates abruptly in two precipitous peaks separated by a deep, wild gorge. The western peak is called Jebel el Qalāb, "Mount of the Leap", or "of the Precipice". A monastery built on this mountain, where the Jews would have cast Christ down headlong, was still occupied by eight monks at the beginning of the ninth century. The ruins now to be seen there belong to the convent of the time of the Crusades.


BARNAKAS MEISTERMANN.

Nazareth. See TARNI AND BARLETTA, DIACES OF.

Nazarite (נס, נַעֲרָי), consecrated to God), the name given by the Hebrews to a person set apart and especially consecrated to the Lord. Although Nazarites are not unknown to early Hebrew history, the only specific reference to them in the Law is in Num. (vi, 1-21), a legal section of late origin, and embodying doubtless a codification of a long-standing usage. The regulations here laid down refer only to persons who consecrate themselves to God for a special time in virtue of a temporary vow, but there were also Nazarites for life, and there are even indications pointing to the consecration of children to that state by their parents.

According to the law in Num. (vi, 1-21) Nazarites might be of either sex. They were bound to abstain during the period of their consecration from wine and all intoxicating drink, and even from all products of the vineyard in any form. During the same period the hair must be allowed to grow as a mark of holiness. The Nazaree was forbidden to approach any corpse, even that of his nearest relatives, under pain of defilement and consequent forfeiture of his consecration. If through accident he finds himself defiled by the presence of a corpse, he must shave "the head of his consecration" and repeat the operation on the seventh day. On the eighth day he must present himself at the sanctuary with two turtle doves or young pigeons, one of which was offered as a holocaust and the other for a sin offering. Furthermore, in order to renew the lost consecration, it was necessary to repeat the above solemn rite for a sin offering. At the expiration of the period determined by the vow the Nazarite brought to the sanctuary various offerings, and with symbolic ceremonies including the shaving of the head and the burning of the hair with the fire of the peace offering, he was restored to his former liberty (Num. vi, 13-21). The meaning symbolized by these different rites and regulations was in part negative, separation from things worldly, and partly positive, viz. a greater fulness of life and holiness indicated by the growth of the hair and the importance attached to ceremonial defilement. The existence of a class of perpetual Nazarites is known to us through occasional mention of them in the Old Testament writings, but these references are so few and vague that it is impossible to determine the origin of the institution or its specific regulations, which in some respects at least must have differed from those specified in Num. (vi, 1-21). Thus of Samuel who is called a "Nazarite of God from his mother's womb" (Judges, xiii, 5), it is merely said that "no razor shall touch his head". No mention is made of abstention from wine etc., though it has been plausibly assumed by many commentators, since that restriction is enjoined upon the mother during the time of her pregnancy. That his quality of Nazarite was considered to be independent of defilement through contact with the dead is plain from the account of his subsequent career and the famous exploits attributed to him. The prophet Samuel is generally reckoned among the Nazarites for life, but nothing is known of him in that connexion beyond what is inferred from the promise of his mother: "I will give him to the Lord all the days of his life, and no razor shall come upon his head" (1 Kings, i, 11). It has likewise been inferred (cf. IV Kings, iii, 2) that the Rechabites were consecrated to the Lord by the Nazarite vow, but in view of the context, the protest against drinking wine which forms the basis of the assumption is probably but a manifestation on the part of the clan of their general preference for the simplicity of the nomadic as opposed to the settled life. In the passage of Amos (ii, 11, 12) the Nazarites are expressly mentioned together with the Prophets, as young men raised up by the Lord, and the children of Israel are reproached for giving them wine to drink in violation of their vow. The latest Old Testament reference is in 1 Mach. (iii, 49, 50), where mention is made of a number of "Nazarites that had fulfilled their days." In the prophecy of Jacob (Gen., xlix, 26), according to the Douay Version, Joseph is called a "Nazarite among his brethren" but here the original word nazar should be translated "chief" or "leader" —Nazarite being the equivalent of the defective rendering nazaraeus in the Vulgate. The same remark applies to the parallel passage in Deuteronomy (xxix, 9) and also to Lam., i, 10. The Hebrew noun nazir (Heb. neszerim) stands for "princes" or "nobles".

Nazarites appear in New Testament times, and reference is made to them for that period only in the Gospel and Acts, but also in the works of Josephus (cf. Ant. Jud., xx, vi, 1, and Bell. Jud., II, 1, and in the Talmud (cf. Mishna, Nazir, iii, 6). Familiar among them in first century was the Baptist, of whom the angel announced that he should "drink no wine nor strong drink". He is not explicitly called a Nazaree, nor is there any mention of the unshaven hair, but the severe austerity of his life agrees with the supposed asceticism of the Nazarites. From Acts (xx, 23 sqq.) we learn that the early Jewish Christians occasionally took the temporary Nazarite vow, and it is probable that the vow of St. Paul mentioned in Acts, xviii, 18, was of a similar nature, although the shaving of his head in Cenchre, outside of Palestine, was not in conformity with the rules laid down in the sixth chapter of Numbers, nor with the interpretation of them by the Rabbinical schools of first century (cf. E. J. Paz, Hastings, Dict. of the Bible, s. v. Nazarites.) If we are to believe the legend of Hegesippus quoted by Eusebius ("Hist. Eccl.", II, xxiii), St. James the Less, Bishop of Jerusalem, was a Nazaree, and performed with rigorous exactness all the ascetic practices enjoined by that rule of life.


JAMES F. DISCOLL.

Nazarus, Saint, fourteenth abbot of the monastery of Lerins, probably sometime during the reign of the Merovingian Clootair II, 584-629. He successfully attacked the remnants of heathendom on the southern coast of France, overthrew a sanctuary of Venus near Cannes, and founded on its site a convent for women, which was destroyed by the Saracens in the eighth century. His name is inscribed on the calendar of saints of the French Church, on 18 November.

Dict. of Christ. Bap., s. v.; Gallia Christiana, ed. Fiolon, III Paris, 1870, 1; P. RICHER.

Nazarus, John Paul, Dominican theologian, b. in 1556 at Cremona; d. in 1645 or 1646 at Bologna. He entered the order at an early age in his native
town and from the beginning was noted for his spiritual and love of study. It is most probable that he studied divinity and theology in the University of Bologna. He taught with great success in various schools of his order in Italy. In 1592 he was sent by Clement VIII and the General of the Dominicans, Beccaria, to accompany the Apostolic Nuncio to Prague to combat the prevailing heresies. There he spent three years teaching in the Studium Generale of the province, preaching on the University, and defending the faith against the errors of the innovators. Returning to Italy in 1596 he became regent of studies in the convent at Milan. The following year the pope appointed him to defend in a public debate at Chiavenna the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass against Calvinistic proceedings of the Universal church. His demonstration of the absolute truths of the faith was such a triumph that his services were sought in other parts of the country. In 1620 the citizens of Milan chose him as ambassador to the Court of Philip III of Spain to adjust certain matters of importance to Milan; in May, 1622 he represented as delegate the province of Lombardy at the general chapter held at Milan. He spent the close of his life at Bologna where he occupied himself with teaching and writing. Of his works the following are the most important: "Commentaria et Controversiae in primam partem Summe S. Thomae" (Bologna, 1620) and "in tertiam partem Summe S. Thomae" (Bologna, 1625); "Opera varia theologica et philosophica" (Bologna, 1629); his commentary on the Acts of the Apostles; "De SS. Patrum et doctorum Ecclesiae auctoritate in doctrina theologica" (Bologna, 1633).

Joseph Schroeder.

**Nazarius and Companions, Saints.** In the Roman Martyrology and that of Bede for 12 June mention is made of four Roman martyrs at Bolschioria: Cyrius, Nabor, and Nazarius, who suffered death under Diocletian. Their names were taken from the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum," in the Berne MS. of which (ed. De Rossi-Duschesne, Acta SS., Nov. II [177]) we read: Rome, via Aurelia millario V, Basilica, Tribuli, Nagesi, Magdala, Dini, Aureli, Nazarius. The name Cyrius is mentioned as second name in the list, Tribulus, is derived from a place-name, Tripoli, as is evident from the Echternach MS., and those following it have also an African origin. In an ancient itinerary to the graves of the Roman martyrs (De Rossi, "Roma Sottierranei," I, 183) mention is made of a mortuary chapel of a martyr at Bolschioria, Nazarius, Nabor, Beatus and Cyrius, whose feast is on 10 June. The group of three Roman saints, Cyrius, Nabor, Nazarius, to which was added later Basilides, has in the "Sacramentarium Gelasianum" (ed. Wilson, Oxford, 1884, 174-5) its special form of invocation in the Canon of the Mass. The date and the circumstances of the deaths of Cyrius, Nabor, and Nazarius, and the bones of Saint Nazarius and Nabor were transferred by Bishop Chrodegang of Metz to his diocese (Mon. Germ. Hist., Script., II, 203).

Quoted: Acta SS., June, II, 511 sqq.; Questum, Les martyrologes hist. du moyen-age (Paris, 1906), 31, 325, 374, etc. See also the Martyrology der Christl. Gemeinde zu Rom (Leipzig, 1901), 156 sqq.

J. P. Kirks.

**Nazianzus,** titular metropolitan see of Cappadocia Tertia. Nazianzus was a small town the history of which is completely unknown. It is the modern village of Nenizi east of Ak-Serai (formerly Archealis), in the villayet of Koniah, but has sometimes been wrongly identified with Diosarea. At the beginning of the fourth century Nazianzus was suffragan to Cappadocia; under Valens it formed part of Cappadocia Secunda, the metropolis of which was Tyana. Later it depended on Cappadocia Tertia and on Moeceus, and finally became a metropolitan see under the Emperor Diogenes. In 370 it was united to the metropolitan See of Cesarea. Up to the year 1200, fourteen of its bishops are known. Its name is inseparably connected with its illustrious doctor and poet-bishop, St. Gregory.

Smith, D.D., Greek and Roman Geo., s. v., Diosareae, Nazia, R. H. Major, Hist. of Early Church, 258, 269, 368; Curtius, Christl. Gesch. (1740), I, 409; Mischler and Mullen, Ada patriarcalis Constantinop. 1 (Vienna, 1860), 465, 536; see Mullen's notes to Polyeon, ed. Drob. I, 878.

S. Pétrides.

**Neale, Leonard,** second Archbishop of Baltimore, b. near Port Tobacco, Charles County, Maryland, 15 Oct., 1746; d. at Georgetown, D. C., 18 June, 1817. He was a descendant of Captain James Neale, the founder of the family in America, who settled in Maryland as early as 1642. At twelve Leonard was sent to the Jesuit College at St. Omeris in French Flanders. Thence he went to Bruges, and later to Liège, where he was ordained a Jesuit priest. On the suppression of the Society of Jesus, Father Neale, together with the English Jesuits, repaired to England, where he engaged in pastoral work for many years; but, in response to his petition for a foreign mission, he was assigned to Demarara, in British Guiana, South America, where he laboured from 1779-83. Discouraged by the slow improvement of the people, and with health impaired by the climate, he set sail for America in January, 1784, arriving in Maryland, where he engaged once more himself with his former Jesuit brethren of the Society of Jesus, among them the Rev. John Carroll. During the yellow fever epidemic in Philadelphia, in 1793, the two priests of that city were stricken, and Father Neale gladly took their place. For nearly six years he remained there, acting as vicar-general to the then

J. P. Kirks.
Bishop Carroll of Baltimore. During the second visitation of the yellow fever to Philadelphia in 1797-8, he was overtaken by the dread disease.

In 1798 Bishop Carroll called Father Neale from Philadelphia to succeed Rev. Dr. Dubourg in the presidency of the college at Georgetown. He acted in the dual capacity of president and tutor for several years and under his guidance, the institution was elevated from an academy into a college in 1801. The venerable Bishop Carroll had some time previous to this applied to Rome to name Father Neale as his coadjutor. He was consecrated by Bishop Carroll in 1800, but remained as President of Georgetown until 1806 when he was succeeded by the Rev. Father Moreau.

Up to the death of Archbishop Carroll on 3 December, 1815, Bishop Neale succeeded him and received the pallium from Pius VII the following year. Already nearly seventy years old, he lived most of the time at Georgetown in quiet and retirement, but when his duties as the highest dignitary of the Church in the United States called him to Baltimore, he was remarkably energetic for one of his age and feeble health. While in Philadelphia, Father Neale had made the acquaintance of Miss Alice Lalor, through whose aid he started a small school conducted by three ladies, which was destined to be the seed of a great religious order of female teachers in America. This school was broken up by the stages of yellow fever, but the present institution is revisited by Bishop Neale who requested Miss Lalor with another lady from Philadelphia to come to Georgetown. They associated themselves with the Order of St. Clare, or Poor Clares. In 1805, on the death of their Abbess, the Poor Clares returned to Europe, selling their convent property to Bishop Neale, who conveyed it to Miss Lalor and her associates, who submitted to enter into simple vows in 1813. After his accession to the See of Baltimore, the archbishop petitioned Pius VII for the regular establishment of a monastery of the Order of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary at Georgetown, which request was readily granted.

His health failing, Archbishop Neale applied to Rome to have Bishop Cheverus of Boston associated with him in governing the Diocese of Baltimore with right of succession. But Bishop Cheverus objected, proposing instead that a coadjutor be appointed with right of succession. To this the archbishop agreed, and Rev. Ambrose Maréchal was selected by Archbishop Neale as the person to be appointed as his coadjutor. By a decree of Pius VII, dated 24 July, 1817, Father Maréchal was appointed coadjutor with right of succession, under the title of Bishop of Stauropolis in partibus infidelium, but before the arrival of the brief the venerable archbishop had already died.

**Nebo, Mount** (Heb. מֵנָב, LXX.: Ναβανός), a mountain of the Abrim (q. v.) range east of Jordan and the Dead Sea, from which Moses surveyed the Promised Land (Deut., xxxii, 49), and where he died (ibid., xxxiv, i, 5). The same is probably mentioned in the wandering in the wilderness (Deut., xxvii, 47): “And departing from Helmondelathaim, they came to the mountains of Abarim over against Nabo” (Heb. Nebo), though here the reference may be to the town (see Nabo). The location of Mount Nebo is doubtful. A comparison of Deut., iii, 27 (cf. Num., xxvii, 12) with Deut., xxxii, 49 indicates that the “top of Phaega” and the “mountains of the high place” of Helmondelathaim are identical. Difficulty arises in that from no point of the Abarim range does it seem possible to behold all the territory mentioned in Deut., xxxiv, 1-3, especially if the “furthest sea” means the Mediterranean sea, as in Deut., xi, 24. By some Nebo is identified with the modern Jebel Neba, an oblong ridge on an elevated plateau five miles south-west of Hesebon, 2700 feet above sea level.

**Hummelauer, Comment. in Deut. (Paris, 1901), 211,533,550 sqq.** Giere, Hours with the Bible, VI (New York, 1890), 150; Butler in Introd. Crit. Comment. (New York, 1898), Deuteronomy, Chap. xxiv.

**James F. Driscoll.**

**Nebraska,** meaning in English, “shallow water,” occupies geographically a central location among the states of the Union and is a part of the Louisiana territory, purchased from France in 1803. It is bounded on the north by South Dakota; on the east by the Missouri River, which separates it from Iowa, and the north-west corner of Missouri; on the south by Kansas and Colorado; and on the west by Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana. It has an area of 76,840 square miles. The surface of the state is mainly an undulating plain with a gradual upgrade from south-east to north-west of about 2300 feet. It is drained by several streams, the principal being the Platte, which is formed by the junction of two forks rising in the Rocky Mountains and flowing east through the centre of the state to the Missouri, and receives many tributaries in its course. The Niobrara flows north to the Missouri, and the Republican in the south empties into the Kansas River. Except at certain seasons, all those rivers are shallow. The population by the census of 1910 is 1,192,214. The climate is exceptionally fine. The mountain breezes sweep over the plains and owing to the splendid drainage, the atmosphere, purged of all malaria, is dry and exhilarating. The annual mean temperature is about 48° Fahrenheit; in winter, 22° and in mid-summer, 75°. The winters are comparatively short and the summers free from excessive heat and humidity.

**Resources.—Nebraska may be described as altogether an agricultural state, being practically without minerals. Deposits of coal have been discovered only in very small quantities. Building stone of the limestone varieties is also found, but not extensively. Excepting in the north-west where there is a barren tract, known as the Bad Lands, rich in fossil remains, the soil is a deep, rich loam, exceedingly fertile. Professor Aughey in Nebraska, its Advantages, Resources, etc., says “One of the most remarkable deposits, and most valuable for settled purposes, in the world, prevails over three fourths of the surface of Nebraska. It is known as the lacustrine or loess deposit.” Beneath this there is a porous subsoil which enables Nebraska to stand a drought much longer than any of the bordering states. The report of the monetary value of Nebraska's farm output for 1909 is extraordinary, when we recollect how recently this territory was part of the desert and so designated on the maps. The accompanying table is taken from the carefully prepared report of H. M. Bushnell's Trade Review, published in Lincoln.

The report covering the manufactures of Nebraska for 1908, issued in August, 1909, by the State Bureau of Labour and Statistics, gives the amount of capital invested as $90,593,659, and the year's output at $100,232,792. The total value of all deeded land, in 1909, embracing 34,419,471 acres, was $1,015,040,225. For 1909, the total valuation of all property in the state exclusive of railroads, was $1,722,197,270; the
valuation of railroads being $274,044,325. The means of communication is almost exclusively by railroads, of which there are 6105 miles in operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>169,179,137 bushels</td>
<td>$93,048,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>50,315,900 bu.</td>
<td>$35,880,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>29,770,479 bu.</td>
<td>$23,561,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>5,600,260 tons</td>
<td>$59,285,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfalfa</td>
<td>1,077,777 cwt.</td>
<td>$22,513,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,257,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,379,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,399,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley, rye, and canes</td>
<td>4,047,948 bus.</td>
<td>$3,794,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>7,366,497 bu.</td>
<td>$5,928,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaches</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,514,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy products</td>
<td></td>
<td>$36,743,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor crops, beets, fruit, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$402,579,085</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATION AND RELIGION.—Educational facilities are exceptionally good. The State University, founded 15 February, 1869, enjoys a high reputation as an institution of learning, especially in all technical branches of science. The professors and teaching staff number 250 persons, with an attendance of 3611 students. The appropriation for actual expenses for the two years ending 31 March, 1911, amounts to $1,238,000. There are 6930 public schools, of which 103 are normal training high schools. The total expenditure for schools for year ending 13 July, 1908, was $6,418,542. Of the amount, $1,340,610, is derived from the state, and the rest is derived from state and federal sources. The state and federal governments provide $60,000, and the principal amount is derived from the local school corporations. Catholic education is well provided for. Besides Creighton University, there are one college for boys, fifteen convent boarding schools for girls, and, including some district schools, practically Catholic, there are one hundred and four parochial schools with an attendance of 7,013 pupils. Of these, 75 are parochial schools under the control of the State University, and three are recognized by the state for normal training work. Of non-Catholic educational institutions, the principal are: Wesleyan University (Methodist), and Cotner University (Christian), both near Lincoln; Bellevue College (Presbyterian) near Omaha; Doane College (Congregational) at Crete; Brownell College (Episcopalian) at Omaha. Other institutions under state control include one penitentiary, one reform school, two industrial homes, three insane asylums, one Home for the Friendless, one institute for the feeble-minded, one hospital for crippled and deformed children, one institute for the blind, one for the deaf and dumb, two homes for soldiers; and five hospitals controlled by the Sisters of St. Francis; two orphan asylums, containing 210 inmates; a reformatory for women, managed by the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; one Industrial and Reform school. The Methodist and Presbyterian have each a hospital at Omaha.

The Constitution of Nebraska guarantees complete freedom of worship and equal rights to men of every creed, but recognition is given to the pre-eminence of Christianity. While there is no law specially directed against blasphemy, there is a statute against profanity which imposes a fine of twenty-five cents for each offense on all over fourteen years who profanely swear by the name of God, Jesus Christ, or the Holy Ghost (sec. 242, Proc. Crim. Code Neb.). The observance of Sunday by abstinence from all unnecessary labour is enforced by state and local ordinances with reasonable strictness, an exemption being made in favour of those who, by a precept of their religion, observe the sabbath as the first day of the week, are administered by raising the right hand and calling God to witness; where conscientious convictions interpose, an affirmation can be made instead. Both houses of the legislature are opened with prayer by a chaplain, appointed to hold office during the session. Statutory law exempts the priest from revealing communications made under seal of the confessional without the consent of the informant (sec. 228, Civil Code, Neb.). Christmas Day is the only religious holiday recognized as such by law.

Ecclesiastical property, by diocesan statute, is vested in the bishop as trustee, but there is no civil statute so ordering. Under secs. 4193-4, Corporations, 1900, Nebraska Civil Code, each parochial church is to organize and incorporate in the manner provided: "The chief, or presiding or executive officer of the religious bodies, sects, and denominations mentioned in the first section of this act, may, at such place in this state as he may appoint for the purpose, convene a meeting of himself and some other officer subordinate to himself, having general jurisdiction throughout the state or part of the state aforesaid, and the priest, presbyter, or clergyman of the proposed church, parish or society, and at least two laymen, residents within the limits thereof, of which the said chief, etc. shall be president and one of the other persons present shall be secretary." These five persons shall then adopt articles of incorporation and shall have power to name the church or parish, decide the manner in which it shall contract and be bound for debts, or convey, encumber or charge the property, regulate succession of members, fill vacancies, name time corporation is to last and decide by what officers its affairs shall be conducted. Under this last clause the diocesan regulation can be changed, as 182,610 votes in a diocesan affair shall be conducted in the parish or church. If five persons neglect to file articles of incorporation for the parish, the diocesan regulation investing the property in the bishop, as trustee, has no recognition from the civil law, and without a supplementary act in amendment, a transfer of the property by the bishop, as trustee, will be ineffective. The five are acts of the organization of the parish, adopted the diocesan rule and then filed articles of incorporation, that the action of the bishop, as trustee, would be legal. Otherwise, the neglect to incorporate obstructs the operation of the diocesan statute. Churches, parochial schools, and charitable institutions are exempt from taxation, and clergymen are also exempt from personal taxes and are not liable to military or jury service. Catholic priests have free access to all state institutions and their courteous treatment has been a rule without exception.

The status of the Bible in the public schools has been the subject of contention, but the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1872 reversed the State of Nebraska, and the decision was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1872. In 1899, a teacher in a Gage County school obtained permission from the local school board to have religious exercises during school hours. The reading of the Bible was a feature of the exercises. One Daniel Freeman, a free-thinker, whose children attended the school, objected. The question was referred to the state superintendent, who ruled against Freeman. In the meantime Freeman began an action at law in the Gage County District Court; the decision was against him. The case was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States and the judgment of the lower court was reversed. Commissioner Armes decided that the reading of the Bible in the public schools was a breach of the Constitution. In this opinion, Commissioners Duffie and Albert coincided. Judge Sedgwick coincided on the ground that the instruction was sectarian. Judge Holcomb also coincided as to the particular case, but held that, excepting its use for sectarian purposes, the reading of the Bible was discretionary with the school authorities (State of Nebraska, ex rel. Daniel Freeman, 101 U.S. 592 (1881), 20 L.Ed. 553). A motion for rehearing was filed 21 January, 1903, and Chief-Justice Sullivan, while overruling the motion for a rehearing, gave the opinion, that "The section of the Constitution which provided that no sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by the public..."
funds set apart for educational purposes cannot, under any canon of construction with which we are acquainted, be claimed as the property of the state, and, in any part of it, from Genesis to Revelation, may be read in the educational institutions fostered by the state. We do not wish to be understood as either countenancing or discountenancing the reading of the Bible in the public schools. Even where it is an irri
tant element, the question, whether its legitimate use shall be allowed or disapproved, is an administrative
and not a judicial question; it belongs to the school authorities and not the courts. The motion for a
rehearing is overruled and the judgment heretofore rendered is adhered to” (ibid., p. 887).

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.—Subject to procuring a
civil license, marriage can be legally performed by
both parties on the same day, and many outsiders were taking advantage of it. To stop this, amendatory enactments were passed by the legislature of 1909. At present, no divorce can be
grant for any cause unless petitioner has had one
year’s actual residence in the state immediately before
bringing suit and shall then have a bona fide intention
of remaining a resident of the state. The parties
unless the marriage was solemnized in the state and
the parties shall have resided therein from the time of
marriage to the filing of petition. No person shall be
etitled to a divorce for any cause arising outside of
the state unless petitioner or defendant shall have re
sided in the same state for at least five years next before
bringing suit for divorce, with a bondfiled in the office
of the clerk, making his or her permanent home in Nebraska.

Liquor Laws.—Liquor laws are strict and well
enforced. The manufacture or sale of intoxicating
liquor is forbidden in many of the smaller towns and
cities, and notably in Lincoln, the capital. Where
the trade is licensed, it is under the system known as high
license and subject to the operation of the Slough
law, the most effective law ever passed for a severe
regulation of the liquor traffic under the license sys
tem. Under its provisions, treating is a misdemeanour
subject to fine; selling to minors is punished by severe
penalties, and the saloon-keeper and those on his bond
are liable to a maximum of $5,000 damages at the
suit of any woman whose husband has been allowed to
become a habitual drunkard by frequenting the saloon
keeper’s place of business. By statute passed during
the legislature of 1909, saloons can sell liquor only be
between the hours of 7 A. M. and 8 P. M. on week days.
Sunday trading is forbidden and the law rigidly
enforced.

History.—(1) Civil.—Up to 1541 the history of
Nebraska is a blank. In that year it is claimed that
Francisco Vasquez de Coronado led a party of Span
iards in search for the fabled Kingdom of Quivira,
supposed to be a land of boundless wealth. It is
claimed that he reached 40° N. Lat., which is the
south boundary line of Nebraska. This is disputed
and critics claim that he did not come further north
than a point in Kansas, near Junction City. In 1662
another Quivira Expedition set forth under command of Don Diego, Count of Pene
losa, and accompanied by Father Nicholas de Freytas who wrote an elaborate and detailed account of
the expedition. It is claimed Penalessa reached the Platte,
where he found a very populous city belonging to
Quivira. As it was burned in one night, it could have been but a large Indian village. Penalessa returned
to Mexico in June, 1662. Not much credence is given to
the story of Penalessa. In 1673 Spain claimed all the
trans-Mississippi region, but ten years later La
Salle asserted the sovereignty of France. In 1762
the French relinquished this territory to Spain, but it was reseeded to France in 1800; finally in 1803
under the name of Louisiana was purchased into the possession of the United States. In
many American works the statement is made, that
the first white men to visit and give a description of
Nebraska were Lewis and Clark. This is incorrect.
The sixth volume of Pierre Margry’s “Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l’Amérique” 
(Paris, 1856) now in the library of the St. Louis Historical Society, contains the records of several expeditions to the regions between the Mississippi and the
Missouri and further west. Among them is the original report of the journey of Pierre and Paul Mallet and
their companions across Nebraska on a mission to
Santa Fé to open up trade facilities with the Spaniards
of New Mexico. The party consisted of ten men, and their companions were Philippe Robitaille, Louis
Morin, Michel Beslot, Joseph Belcourt, also Can-
dians, and Jean David, a native of France.

The report reads: “To understand the route taken
by these Canadians to discover New Mexico, it is well
known that it is 100 leagues from the Canones
[Indians] to those of the Missouri on the river of
that name; 80 leagues from there to the Canzes
[Kansas]; 100 leagues from the Kansas to the Octocto-
tates [Otoes] and 80 from there to where the river of
the Panimahas [Omahas] empties into the Missouri
[Omaha Creek in the north-east of Nebraska].” This
nation is located at the mouth of the river of
their name and it was there the discoverers took their
starting-point, 29 May, 1739. All who had hitherto
attempted to reach New Mexico thought they could
find it at the sources of the Missouri, and with that
idea had gone up as far as the Ricaras [Indians], more
than 150 leagues above the Panis [Pawnees], with
which they confounded the modern Omahas and
Omahas. The discoverers, on the advice of some of the
aborigines, took an entirely different direction and
leaving the Pawnees took a route across the country,
retracing their steps almost in parallel with the Missouri.
On 2 June, they met with a river which they called the
Plate [Platte] and seeing that it did not diverge from
the route they had mapped out, they followed up its
right bank for about 25 leagues when they found it
made a fork with the river of the Padocas which empr
ties itself at this point. Three days after that, on
13 June, they crossed to the left bank of said river.
On the fifteen and sixteenth they continued across the
country and on the seventeenth they fell upon another river
which they named Des Costes Blanches. During these
three days, they crossed a country of plains where they
found barely enough wood to make fires and it appears
from their Journal that these plains extended all the
way to the mountains near Santa Fé. On the six-
teenth they camped on the banks of another river
which they crossed and named Rivière Aimable. On
the seventeenth they continued on another river called Rivière des Soucis. On the twentieth they
struck the Rivière des Cances. This river was prob
ably not the Kansas but the Arkansas River. In
any case, both are south of the Nebraska state line, mak
ing it clear that these French Canadian Catholics,
Pierre and Paul Mallet, crossed Nebraska in a south-westerly direction in 1739 on their way to Santa Fé and gave an authentic account of the territory sixty-five years before Lewis and Clark visited it.

Subsequent to that date, many French Canadians and French creoles of Louisiana made their homes in Nebraska; they were bounted upon by the fur-trading expeditions, which married Indian women and lived under the protection of the tribes with which they had become related. When allotting land to the Indians, the government set aside a tract in the north-east part of the state called the "Half-Breed Tract", the French Canadians who had married Indian women settled on this land. Among those who came were Charles Rouleau, Henry Fontenelle, and Michel Barada, who had towns named after them. Sarpys county is also called after a French creole, named Louis Sarpys. As late as 1846, Nebraska had practically no other population than the Omahas, Otoes, Poncas, Pawnees, and Sioux. In that year occurred the Mormon migration and a temporary settlement in the desert was made by them at Florence, near Omaha, lasting for about a year, until they moved on to Utah. The first permanent white settlers came in the train of the '49 rush to California, and on 30 May, 1854, Nebraska was organized as a territory with an area of 351,558 square miles, reaching from 40° N. lat. to 49° N. lat., and from the Missouri to the Rocky Mountains. This was finally cut down to the present area of the state. The creation of the Kansas and Nebraska territories was the cause of the bitter quarrel between the slavery and anti-slavery parties and ultimately led to the secession of the southern states. On 1 March, 1867, President Johnson proclaimed Nebraska a state and added the thirty-seventh star to the American flag. After the Civil War, many of the discharged soldiers secured grants of Nebraska land under the Homestead Law. They were followed by men who worked in the construction of the Union Pacific and Burlington railroads and who bought the land donated to the railroad companies. There was a steady inflow of immigrants and land-seekers until the visitation of the grasshopper plague in 1874, when many settlers became discouraged and left the state. But the rush for land was on, the grasshoppers were forgotten, and an increasing stream of immigration poured in. The state is now divided into numerous counties, the first state in the Union to allow foreign-born immigrants, but the Germans are the most numerous, followed by the Scandinavians, Irish, Bohemians, and British in the order named. In late years Italians have become an immigrating element, but not to any considerable extent. Although the first to enter the state, French Canadian immigrants are not numerous.

Catholic Immigration.—While many Catholics were among the immigrants subsequent to 1849, there was no attempt at Catholic colonization until 1855, when Father Tracy induced a number of Irish families to settle in Dakota County, where their descendants constitute the wealthiest and most prominent section. The inhabitants of the town of O'Neill with eighteen Irish Catholics from Boston, colonized a tract in Holt County; they were followed by others, and a town was laid out which they named O'Neill. O'Neill is now one of the most progressive cities north of the Platte and the centre of a prosperous Catholic community. In 1877 some of those who went to Holt County with General O'Neill, dissatisfied with the outlook there, took up land in Greeley County. In compliment to Bishop James O'Connor of Omaha, General O'Neill named his first town site, O'Connor. The town was subsequently moved to where the church and convent of O'Connor now stand, while the present county seat, Greeley Center, was built half a mile north of the creek. A Catholic company was formed and a tract of land was secured by Bishop O'Connor, John Fitzgerald, William Quan, and William J. Onahan of Chicago, and others, and sold at $2 per acre to Irish colonists from Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. This is now a very prosperous Catholic section embracing the thriving towns of Greely Center, Spalding, and Scotia, and comprising a wealthy farming population. Land purchased at $2 per acre is appraised in 1910 at from $60 to $100 per acre. Besides these organized colonies, many Irish Catholic families drifted into Nebraska during the years preceding 1874. During that period there was also a comparatively large immigration of German Catholics, but without any regular effort at colonization. The growth of the Catholic priest. Platte County is almost entirely populated by German Catholics, the immigration being largely due to the efforts of Father Ambrose, O.F.M., the first Franciscan priest in that section. In Cedar County, there are eight large parishes of German Catholics, who were induced to settle in that district during the same period by the late Father Daxscher, the first pastor of St. Helena in that county. South of the Platte there are also several well-to-do German settlements, but no distinct colonies. There is an Austrian settlement at Bellwood in Buffalo County. Bohemian Catholics are quite numerous north and south of the Platte. The Catholic immigration into Nebraska since the year 1874 has largely settled this land have prospered in a measure beyond their most sanguine expectations. A pleasing feature in regard to Catholic settlement in Nebraska is the frequent intermarriages between the young people of different races, especially between the Irish and German elements.

Catholics hold prominent positions in the political, social, and industrial life of the state. Out of the counties in Nebraska has not yet had a Catholic Governor. Prominent among the benefactors and builders of the state have been Edward and John Creighton, founders of Creighton University and other beneficial institutions in Omaha. John Fitzgerald of Lincoln was also a generous benefactor to Catholic works, religious and educational, in this and other cities. John A. McShane represented the then First Nebraska district in Congress in 1886 and in 1888 was the unsuccessful candidate for governor in opposition to General John M. Thayer. Constantine J. Smyth was attorney-general of the state from 1897 to 1901. The first Catholic newspaper in Nebraska was the Catholic News, which was established in 1867.

(2) Ecclesiastical History.—Ecclesiastically, Nebraska was first under the jurisdiction of the Franciscan Bernard Boil, Provincial of the Franciscans in Spain, according to the Bull of Alexander VI, dated 25 June, 1493. Theoretically, it became part of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Spain until 1682, when it passed over to the spiritual domain of the Bishop of Quebec. In 1776 it became subject to the Diocese of Quebec, Canada. General O'Neill, with eighteen Irish Catholics from Boston, colonized a tract in Holt County; they were followed by others, and a town was laid out which they named O'Neill. O'Neill is now one of the most progressive cities north of the Platte and the centre of a prosperous Catholic community. In 1877 some of those who went to Holt County with General O'Neill, dissatisfied with the outlook there, took up land in Greeley County. In compliment to Bishop James O'Connor of Omaha, General O'Neill named his first town site, O'Connor. The town was subsequently moved to where the church and convent of O'Connor now stand, while the present county seat, Greeley Center, was built half a mile north of the creek. A Catholic company was formed and a tract of land was secured by Bishop O'Connor, John Fitzgerald, William Quan, and William J. Onahan of Chicago, and others, and sold at $2 per acre to Irish colonists from Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. This is now a very prosperous Catholic section embracing the thriving towns of Greely Center, Spalding, and Scotia, and comprising a wealthy farming population. Land purchased at $2 per acre is appraised in 1910 at from $60 to $100 per acre. Besides these organized colonies, many Irish Catholic families drifted into Nebraska during the years preceding 1874. During that period there was also a comparatively large immigration of German Catholics, but without any regular effort at colonization. The growth of the Catholic priest. Platte County is almost entirely populated by German Catholics, the immigration being largely due to the efforts of Father Ambrose, O.F.M., the first Franciscan priest in that section. In Cedar County, there are eight large parishes of German Catholics, who were induced to settle in that district during the same period by the late Father Daxscher, the first pastor of St. Helena in that county. South of the Platte there are also several well-to-do German settlements, but no distinct colonies. There is an Austrian settlement at Bellwood in Buffalo County. Bohemian Catholics are quite numerous north and south of the Platte. The Catholic immigration into Nebraska since the year 1874 has largely settled this land have prospered in a measure beyond their most sanguine expectations. A pleasing feature in regard to Catholic settlement in Nebraska is the frequent intermarriages between the young people of different races, especially between the Irish and German elements.

Catholics hold prominent positions in the political, social, and industrial life of the state. Out of the counties in Nebraska has not yet had a Catholic Governor. Prominent among the benefactors and builders of the state have been Edward and John Creighton, founders of Creighton University and other beneficial institutions in Omaha. John Fitzgerald of Lincoln was also a generous benefactor to Catholic works, religious and educational, in this and other cities. John A. McShane represented the then First Nebraska district in Congress in 1886 and in 1888 was the unsuccessful candidate for governor in opposition to General John M. Thayer. Constantine J. Smyth was attorney-general of the state from 1897 to 1901. The first Catholic newspaper in Nebraska was the Catholic News, which was established in 1867.
State of Nebraska became the Diocese of Omaha, with the then viceroyal-Apostolic, Rt. Rev. James O’Connor, as Catholics beheld the joy of special enunciation. For the last week in September, 1900, the following figures were given as the numerical strength of the various non-Catholic denominations in Nebraska: Methodists, 64,352; Lutherans, 59,485; Presbyterians, 23,862; Disciples (Christians), 19,613; Baptists, 17,599; Congregationalists, 16,629; Evangelicals, 6,583; United Brethren, 6,086; and all other Protestants, 19,657.

Curtis, Neb. Its Advantages etc. (New York, 1875); Burnwell, Lincoln Trade Review (Lincoln, 1910); State Bureau Labor and Industrial Statistics (Lincoln, 1909); Nebraska Educational Directory (Lincoln, 1910); Willits, Directory (1910); Reports Nebraska State Historical Society; Magon, Découvertes et Bibliothèque des Français dans l'Amerique Dévoisée (1880); Shaw, The Morton History of Nebraska (Lincoln, 1900).

John P. Sutton.

Nebuchadnezzar. See Nabuchodonosor.

Necessity. In a general way denotes a strict connexion between different beings, or the different elements of a being, or between a being and its existence. It is therefore a primary and fundamental notion, and it has an immediate certitude in its own meanings and applications in philosophy and theology.

In Logic, the Schoolmen, studying the mutual relations of concepts which form the matter of our judgments, divided the judgments or propositions into judgments in necessary matter (in materia necessaria), and judgments in contingent matter (in materia contingens). The judgments in necessary matter were known as propositions per se; they are called by modern philosophers “analytic”, “rational”, “pure”, or “a priori” judgments. The proposicio per se is defined by the Schoolmen as the predicate of which is either a constitutive element or a natural property of the subject in which the case with primary truths, metaphysical, and mathematical principles. (Cf. S. Thom., “In I Anal.”, lect. x and xxxv; “de Anima”, II, lect. xiv.) It is by ignoring the last part of this definition and arbitrarily restricting the concept of analytic judgments to those of which the predicate is a constitutive element of the subject, that Kant invented the false notion of synthetic a priori judgments.

Considered under its metaphysical aspect, being in its relation to existence is divided into necessary and contingent. A necessary being is one of which the existence is included in and identical with its very essence. The different beings which we observe in our daily experience are subject to the beginning, to change, to perfection, and to destruction; existence is not essential to them and they have not in themselves the reason of their existence; they are contingent. Their existence comes to them from an external efficient cause. It is from the real existence of contingent beings that we arrive at the notion and prove the existence of a necessary being—one that produces them but is not produced, one whose existence is its own essence and nature, that is at the same time eternal, all-perfect, infinite, viz., God (see CONTINGENCY). And so in relation to existence, God alone is absolutely necessary; all other beings are contingent.

When we consider the divers beings, not from the point of view of their being, but in relation to their constitution and activity, necessity may be classified as metaphysical, physical, and moral. Metaphysical necessity implies that a thing is what it is, viz., it has the elements essential to its specific nature. It is a metaphysical necessity for God to be infinite, man rational, an animal a living being. Metaphysical necessity is absolute (Plato's Parmenides) in connexion with the activity of the material beings which constitute the universe. While they are contingent as to their existence, contingent also as to their actual relations (for God could have created another order than the present one), they are, however, necessarily determined in their activity, both as to its exercise and its specific extent. This determination is dependent upon certain conditions, the presence of which is required, the absence of one or the other of them preventing altogether the exercise or normal exercise of this activity. The laws of nature should always be understood with that limitation: all conditions being realized. The laws of nature, therefore, being subject to physical necessity, this necessity is absolutely necessary, as materialistic mechanism asserts, nor merely contingent, as the partisans of the philosophy of contingency declare, but they are conditionally or hypothetically necessary. This hypothetical necessity is also called by some consequent necessity. Moral necessity is necessity as applied to the activity of free beings. Man knows the men under certain circumstances, although they are free, will act in such and such a way. It is morally necessary that such a man in such circumstances act honestly; it is morally necessary that several historians, relating certain facts, should tell the truth concerning them. This moral necessity is the basis of historical and moral certitude in its general meanings.

The term is also used with reference to freedom of the will to denote any undue physical or moral influence that might prevent the will from freely choosing to act or not act, to choose one thing in preference to another. The derivatives, necessitation and necessarianism, in their philosophical signification express the doctrine that all events are determined by physical or psychical antecedent conditions (see DETERMINISM; Free Will).

In theology the notion of necessity is sometimes applied with special meaning. Theologians divide necessity into absolute and moral. A thing is said to be absolutely necessary when without it a certain end cannot possibly be reached. Thus revelation is absolutely necessary for man to know the mysteries of faith, and grace to perform any supernatural act. Something is said to be morally necessary when a certain end could, absolutely speaking, be reached without it, but cannot actually and properly be reached without it, under existing conditions. Thus, one may say that, absolutely speaking, as man is able to know all the truths of the natural law or to observe all the precepts of the natural law; but considering the concrete circumstances of human life in the present order, men as a whole cannot actually do so without revelation or grace. Revelation and grace are morally necessary to man to know sufficiently all the truths of the natural law (cf. S. Thom., “Sum. Thol.”, P. Ia, a 1; “Contra Gentil.”, I, iv).

Again, in relation to the means necessary to salvation theologians divide necessity into necessity of means and necessity of precept. In the first case the means is so necessary to salvation that without it (absolute necessity) or its substitute (relative necessity), even if the omission is guiltless, the end cannot be reached. Thus faith and baptism of water are necessary by a necessity of means, the former absolutely, the latter relatively, for salvation. In the second case, necessity is based on a positive precept, commanding some thing the omission of which, unless culpable, does not absolutely prevent the reaching of the end.

Mercer, Ontology (Louvain, 1902), II, 3; Rickert, First Principles of Knowledge (London, 1903), i, v; in General Metaphysics (London, 1901), I, iv.

George M. Sauvage.
NECKAM, (NECHAM), ALEXANDER OF, English scholar, b. in Hertfordshire, 1157; d. at Kennington, Worcestershire, 1217. His first studies were in the abbey school of St. Albans; his higher courses began in Paris, in the school of Petit Pons. In 1180 he commenced his career as teacher with great success, his comprehensive knowledge of philosophy and theology, and his Latin style, both in prose and verse, attracting many students to his lectures. Returning to England in 1184, he was first appointed teacher at Dunstable, and afterwards at St. Albans. After joining the Augustinian Order, he was chosen, in 1213, Abbot of Cirencester.

Neckam was a prolific writer on various subjects, but his works are, for the most part, still in manuscript. He wrote a grammar, commentaries on Scripture, and the works of Aristotle; theological treatises, and sermons. He also translated the Fables of Æsop into elegiac verse. Only two of his works, however, have been printed: the "De naturis rerum" and the poem "De laudibus divinae sapientiae" (ed. Th. Wright in Rolls Series). In the former he discusses the heavens, the stars, the atmosphere, the earth, water, and living creatures. Neckam is the first European author to mention the mariners' compass.


J. P. Kirsch.

Neorelogies, or, as they are more frequently called in France, obituares, are the registers in which religious communities were accustomed to enter the names of the dead—notably their own deceased members, their associates, and their principal benefactors—with a view to the offering of prayers for their souls. The term "neorelogium," which may at first appear a somewhat misnomer, differed almost as much as the form in which the entries were made. There are necrologies connected with cathedral chapters, others (and those the most numerous) belonging to monasteries and religious houses, others to colleges, such as, e. g. the Sorbonne (in Molinier and Longnon, "Obituares", I, 757-52), others to collegiate churches, others again to parishes, while, as for the registers themselves, some are drawn up in the form of marginal entries in martyrologies or calendars, others form a book apart, but arranged according to the days of the month, others again are mere disorderly lists of names, which seem to have been written down just as they were sent in, or as occasion arose. Not less diversified are the rubrics by which these registers were known. Perhaps the commonest was martirologium, because they often took the form of mere additions to the martyrologium, or list of martyrs and saints commemorated on each day. We find also necrologium, memoriae mortuorum, or memoriale fratum, mortuolatum, liber obituariorum, liber obituariorum, and, more rarely, liber mortuorum, sometimes, owing to its connexion with the calendar, calendarium, sometimes, because the monastic rule was commonly used up in the same book, liber regulae or simply regulae, sometimes, from the occasion when it was read aloud, liber capituli (chapter book), sometimes, in reference to the entries of the names of benefactors, liber fundationum, or liber benefactorum. Also, although Molinier seems to contest this usage ("Les Obituares français", p. 22), such a collection of names, consisting largely of benefactors, was occasionally called liber vitae (book of life).

No better description of the purposes served by these lists and of the spirit which animated the whole institution was ever to be found than that contained in the prologue to the Winchester book of the eleventh century known as the "Hyde Register". In spite of its length, it deserves to be quoted entire: "Behold, in the name of God Almighty and of our Lord Jesus Christ and of His most Holy Mother, the ever-stainless Virgin Mary, and also of the twelve holy Apostles by whose teaching the world is made glorious in the true faith, to whose honor the Minister, which is called the New Minister in distinction to the old monastery hard by, there are set down here in due order the names of brethren and monks, of members of the household also (familiorum), or of benefactors living and dead, that by the perishing memorial of this writing they may be written in the page of the heavenly book, by the virtue of which this family, this family, this family, through Christ's bounty, is fed. And let also the names of all those who have commended themselves to its prayers and its fellowship be recorded here in general, in order that remembrance may be made of them daily in the sacred celebration of the Mass or in the harmonious chanting of psalms. And let the name of each be recited daily by the subdeacon before the altar at the early or principal Mass, and as far as time shall allow let them be recited by him in the sight of the Most High. And after the oblation has been offered to God by the right hand of the cardinal priest who celebrates the Mass, let the names be placed upon the holy altar during the very mystery of the Mass and be commended most humbly to God Almighty: so that as remembrance is made of them upon earth (sicul eorum memoria agitur in terris—a phrase from the Ordinarium Missae), so in the life to come, by His indulgence who alone knows how they stand or are to stand in His Kingdom, those who are of greater merit may be augmented in Heaven, and the account of those who are less worthy may be lightened in His secret judgments. Be ye glad and rejoice that your names are written in Heaven, through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with God the Eternal Father and the Holy Ghost, there remains all honour, power, and such necessary virtues.

This account is particularly interesting, because, although the laying of the necrology upon the altar during Mass afterwards fell into disuse, and the names were read in chapter instead of in choir, still the extract clearly shows that the book of obituares had its origin in the old "dipytchas" (see Dipyrchus), or tables, upon which were formerly entered the names which were read out by the priest at the Commemoration of the Living and the Commemoration of the Dead in the Canon of the Mass. So far as can be seen, the recitation of the names of the defunct bishops in the dipytchas was later on represented by the reading of the martyrologium proper, while the commemoration of the benefactors is represented in the form of a necrology. It will be remembered that in the everyday Requiem Mass (missa quotidiana de functorum) of our Missals, the priest is first directed to pray "pro defunctis episcopis seu sacerdotibus", next "pro fratribus, propinquis et benefactoribus", and lastly "pro omnibus fideli bus defunctis". This corresponds to the entry in the necrology, viz., of those included in the martyrologium, those named in the necrology, and those not specially mentioned at all. The entry of the names of the dead in the register of a monastery or other religious institution, and the consequent participation in the prayers and good works of all its members, was a privilege which, from the eighth century onward, was greatly coveted. Such mutual rights of the insertion of the names of deceased brethren in each other's necrologies was a constant subject of negotiation between different abbeys, etc., and at a somewhat later date it became the custom for monasteries to send messengers with "mortuary rolls" (rotuli) requesting the promise of prayers. The necrology also served as a document for the senders to pray for the deceased brethren of the monasteries who rendered them this service. (But for this see Rotuli)

Although the entries in the extant necrologies of monasteries and cathedrals are generally of the brief-
As parallel to this passage of Homer may be mentioned the sixth book of Virgil’s Æneid, which relates the descent of Æneas into the infernal regions. But here there is no true evocation, and the hero himself goes through the abodes of the souls. Besides these poetical and mythological narratives, several instances of necromantic practices are recorded by historians. At Cape Teneaenus Calliopas evoked the soul of Archilochus, whom he had killed (Plutarch, “De sere navis minvis vindicta”, xvi). Periander, tyrant of Corinth, and one of the seven wise men of Greece, sent messengers to the oracle on the River Acheron to ask his dead wife, Melissa, in what place she had laid a stranger’s deposit. Her phantom appeared twice and, at the second appearance, gave the required information (Herodotus, V, xxxi). King Attalus of Pergamum killed Cleonice, whom he had mistaken for an enemy during the night, and in consequence he could find neither rest nor peace, but his mind was filled with strange fears. After trying many purifications and expiations, he went to the psychopompos of Phigalia, or Heracles, evoked her soul, and received the assurance that his dreams and fears would cease as soon as he should have returned to Sparta. Upon his arrival there he died (Pausanias III, xvii, 8, 9; Plutarch, “De sere num. vindo.”, x; “Vita Cimonis”, vii). After his death, the Spartans sent to Italy for psychagogues to evoke and appease his manes (Plutarch, “Desera num. vindo.”, xvii). Necromancy is mixed with one-ironed spells of the Egyptian kind, and was used by those who desired to know if his son’s sudden death was due to poisoning. He went to the oracle of the dead and, while sleeping in the temple, had a vision of both his father and his son who gave him the desired information (Plutarch, “Consolatio ad Apollonium”, xiv).

Among the Romans, Horace several times alludes to the evocation of the dead (see especially Satires, I, viii, 25 sq.). Cicero testifies that his friend Appius practised necromancy (Tuscul. quaest., I, xvi), and that Vatinius called up souls from the netherworld (in Vatin., vi). The same is asserted of the Emperor Drusus (Tacitus, “Annales”, II, xxviii), Nero (Suetonius, “Nero”, xxiv; Pliny, “Hist. nat.”, XXX, v), and Carus (Die Cassius, LXXVII, xv). The grammarians Apion pretended to have conjured up the soul of Homer, whose country and parents he wished to ascertain (Pliny, “Hist. nat.”, XXX, vi), and Sextus Pompeius consulted the famous Thessalian magician Erichtho to learn from the dead the issue of the struggle between his enemy Octavius Caesar and himself (Dio Cassius, LXXIV, VI). Nothing certain can be said concerning the rites or incantations which were used; they seem to have been very complex, and to have varied in almost every instance. In the Odyssey, Ulysses digs a trench, pours libations around it, and sacrifices black sheep whose blood the shades drink before speaking to him. Lucan (Pharsalia, II, 578) speaks of lengthy incantations, and speaks of warm blood poured into the veins of a corpse as if to restore it to life. Cicero (In Vatin., VI) relates that Vatinius, in connexion with the evocation of the dead, offered to the manes the entrails of children, and St. Gregory Nazianzen mentions that boys and virgins were sacrificed and dissected for conjuring up the dead and divining (Orat. I contra Julianum, xiii, in P. G., XXV, 624).

II. NECROMANCY IN THE BIBLE.—In the Bible necromancy is mentioned chiefly in order to forbid it or to reprove those who have recourse to it. The Hebrew term ‘bôbeth’ (sing., ‘bôboth’) denotes primarily the spirits of the dead, or ‘pythons’, as the Vulgate calls them (Deut., xviii, 11). The ‘bôbeth’ were suspected in order to learn the future (Deut., xviii, 10, 11; I Kings, xviii, 8), and gave their answers through certain persons in whom they resided (Leviti., xx, 27; I Kings, xxviii, 7), but is also applied to the persons themselves who were supposed to foretell events under
the guidance of these "divining" or "pythoic" spirits (Levit., xx, 6; 1 Kings, xxviii, 3, 9; Isa., xix, 3). The term yiddde 'onim (from yadda, "to know"), which is also used, but always in conjunction with 'obhash, refers either to knowing spirits and persons through whom they spoke, or to spirits who were known and familiar to the worshippers. The term 'obhash signifies both "a divine being," and "a leprous hand." (Job—xxxii, 19—uses it in the latter sense), but scholars are not agreed whether we have two disparate words, or whether it is the same word with two related meanings. Many maintain that it is the same in both instances, as the diviner was supposed to be the recipient and the container of the spirit. The Septuagint renders 'obhash by ἔφαγον τὸν κάρπον (E£αγασμενον), either because the translators thought that the diviner's alleged communication with the spirit was but a deception, or rather because of the belief common in antiquity that ventriloquism was not a natural faculty, but due to the presence of a spirit. Perhaps, also, the two meanings may be connected on account of the peculiarity of the voice of the ventriloquist, which was weak and indistinct, as if it came from a cavity. Isaiah (viii, 19) says that necromancers "utter" and makes the following prediction concerning Jerusalem: "Thou shalt speak out of the earth, and thy voice shall be heard out of the ground, and thy voice shall be from the earth like that of a man, and out of the land shall come a voice" (xxix, 4). Profane authors also attribute a distinctive sound to the voice of the spirits or shades, although they do not agree in characterizing it. Homer (Ilad, XXIII, 101; Od., XXIV, 9, 9) uses the verb τραυματεύεσθαι, and Statius (Thebais, VII, 770) ἀπολλυτρείεσθαι, both of which mean "to utter a shrill cry." Horace quotes Vergil, speaking of Virgil's shade: ut frater tabula faciet: (Sat., I, 3, 59). Virgil speaks of their vox exigua (Ecneid, VI, 492) and of the gemitus lacrymabolis which is heard from the grave (op. cit., III, 39); and in a similar way Shakespeare says that "the sheathed dead did squeak and gibe in the Roman streets" (Hamlet, I, i). The Mosaic Law forbids necromancy (Levit., xx, 31; xx, 6), declares that to seek the truth from the dead is abhorred by God (Deut., xvii, 11, 12), and even makes it punishable by death (Levit., xx, 27; cf. I Kings, xxviii, 9). Nevertheless, owing especially to the contact of the Hebrews with pagan nations, we find it practised in the time of Saul (I Kings, xxviii, 7, 9), of Isaiah, who strongly reproves the Hebrews on this point, and of David (I Kings, xxxiv, 6; II Par., xxxiii, 6). The best known case of necromancy in the Bible is the evocation of the soul of Samuel at Endor (I Kings, xxviii). King Saul was at war with the Philistines, whose army had gathered near that of Israel. He "was afraid and his heart was very much dismayed. And he consulted the Lord, and the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by priests, nor by prophets" (5, 6). Then he went to Endor, to a woman who had "a divining spirit," and persuaded her to call the soul of Samuel. The woman alone saw the prophet, and Saul recognized him from the description she gave of him. But Saul himself spoke and heard the prediction that, as the Lord had abandoned him on account of his disobedience, he would be defeated and killed. This narrative has given rise to several interpretations. Some deny the reality of the apparition and claim that the witch deceived Samuel; thus St. Jerome (In Is., iii, vii, 11, in P. L., XXIV, 108; in Ezech., xi, 17, in P. L., XXV, 119) and Theodoret, who, however, adds that the prophesies from God (Qb., LXXIII, LXIV, in P. G., LXXX, 589). Others attribute it to the devil, who took Samuel's appearance; thus St. Basil (In Is., viii, 218, in P. L., XXX, 497), St. Gregory of Nyssa ("De pythoicis, ad Theodos., episc. epist.", in P., XXV, 107-14), and Theodulf (De anima, LXIII, in P. L., II, 794). Others, finally, look upon Samuel's apparition as real; thus Joseph (Antiq. Jud., IV, xiv, 2), St. Justin (Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo, 105, in P. G., VI, 721), Origen (In Reg., xxvii, "De Engastrymytho," in P., G., XII, 1011-1028), St. Ambrose (In Luc., i, 33, in P. L., XV, 1547), and St. Augustine, who finally adopted this view after having held the other (De diversis quaest., 1, Simplicius, In Pl., L, XL, 1477; Dulcitii quest., VI, in P. L., XL, 162-65; De cura pro mortuis, xx, in P. L., XL, 606; De doctrina christiana, II, xxii, in P. L., XXXIV, 52). St. Thomas (Summa, I, II, Q. clxxiv, a. 5, ad 4 um) does not pronounce. The last interpretation of the reality of Samuel's apparition is favoured both by the details of the profane and by another Biblical text which convinced St. Augustine: "After this, he [Samuel] slept, and he made known to the king, and showed him the end of his life, and he lifted up his voice from the earth in prophecy to blot out the wickedness of the nation" (Eccles., xivi, 23).

III. NECROMANCY IN THE CHRISTIAN ERA.—In the first centuries of the Christian era the practice of necromancy was common among pagans, as the Fathers frequently testify (see, e.g., Tertullian, "Apol.", xxii, P. L., I, 470; De anima, LVI, LVII, in P., II, 790 sqq.; Laetantius, "Divine institutions," IV, xxvii, in P., VI, 531). It was associated with other magical arts and other forms of demonical sorcery, and thus profaned even by another Biblical text which convinced St. Augustine: "After this, he [Samuel] slept, and he made known to the king, and showed him the end of his life, and he lifted up his voice from the earth in prophecy to blot out the wickedness of the nation" (Tertullian, De anima, LVI, in P., II, 793). Nevertheless, even Christians converted from paganism sometimes indulged in them. The efforts of Church authorities, popes, and councils, and the severe laws of Christian canonists, ended this evil, and the task was taken over by Constantine, Constantius, Valentinian, Valens, Theodosius, were not directed specifically against necromancy, but in general against pagan magic, divination, and superstition. In fact, little by little the term necromancy lost its strict meaning and was applied to all forms of black art, becoming closely associated with alchemy, witchcraft, and magic. Notwithstanding all efforts, it survived in some form or other during the Middle Ages, but was given a new impetus at the time of the Reformation by the revival of the neo-Platonic doctrine of demons. In his memoirs (translated by Roesce, New York, 1851, ch. xiii) Benvenuto Cellini shows how vague the meaning of necromancy had become, and how easy it was to be relapsed into. In the evocations in which multitudes of "devils" appeared and answered his questions. Cornelius Agrippa ("De occulta philosophia," Cologne, 1510, tr. by J. F. London, 1651) indicates the magical rites by which souls are evoked. In recent times, necromancy, as a distinct belief and practice, reappears under the name of spiritism (or spiritualism not to be confounded with spiritism). The Church does not deny that, with a special permission of God, the souls of the departed may appear to the living, and even manifest things unknown to the latter. But, understood as the art or science of evoking the dead, necromancy is held by theologians to be due to the agency of evil spirits, for the means taken are inadequate to produce the expected results. In intended evocations of the dead, there may be many things explainable naturally or due to fraud; how much is real, and how much must be attributed to imagination and deception, cannot be determined, but real facts of necromancy, with the use of incantations and magical rites, are looked upon by theologians as the result of human intercourse with the spiritual world, and are, therefore, a special mode of divination, due to demonic intervention, and divination itself is a form of superstition.

Enonym. — La magie chez les Chaldéens (Paris, 1875): Iord, La divination et la science des prophétes chez les Chaldéens (Paris, 1859-67); Du Boull-Clecfler, Histoire de la divination dans l'Antiquité (Paris, 1879-82); Tyldes, Researches into the Early History of Mon-
NEBRIUS (Nextapor), Patriarch of Constantinople, (381-397), d. 27 Sept., 397, eleventh bishop of that city since Metropoles, and may be counted its first patriarch. He came from Tarsus of a senatorial family, and sat at Constantinople as a member of the second general council (381). When St. Gregory Nazianzen resigned his occupation of that see the people called for Nectarius to succeed him and their choice was ratified by the Council (Socrates, "H. E." V), before August, 381. Sozomen (H. E., VII, 8) adds that Nectarius, about to return to Tarsus, asked Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, if he could carry any letters for him. Diodorus, who saw that his visitor was the most suitable person to become Bishop of Constantinople, persuaded Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, to add his name to the list of candidates presented by the council to the emperor. The emperor then, to every one’s surprise, chose Nectarius, who was not yet fifty years of age, and he was consecrated bishop. Tillemont (Mémoires, IX, 486) doubts this story. Soon after Nectarius’ election the Council passed the famous third canons giving Constantinople rank immediately after Rome. A man of no very great power, Nectarius had an uneventful reign with which St. Gregory was not altogether pleased ("Ep." 88, 91, 151, 153; Tillemont, op. cit., IX, 65). Suspected of concessions to the Novatians (Socrates, V, 10; Sozomen, VII, 12), he made none to the Arians, who in 388 burnt his house (Socrates, V, 13). Palsmon says that in 394 he held a synod at Constantinople which decreed that no bishop should be doped without the consent of several other bishops of the same province (Harduin, I, 955). The most important event, however, is that, according to Socrates (V, 19) and Sozomen (VII, 16), as a result of a public scandal Nectarius abolished the discipline of public penance and the office of penitentiary hitherto held by a priest of his diocese. The incident is important for the history of Penance. Nectarius preached a sermon which he afterwards prepared and published ("Mémoires de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres"), XXIII (1754), 174; Kohlers, De origine et progressu necromantiae mense mensis novembris aequo sabbato et natore tum Graecos tum Romanos per sponsum Festas (Freiburg im Br., 1839), 31; Watten, The Mysteries of Magic (London, 1897), 31; Holmes in Kato’s Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, s. v. Divination; Whitman, The Bible, s. v. Prophets; in Dict. de la Bible, s. v. Evocation des morts; Schmids in Kirchenlexi- com, s. v. Todtensprechung.

C. A. Dubray.

Negligence (Lat. nec, not, and legere, to pick out), the condition of not heeding. More specifically it is here considered as the omission, whether habitual or not, of the care required for the performance of duties, or at any rate, for their full and adequate discharge. In the teaching of St. Thomas, it is rated not only as a characteristic discernible in the commission of all sins, but also as a special sin in itself. Its particular deformity he judges to be the imputable lack of such solicitude as is here and not the obligation of satisfying obligations. He therefore assigns prudence as the virtue to which it is directly opposed. What has been said applies also to actions which are not of precept, once it is resolved to undertake them. Negligence, according to St. Thomas, is initially at least a lack of promptness of will, and is quite distinguishable from torpor or alipshodnus in execution. It is not commonly esteemed to be more than a venial sin. There are, however, two notable exceptions to this statement: (1) if a person is careless to the point of omitting something which is indispensable for salvation (de necessitatis salute), or (2) if the remissness of will be so great as totally to extinguish the love of God in the soul, then, then, then the negligence becomes mortal.

Negligence is a factor to be reckoned with in determining the liability of one who has damaged another in any way. In the court of conscience the perpetrator of damage can only be held responsible and bound to restitution when his action has been attended with moral culpability, i.e., has been done freely and deliberately. Negligence is an act of negligence per se in regard to that measure which is established according to the different subject matter involved. The absence of this degree of care on the part of an agent is assumed by the civil law to be culpable, and is punished with the penalties provided. Thus the common law generally distinguishes three classes of negligence as follows: gross negligence is the failure to employ even the smallest amount of care, such as any person, no matter how heedless, would use for the safeguarding of his own interests; ordinary negligence is the failure to exercise ordinary care, such as a person of ordinary capacity and capable of governing a family would take of his own affairs; slight negligence is the failure to bring to bear a high degree of thoughtfulness persons would maintain in looking after their own interests. The civil law may and does impose the obligation of reparation for harm wrought not only where ordinary and gross negligence are shown, but also at times when only slight negligence is proved to have existed. This obligation holds good likewise in conscience, once the decision of the judge decreeing has been rendered.

Slater, A Manual of Moral Theology. (New York, 1908); St. Thomas, Summa Theologica, II—II, Q. iv; Genicot, Theologia Moralis Institutiones (Leuven, 1891).

Joseph F. Delany.

Negros. See RACE, NEGRO.

Nehemiah, Book of, also called the second Book of Ezra, is reckoned both in the Talmud and in the early Christian Church, at least until the time of Origen, as forming one single book with Ezra, and St. Jerome in his preface (ad Dominorem et Rogatium), following the example of the Jews, still continues to treat it as making one with the Book of Ezra. The union of the two volumes less has its origin in the fact that the documents of which the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah are composed, underwent compilation and redaction together at the hands probably, as most critics think, of the author of Paralipomenon about B. C. 300. The separation of the Book of Nehemiah from that of Ezra, preserved in our editions, may in its turn be justified by the consideration that the former relates in a distinct manner the work accomplished by Nehemiah, and is made up, at least in great part, from the authentic memoirs of the principal figure. The book comprises three sections: I, vii; II, vii—xiii; III, xii, 431. Sections I and III will be treated first, and section II, which raises so many serious literary problems, will be discussed at the end.

Section I: i—vi, (1) comprises the account, written by Nehemiah himself, of the restoration of the walls of Jerusalem. Already in the reign of Xerxes (B. C. 485—65), and especially during the first part of the reign of Artaxerxes I (B. C. 465—44), the Jews had attempted, but with only partial success, to rebuild and secure their capital, a work, up to then never sanctioned by the Persian kings (see I Esd., iv, 6—23). In consequence of the edict of Artaxerxes, given in I Esd., iv, 18—22, the enemies of the Jews at Jerusalem forcibly stopped the work (ibid., 23) and pulled down a part of what had already been accomplished. (2) With these events the beginning of the Book of Nehemiah is con-
nected. Nehemiah, the son of Helchias, relates how, at the court of Artaxerxes at Susa where he fulfilled the office of the king's cup-bearer, he received the news of this calamity in the twentieth year of the king (Neh., i), and how, thanks to his prudence, he succeeded in getting himself sent on a first mission to Jerusalem with full powers to rebuild the walls of the Jewish capital (Neh., ii, 1–8). This first mission lasted twelve years (v. 14; xiii, 6); he had the title of Pehah (v. 14; xii, 26) or Athersatha (vii, 9; x, 1). It had long been the opinion of most historians of Israel that the Artaxerxes of Nehemiah was certainly the first of that name, and that consequently the first mission of Nehemiah fell in the year B. C. 445. The Aramaic papyri of Elephantine, recently published by Sayce, afford moreover the key to the text (v. 14). For in the letter which they wrote to Bahohim, Governor of Judea, in the seventeenth year of Darius II (B. C. 408), the Jewish priests of Elephantine say that they have also made an application to the sons of Sanballat at Samaria. Now Sanballat was a contemporary of Nehemiah, and the Artaxerxes of Nehemiah, therefore, was the predecessor, and not the successor, of Darius II.

(3) On his arrival at Jerusalem, Nehemiah lost no time; he inspected the state of the walls, and then took measures and gave orders for taking the work in hand (ii, 9–18). Chapter iii, a document of the highest importance for determining the area of Jerusalem in the fifth century, contains the inventory of the names of the people who participated in the work. The description of the work, carried out at all points at once under the direction of the zealous Jewish governor, the high priest Eliashib is named first among the fellow workers of Nehemiah (iii, 1). To bring the undertaking to a successful termination the latter had to fight against all sorts of difficulties. (4) First of all, there was the opposition of the Samaritans (iv, 1). The Jews who had returned from captivity almost a century before, had found the country partly occupied by people belonging to the neighboring races, and being unable to organize themselves politically, had seen themselves reduced, little by little, to a humiliating position in their own land. And so, at the time of Nehemiah, we see certain foreigners taking an exceedingly arrogant attitude towards the Jewish governor and his work. Sanballat the Horonite, chief of the Samaritans (iv, 1, 2), Tobias the Ammonite, Goessem the Arabian, claim to exercise constant control over Jewish affairs, and try by all means in their power, by calumny (ii, 19), scoffs (iv, 1 ff.), threats of violence (iv, 10), attempts to turn the king against Nehemiah, to stop him in his work or ruin him. The reason of this was that the raising up again of the walls of Jerusalem was destined to bring about the overthrow of the moral domination, which for many years circumstances had secured for these foreigners.

(5) The cause of the foreigners was upheld by a party of Jews, traitors to their own nation. The prophet Noadias and other false prophets sought to terrify Nehemiah (vi, 14); there were some who, like Samia, allowed themselves to be hired by Tobias and Sanballat to set snares for him (vi, 10–14). Many Jews sided with Tobias on account of the matrimonial alliances existing between his family and certain Jewish families. Nehemiah, however, does not speak of the mixed marriages as if they had been actually forbidden. The father-in-law of Tobias' son, Mosollam, the son of Barachias, on the contrary, was a fellow worker of Nehemiah (vi, 18; iii, 4). The law of Deuteronomy only forbade marriages between Jews and Chanaanites (Deut. vii, 1, 3). (6) Difficulties of a social nature are also treated of by the poor by the rich, who misused the common distress for their own ends, likewise called for the energetic intervention of Nehemiah (v). On this occasion Nehemiah recalls the fact that previous governors had practised extortion, while he was the first to show himself disinterested in the discharge of his duties (v, 15 ff.). (7) In spite of all these difficulties the rebuilding of the wall made rapid progress. We learn from vii, 15, that the work was completely finished within fifty-one days. Josephus (Ant., V, 7, 8) says that it lasted two years and four months, but his testimony, often far from reliable, presents no plausible reason for setting aside the text. The relatively short duration of the work is explained, moreover, considering that Nehemiah had only to repair the damage wrought after the prohibition of Artaxerxes (I Esd., iv, 23), and finish off the construction, which might at that moment have been already far advanced [see above (1)].

Section III: xiii, 4–31. After the expiration of his first mission, Nehemiah had returned to Susa in the following year, and had by his influence urged Artaxerxes (B. C. 433; viii, 6). Some time after, he was charged with a fresh mission to Judea, and it is with his doings during this second mission that xiii, 4–31 is concerned. The account at the beginning seems mutilated. Nehemiah relates how, at the time of his second arrival at Jerusalem, he began by putting an end to the abuses which Tobias, the Ammonite, supported by the high priest Eliasib, was practising in the temple in the matter of the depository for the sacred offerings (xiii, 4–9). He severely blames the violation of the right of the Levites in the distribution of the tithes, and takes measures to prevent its occurrence in future (xiii, 10–14); he insists on the Sabbath being strictly respected even by the foreigners, and he rebukes C. Tachemon, a great-grandson of Elisashib who had married a daughter of Sanballat (xiii, 23–28). To this son-in-law of Sanballat is generally attributed the inauguration of the worship in the temple of Garseim. It is plain that Nehemiah's attitude towards the foreigners who lived in Judea is not so severe as towards the Jews who had returned from captivity, for his relations with them are not touched upon in the Book of Nehemiah. Much more striking are the mixed marriages which he did not interfere with. The treatment of mixed marriages differs greatly from his attitude at the beginning of his first stay at Jerusalem [see section I, (5)].

Section II: vii–xiii, 3, (1) contains accounts or documents relating to the work of politico-social and religious organisation effected by Nehemiah, after the walls were finished. Here we no longer have Nehemiah speaking in the first person, except in vii, 1–5, and in the account of the dedication of the walls (xii, 31, 37, 39). He relates how, after having rebuilt the walls, he had to proceed to erect houses, and take measures for bringing into the town a population more in proportion to its importance as the capital (vii, 1–5; 15). (2) He describes the mixed marriages (vii, 1 ff.) of the families who had returned from captivity with Zorobabel. This list is in I Esd., ii. It is remarkable that in the Book of Nehemiah, following on the list we find reproduced (vii, 70 ff.) with variants, the remark of I Esd., ii, 68–70 about the gifts given towards the work of the temple by Zorobabel's companions, and the settlement of these latter in the country; and again that Neh., viii, 1 resumes the narrative in the very words of I Esd., iii. This dependence is probably due to the redactor, who in this place gave a new form to the notes supplied him by the Jewish governor's memoirs which also explains the latter's being spoken of in the third person, Neh., viii, 9, 13. There is a desire to depict a grand gathering held in the seventh month under the direction of Nehemiah (viii, 9–12) at which Esdras reads the Law (viii, 13). They then kept the feast of Tabernacles (viii, 13–18). When this feast is over, the people gather together again on the twenty-fourth day of the seventh month (ix, 1 ff.) to praise God, confess their sins, and bind themselves by a written covenant faithfully to observe their obligations. Chapter X after giving the list of the subscribers to the covenant, sets forth the obligations, which the people bind themselves to fulfil; in particular the prohibition of mixed marriages (verses 30): the keeping of the Sabbath, especially in their
treatment of foreign merchants (verse 31), the yearly tribute of a third part of a sicle for the Temple (verse 32), and other measures to ensure the regular celebration of sacrifices (verses 33–34), the offering of the first fruits and of the first born (verses 35–37), and the payment and the distribution of the tithes (verses 35–39).

After chapter x it is advisable to read xii, 43–xiii, 1; the appointment of a commission for the administration of things brought to the Temple, and the regulation of the marriages of foreigners from among the community. Chapter xi, 1, 2, recalls the measures taken to people Jerusalem; verses 3–36 give the census of Jerusalem and of the other towns as Nehemia's measures left it. In chapter xii, 27–43, we have the account of the solemn dedication of the walls of Jerusalem; Esdras the scribe is mentioned, as well as the head of a group of singers (verse 35). The list in xii, 1–26, has no connexion whatever with the events of this epoch.

(4) The proceedings set forth in viii–x are closely connected with the other parts of the history of Nehemia. The obligations imposed by the covenant, described in x, have to do with just the very matters with which Nehemia concerned himself more during his second stay (see above, section III). The regulation concerning the providing of the wood for the altar (x, 34) is recalled by Nehemia in xiii, 31, and the very words used in x, 39 (end of verse), we find again in xiii, 11. The covenant entered into by the people during Nehemia's first mission was broken in his absence. The people were to predict the abuses of the high priests, and he was to take steps to prevent them. The statement that the scribes and the Levites were to be the heads of the people is instructive. The attitude he takes towards mixed marriages is quite different from his attitude at the beginning of his first stay [see above section I (5); section III]. This change is explained precisely by the absolute prohibition pronounced against these marriages in the assembly described in x, 44. The fact that in viii–x there is given a list of events belonging to the period of the organization of worship under Zorobabel, the names of Nehemia (viii, 9; x, 1) and Esdras (viii, 1 ff.) having been added later. But there was certainly sufficient reason for the reorganization of worship in the time of Nehemia (cf. the Book of Maccabees) and Nehem., xii). Others on the contrary would regard Neh., viii–x, as the sequel to the narrative of I Esdras, ix–x, and they likewise hold that Nehemia's name has been interpolated in Neh., viii, 9, and x, 1. This theory is equally untenable. It is true that in the Third Book of Esdras (the Greek I Esdras) the narrative of Neh., viii, is reproduced immediately after Neh., x, but the author of the Book of Esdras was led to do this by the fact that Neh., viii, presents his hero as reader of the Law. He has moreover preserved (III Esd., ix, 50) the information of Neh., viii, 9, about the intervention of the Athersatha (Nehemia), Esdras superior, which clearly proves that this account does not refer to the time when the mission of Nehemia was being carried on, but rather to the time when Esdras returned to Jerusalem and was entrusted with the king with full powers for the administration of the Jewish community. See, moreover, the following paragraph.

(5) According to our view the return of Esdras with his emigrants and the reform effected by him (I Esd., viii–x) ought, chronologically, to be placed after the history of Nehemia, and the Artaxerxes, in the seventh year of whose reign Esdras returned to Jerusalem, is Artaxerxes II (b. c. 405–358). As a matter of fact, Esdras finds the wall of Jerusalem rebuilt (I Esd., ix, 9), Jerusalem well populated (x, 1 ff.), the Temple treasure under proper management (vii, 29 ff.), Jonathan, son of Elieias, high priest (x, 6); cf. Neh., xii, 25, Esdras, son of implacable enemies. The Book of Esdras and Nehemia presents the marriages recognized by every one (ix, 1 ff.). The radical reform, which Esdras introduced in this matter without being troubled by foreigners who still held the upper hand at the time of Nehemia's first coming, definitively put an end to the abuse in question which had proved rebellious to all preventive measures (x).

The political and social situation described in the first six chapters of Nehemia [see above, section I (4), (5), (6)], the religious situation to which the proceedings of the gathering in Neh., x, bear witness [see above, section II (3)], do not admit of being explained as immediately following after the mission of Esdras, who particularly, in virtue of the king's edict, disposed of what people regarded as indispensable to the celebration of the place (I Esd., vii, viii, 25 ff.). Esdras's activity is noticeably noticed in Neh., i–vi, and in the list of the subscribers to the covenant (x, 1 ff.). He is mentioned in Neh., vii, 1 ff., and in xii, 35, as fulfilling subordinate functions. Considering the singular number of the verbs in Neh., vii, 9, 10, it is probable that in the former of these verses the 'two veils' have been named as part of the subject of the phrase is due to a later hand.

At the epoch of Nehemia, therefore, Esdras was at the beginning of his career, and must have gone a little later to Babylonia, whence he returned at the head of a band of emigrants in the seventh year of Artaxerxes II (b. c. 398).

(6) Many critics have maintained that in Neh., vii, we have the history of the first promulgation of the "Priestly Code" by Esdras, but the narrative in question does not authorize such an interpretation. Esdras was probably still a very young man at this time, and all he does is to read the Law before the assembled people. It is quite true that in I Esd., vii, there is made mention in the name of the king, so that the laws of God are promulgated "with the abomination of the Gentiles" (verse 14), but besides the fact that we hold the events related in I Esd., vii, to be posterior to Neh., vii [see above (5)], these words must not be understood literally of a new document of which Esdras was the bearer. In the same terms mention is made of the wisdom of his God which Esdras has in mind (verse 14), and when he says that it is oracular it is to Esdras's compatriots already known the Law of their God.
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A. VAN HOONACKER.

Nehem, STEPHAN JAKOB, church historian; b. at Ebnat, 24 July, 1829; d. at Nordhausen, 7 Oct., 1902. His family were country people of Ebnat, a village in the district of Neresheim in Württemberg, and upon the conclusion of his studies in the gymnasium Neher devoted himself to the study of theology in the University of Tübingen. After his ordination, he laboured as pastor of Dorfmarshausen near Zürich and finally of Nordhausen (in the district of Ellwangen, Württemberg). In addition, Neher devoted himself throughout his life to intellectual pursuits, principally to canon law and church history, giving his attention, in the latter study, chiefly to the two branch sciences of ecclesiastical geography and ecclesiastical statistics, in which he established himself as a prominent figure. In his first considerable work, which appeared in 1861, he deals with the topic of the privileged Altar (altare privilegiumat). In 1864 he published the first volume of his great and carefully planned work, "Kirchliche Geographie und Statistik", which comprises three volumes (Ratisbon, 1864–68). It was, for that day, the most important work, important work, independent in its method of approach. Its author was one of the first in modern times to recognize the importance of this branch of church history, collecting with great care material often very difficult to procure, and arranging it systematically. His book on the celebration of two Masses by a priest
on the same day pertains to canon law, and it bears the title: "Die Bination nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung" by J. R. H. Hart (Ziegenbalg, 1874). After 1878 Neher edited the statistical "Personalkatalog" of his own diocese of Rottenburg, and was one of the principal contributors to the second edition of the Kirchenlexikon of Wetzer and Welte. For this work he wrote no fewer than 235 articles, or greater parts of articles. Their content is chiefly matters relating to church history, or ecclesiastical statistics; his best articles are those relating to the latter subject; those of purely historical interest are often imperfect.

J. P. KIRSCH.

NÉLATON, Auguste, famous French surgeon; born in Paris, 17 June, 1807, d. there, 21 Sept., 1873. He made his medical studies in Paris, graduating in 1836 with a thesis on tuberculous affections of bones. All his subsequent university career was passed at Paris. After the publication of his "Traité des tumeurs de la mamelle" he became agrégé in 1839. In 1851 he became professor of clinical surgery with a thesis which attracted much attention and was translated into several languages the following year. As a member of the surgical staff of the St. Louis Hospital, he devised a number of original surgical procedures and operations, was the first to suggest the ligature of both ends of arteries in primary and secondary hemorrhage, and developed several phases of plastic surgery. The Nélaton probe was a well known instrument, subsequently used by him in Garibaldi's case, in 1862, to locate a bullet in the ankle joint. Some of his suggestions with regard to operations were important advances in abdominal and pelvic surgery. He was, lastly, noted as a great teacher of surgery and a consummate operator.

German historian of medicine, in his "Biographical Dictionary of Prominent Physicians of the Nineteenth Century", says of Nélaton: "He was a man of very clear judgment, of ripe experience, of solid wisdom, and deservedly occupies a place as one of the greatest of French surgeons of the nineteenth century." In 1863 he was elected a member of the Paris Academy of Medicine and in 1867 of the French Institute of Science, and became Senator of the French Empire in 1868. His fame as a writer on surgery rests upon his "Elements of Surgical Pathology" (5 vols., Paris, 1854-60). The last volume was completed with the collaboration of A. Jamin. In 1807 Nélaton had an important share in preparing the "Report on The Progress of Surgery in France".
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J. J. WALEY.

NEMORE, JORDANUS (JORDANUS DE), the name given in MSS. of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries to a mathematician who in the Renaissance period was called Jordanus Nemorarius. A number of his works are extant, but nothing is known of his life. It is customary to place him early in the thirteenth century. Emile Chaclas, the geometrician, concluded from a study of the "Algorismus Jordani" that its author lived not later than the twelfth century. In the fourteenth century the English Dominican Nicolas Triveth, in a chronicle of his order, attributed the "De ponderibus Jordani" and the "De linea datis Jordani" to Jordanus Saxo, who, in 1222, succeeded St. Dominic as master general of the Friars Preachers. Since then, the identity of Jordanus Saxo with Jordanus Nemorarius has been accepted by a great many authors; it seems difficult to maintain this opinion, however, as the Dominican superior general never adds de Némore to his name, and the mathematician never calls himself Saxo. The literal translation of "Jordanus de Némore" (Giordano of Nemi) would indicate that he was an Italian. Jordanus had a great influence on Spicizius in his "Arithmetica" and in the "De comminibus natura", Roger Bacon quotes his "De ponderibus", as well as a commentary which had been written on it at that period. Thomas Bradwardine and the logicians who succeeded him in the school of Oxford likewise make a great deal of use of the writings of Jordanus. During the Renaissance his "De ponderibus" was one of the books which influenced the development of the science of statics.

The treatises composed by Jordanus de Némore are:

1. "Algorismus", a theory of the elementary operations of arithmetic. An "Algorithmus demonstratus Jordani" was printed at Nuremberg in 1534, by Petreius for Johannes Schöner. The "Algorithmus" represents an anonymous MS. found among the papers of Regiomontanus. It was erroneously attributed to Jordanus, and had really been composed in the thirteenth century by a certain Magister Gernardus (Duhem in "Bibliotheca mathematica", 3rd series, VI, 1905, p. 9). The genuine "Demonstratio Algorismi" of Jordanus, which E. Chasles had already examined, has been translated by A. B. J. von Bayern (G. Eneström in "Bibliotheca mathematica", 3rd series, VII, 1906, p. 24), but is still unpublished.

2. "Elementa Arithmeticae"; this treatise on arithmetic, divided into distinctiones, was printed at Paris in 1496 and in 1514, to the order of Lefèvre d'Étaples, who added various propositions to it. "De numeris et proportionibus" was published by Wallis. "De geometrica" was published in "Math. Phys.", XIV, suppl., pp. 127-66, and again in 1891 by Maximilian Curtze (ibid., XXXVI, "Histor. liter. Abtheilung", pp. 1-23, 41-63, 81-95, 121-138).

3. "De triangulis"—Jordanus himself gave this treatise the name of Philotechnes (Duhem in "Bibliotheca mathematica", 3rd series, V, 1903, p. 321; Archiv für die Geschichte der Mathematik und der Technik", 1, 1909, p. 88). It was published by M. Curtze ("Mittheil. der Copernicusverein für Wissenschaft und Kunst", VI—Thorn, 1887).

4. "Planisphærum"—This work on map-drawing gives, for the first time, the theorem: The stereographic projection of a circle is a circle. It was printed by Valderus, at Bâle, in 1536, in a collection containing the cosmographical works of Ziegler, Proclus, Berosus, and Theon of Alexandria, and the "Planisphere" of Ptolemy. "De Speculis", a treatise on catoptrics, still unedited. "De ponderibus", or better, "Elementa super demonstrationem ponderum", a treatise on statics, in nine propositions, was published, seemingly for the first time, in 1544 by G. Francisca. An introduction to a fragment on the Roman balance attributed to one Charistion, contemporary and friend of Philo of Byzantium (second century, b. c.). This fragment has survived under two forms: (a) a Latin version directly from the Greek, entitled "De canonic"; (b) a ninth-century commentary by the Arab mathematician Thabit Ibn Qurrah, translated into Latin by Gerard of Cremona.

Most of the propositions of the "De ponderibus Jordani" are gravely erroneous. But the last offers a remarkable demonstration of the principle of the lever, introducing the method of virtual work for the first time in mathematical history. Towards the end of the fourteenth century, or the beginning of the fifteenth, an anonymous author expanded the demonstrations in Jordanus's treatise; in this enlarged form, the treatise, combined with the "De canonic", is found in many MSS. under the title "Liber Euclidis de ponderibus". There is also an anonymous commentary on the "De ponderibus", based on ideas apparently borrowed from R. de Gliscins "Geometriae mechanicae". This Aristotelian commentary is attributed by Roger Bacon in his "Opus majus"; together with an enlarged edition of the "Liber Euclidis de ponderibus", it was printed at Nuremberg, in 1533, by
to the effect that Abraham having refused to worship the statue of Nemrod was cast into a fiery furnace. A trace of this legend appears in II Esdr., ix, 7, where the translator of the Vulgate renders the original "Ur of the Chaldees" (from which the Lord called Abraham), by "fire of the Chaldeans". It was only natural that the renown of Nemrod as a builder should have caused his name to be connected with nearly all of the principal mounds and ruins to be found in Mesopotamia.


JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

NEOCAESAREA, a titular see, suffragan of Hierapolis in the Patriarchate of Antioch, sometimes called Caesarea, in "Georgii Cyprii Descriptio orbis romanii" (ed. Gelzer, 1882). Among its bishops were Paul, whose hands were burned by order of Liciinus and who attended the Council of Nicaea in 325 (Theodore, "Hist. ecc.", I, VII); Meletius, opposed to the Council of Ephesus in 431; Patricius (451) and John (553). In the sixth-century "Notitia episcopatus" of Anastasius (Chos d'Orrient, Paris, X, 145) this see is mentioned as a suffragan of Hierapolis. According to Procopius (De Edificiis II, 9), Justinian accomplished great things there. Neocæsarea was a fort on the strait, not far from that point where the site was the actual ruins of Balkiz (La frontière de l'Euphrate de Pompe à la conquête arabe, Paris, 1907, 278 sqq.).
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S. VAILHÉ.
Sivas, with a Greek and an Armenian church, both of which are schismatic.


**S. Vaillé.**

**Neo-Platonism**, ((neofytoς), the newly planted, i.e. incorporated with the mystic Body of Christ), a term applied to all those who have lately entered upon a new and higher state or condition of life, e.g. those who have begun the ecclesiastical life, or have joined a religious order. More particularly is it used of those who, lately converted from heathenism, have, by the sacrament of Baptism, been transplanted into the higher life of the Church. From very early times there have been exhibitions against neophytes, last sense being promoted too quickly to Holy Orders and to positions of responsibility in the Church. Thus the Council of Nicea in its second canon lays down rules on this subject, on the ground that some time is necessary for the state of a Catechumen and for fuller probation after baptism; for the Apostolic decree is clear when it states: “Not a neophyte, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the judgment of the devil” (I Tim., iii, 6). The period which should elapse after conversion before promotion is not fixed but (Bened. XIV, “De syn.”, vii, 65–6) is left to the discretion of the bishop and will vary with the individual case. (See *Divorce*, sub-title *Pauline Privilege*.)


**Arthur S. Barnes.**

**Neo-Platonism**, a system of idealistic, spiritual-philosophical thought, tending towards mysticism, which flourished in the pagan world of Greece and Rome during the first centuries of the Christian era. It is of interest and importance, not merely because it is the last attempt of Greek thought to rehabilitate itself and restore its exhausted vitality by recourse to Oriental religious ideas, but also because it definitely entered the service of pagan polytheism and was used as a weapon against Christianity. It derives its name from the fact that its first representatives drew their inspiration from Plato’s doctrines, although it is well known that much of the thought on which the system is founded is not genuine work of Plato. It originated in Egypt, a circumstance which would, of itself, indicate that while the system was a characteristic product of the Hellenic spirit, it was largely influenced by the religious ideals and mystic tendencies of Oriental thought.

To understand the neo-Platonic system in itself, as well as to appreciate the attitude of Christianity towards it, it is necessary to explain the two-fold purpose which actuated its founders. On the one hand, philosophico-religious thought in the Hellenic world had proved itself inadequate to the task of moral and religious regeneration. Stoicism, Epicureanism, Eclecticism and even Gnosticism each having failed in the task of “making men happy”, and each in turn failed. Then came the thought that Plato’s idealism and the religious forces of the Orient might well be united in one philosophical movement which would give definiteness, homogeneity, and unity of purpose to all the efforts of the pagan world to rescue itself from impending ruin and destruction. On the other hand, the pagan point of view, the aggressiveness of Christianity began to be realized. It became necessary, in the intellectual world, to compose on the Christians by showing that Paganism was not entirely bankrupt, and, in the political world, to rehabilitate the official polytheism of the State by furnishing an interpretation of it, that should be acceptable in philosophy. Speculative Stoicism had reduced the gods to personifications of natural forces; Aristotle had definitely denied their existence; Plato had sneered at them. It was true, therefore, that the growing prestige of Christianity should be offset by a philosophy which, claiming the authority of Plato, whom the Christians revered, should not only retain the gods but make them an essential part of a philosophy, based on the origin of neo-Platonism. It should, however, be added that, while the philosophy which sprang from these sources was Platonic, it did not disdain to appropriate to itself elements of Aristotelianism and even Epicureanism, which it articulated into a Syncretic system.

**I. Forerunners of Neo-Platonism.**—Among the more or less eclectic Platonists who are regarded as forerunners of the neo-Platonic school, the most important are Plutarch, Maximus, Apuleius, Enesidemus, Numenius. The last-mentioned, who flourished towards the end of the second century of the Christian era, had a direct and immediate influence on Plotinus, the first systematic neo-Platonist. He taught that there are three gods, the Father, the Maker (Demiurgos), and the World. Philo the Jew (see Philo Judaeus), who flourished in the middle of the first century, was also a forerunner of neo-Platonism, although it is difficult to say whether his doctrine of the mediation of the Logos had a direct influence on Plotinus.

**II. Ammonius Saccus, a porter on the docks at Alexandria, is regarded as the founder of the Alexandrian school. Since he left no writings, it is impossible to say what his doctrines were.** We know, however, that he had an extraordinary influence over men like Plotinus and Origen, who willingly abandoned the professional teachers of philosophy to listen to his discourses. According to Eusebius, he was born of Christian parents, but reverted to paganism. The date of his birth is given as 242. No certain information on his life is available.

**III. Plotinus, a native of Lycopeia in Egypt, who lived from 205 to 270 was the first systematic philosopher of the school.** When he was twenty-eight years old he was taken by a friend to hear Ammonius, and Thrasyllos forth for eleven years he continued to study, and later to be the lectures of the porter. At the end of the first discourse which he heard, he exclaimed: “This man is the man of whom I was in search.” In 242 he accompanied the Emperor Gordian to Mesopotamia, intending to go to Persis. In 244 he went to Rome, where, for ten years, he taught philosophy, counting among his pupils all of the Emperor Elagabalus, and his son, and his wife Salonina. In 253 he retired to Campania, and spent his life as a hermit, making disciples, including Porphyry, and there he died in 270. His works, consisting of fifty-four treatises, were edited by Porphyry in six groups of nine. Hence they are known as the “Enneads”. The “Enneads” were first published in a Latin translation by Marsilius Facins (Florence, 1492); of recent editions, the best are Breuer and Moser’s (Oxford, 1855), and Kirchhoff’s (Leipzig, 1856). Parts of the “Enneads” are translated into English by Taylor (London, 1787–1817).

Plotinus’ starting-point is that of the idealist. He meets what he considers the paradox of materialism, the emphatic assertion that the soul is spirit, and the emphatic assertion of the existence of spirit. If the soul is spirit, it follows that it cannot have originated from the body or an aggregation of bodies. The true source of reality is above us, not beneath us. It is the One, the Absolute, the Infinite. It is God. God exceeds all the categories of finite thought. It is not correct to say that He is a Being, or a Mind. He is Over-Being, over-Mind. The only attributes which may be appropriately applied to Him are Good and One. If God were only One, He should remain forever in His undifferentiated unity, and there should be nothing but God. He is, however, good; and goodness, like light, tends to diffuse itself. Thus, from the One, there can be infinite Folds (Neo), which is the image of the One, and at the same time a
partially differentiated derivative, because it is the world of ideas, in which are the multiple archetypes of things. From the intellect emanates an image in which are a matter, a form, and a quality. It is described in figurative language, and thus its precise philosophical value is not determined. Similarly the One, God, is described as light, and Matter is said to be darkness. Matter, is, in fact, for Plotinus, essentially the opposite of the Good; it is evil, and the source of all evil. It is unreason and wherever it is present, there is not only a lack of goodness but also a lack of reality. God alone is free from Matter; He alone is Light; He alone is fully real. Everywhere there is partial differentiation, partial darkness, partial unreason; in the Intellect, in the World-Soul, in Souls, in the material universe. God, the reality, the spiritual, is, therefore, contrasted with the world, the unreal, the material. God alone, the One, everything else is appearance, or phenomenon.

Man, being composed of body and soul, is partly, like God, spiritual, and partly like matter, the opposite of spiritual. It is his duty to aim at returning to God by eliminating from his being, his thoughts, and his actions, everything that is material and, therefore, bequeathed by matter from God. It existed before its union with the body; its survival after death is, therefore, hardly in need of proof. It will return to God by way of knowledge, because that which separates it from God is matter and material conditions, which are only illusions or deceptive appearances. The first step, therefore, in the return of the man to God is the understanding of the being of the soul, withdrawing from the world of sense by a process of purification (katastasis), frees itself from the trammels of matter. Next, having retired within itself, the soul contemplates within itself the indwelling intellect. From the contemplation of the Intellect within, it rises to a contemplation of the Intellect above. Henceforth forever, He is a spiritual being, a man of

God, a prophet, and a wonder-worker. He commands all the powers of nature, and even bends to his will the demons themselves. He sees into the future, and in a sense shares the vision, as he shares the life, of God.

IV. Porphyry, who in beauty and lucidity of style excels all the other followers of Plotinus, and who is distinguished also by the bitterness of his opposition to Christianity, was born A.D. 233, probably at Tyre. After having studied at Athens, he visited Rome and there became a devoted disciple of Plotinus, whom he accompanied to Campania in 263. He died about the year 330. Of his work "Against the Christians" only a few portions have been preserved. Christian apologists, have come down to us. From these it appears that he directed his attack along the lines of what we should now call historical criticism of the Old Testament and the comparative study of religions. His work "De Antro Nymphaeum" is an elaborate allegorical interpretation and defence of pagan mythology. His "Apostrophe to Philosophy" is an exposition of Plotinus' philosophy. His biographical writings included "Lives" of Pythagoras and Plotinus in which he strove to show that these "god-sent" men were not only models of philosophic sanctity but also soteriouthis, or "wonder-workers", endowed with theurgic powers. The best known of all his works is a logical treatise entitled "Evagoras", an introduction to the Categories of Aristotle. In a Latin translation made by Boethius, this work was very widely used in the early Middle Ages, and exerted considerable influence on the growth of Scholasticism. It is, as is well known, a passage in this "Isagoge" that is said to have given occasion to the celebrated controversy concerning universals in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In his expository works on the philosophy of Plotinus, Porphyry lays great stress on the importance of theurgic practices. He holds, of course, that the practices of asceticism are the starting-point on the road to perfection. One must begin the process of perfection by "thinning out the veil of matter" (the body), which separates the spiritual and material things. Then, as a means of further advancement, one must cultivate self-contemplation. Once the stage of self-contemplation is attained, further progress towards perfection is dependent on the consultation of oracles, divination, bloodless sacrifices to the superior gods and bloody sacrifices to demons, inferior powers. V. Iamblichus, a native of Syria, who was a pupil of Porphyry in Italy, and died about the year 330, while inferior to his teacher in power of exposition, seemed to have a firmer grasp of the speculative principles of neo-Platonism and modified more profoundly the metaphysical doctrines of the school. His works bear the titles of "Organon" and "Summary of the Doctrines of the Doctrines". Whether he or a disciple of his is the author of the treatise "De Mysteriis Egyptianorum" (first pub. by Gale, Oxford, 1678, and afterwards by Parthey, Berlin, 1857), the book is a product of his school and proves that he, like Porphyry, emphasized the magic, or theurgic, factor in the neo-Platonic scheme of salvation. As a result of the development of Plotinus' system, he devoted attention to the doctrine of emanation, which he modified in the direction of completeness and greater consistency. The precise nature of the modification is not clear. It is safe, however, to say that, in a general way, he forestalled the effort of Proclus to distinguish three subordinate emanations, or stages, in the process of creation.

While these philosophical defenders of neo-Platonism were directing their attacks against Christianity, representatives of the school in the more practical walks of life, and even in high places of authority, carried on a more effective warfare in the name of the school. Hierocles, pro-consul of Bithynia during the reign of Valerian, and the patrician of the Christians of his province, but wrote a work, now lost, entitled "The discourse of a Lover of Truth, against the Christians", setting up the rival claims of neo-Platonic philosophy. He, like Julian the Apostate, Celeus (q.v.), and others, was roused to activity chiefly by the claim which Christianity made to be, not a national religion like Judaism, but a world-wide, or universal, religion. Julian sums up the case of philosophy against Christianity thus: "Divine Government is not through a special society (such as the Christian Church) teaching an authoritative doctrine, but through the order of the visible universe and all the variety of civic and national institutions. The underlying harmony of the world is the basis of everything, and is the secret of the order of the universe" (Whitaker, "Neo-Platonists", p. 155). It is in the light of this principle of public policy that we must view the attempt of Iamblichus to furnish a
systematic defence of Polytheism. Above the One, he says, is the Absolutely First. From the One, which is the uncreative, unproductive, passive, self-determining, self-constituted, the Intellectual and the Intelligible, is essentially dual. Both the Intellectual and the Intelligible are divided into triads, which are the superterrestrial gods. Beneath these and subordinate to them, are the terrestrial gods whom he subdivides into three hundred and sixty celestial beings, seventy-two orders of sub-celestial gods, and forty-two genera which could claim to be the semi-divine heroes of mythology and the philosopher-saints such as Pythagoras and Plotinus. From this it is evident that neo-Platonism had by this time ceased to be a purely academic question. It had entered very vigorously into the contest waged against Christianity. At the same time, it had not ceased to be a force which could claim to be a living remnant of pagan culture. As such, it appealed to the woman-philosopher Hypatia, whose fate at the hands of a Christian mob at Alexandria, in the year 429, was cast up as a reproach to the Christians (see Citha of Alexandria). Among the contemporaries of Hypatia at Alexandria was another Hierocles, and the comment on the Pythagorean "Golden Verses".

VI. Proclus, the most systematic of all the neo-Platonists, and for that reason known as "the scholastic of neo-Platonism," is the principal representative of a phase of philosophic thought which developed at Athens during the fifth century, and lasted down to the year 452. The occasion was the death of Plutarch. The Athenian school was Plutarch, the Great (not Plutarch of Chaeronea, author of "Lives of Illustrious Men"), who died in 431. His most distinguished scholar was Proclus, who was born at Constantinople in 410, studied Aristotelian logic at Athens, where he later occupied the chair of Plutarch. He died at Athens in 452. He is the author of several Commentaries on Plato, of a collection of hymns to the gods, of many works on mathematics, and of philosophical treatises, the most important of which are: "Theological Elements," 

"Theological Elements," 

(printed in the Paris ed. of Plotinus' works); "Platonic Theology" (printed, 1618, in a Latin translation by Emilius Portus); shorter treatises on Fate, on Evil, on Providence, etc., which exist only in a Latin translation made by William of Moerbeka in the thirteenth century. These are collected in Cousin's edition, "Procli Opera," Paris, 1820-25. Proclus attempted to harmonize and to systematize the teaching of Plotinus by means of Aristotelian logic. The cardinal principle on which his attempt rests is the doctrine, already foreshadowed by Iamblichus and others, that in the process of emanation there are always three subordinate stages, or moments, namely the original (μόρβος), emergence from the original (εξέλοιθος) and return to the original (επέδρεω). The reason of this process is enunciated as follows: the derived is at once unlike the original and like it; its likeness is the cause of its derivation, and its likeness is the cause, or reason, of the tendency to return. All emanation is, therefore, serial. It constitutes a "chain" from the One down to the antithesis of the One, which is matter. By the emanation from the One come the hexades", the supreme gods who exercise providence over worldly affairs; from the hexades comes the "triazl", intelligible, intelligible-intellectual, and intellectual, corresponding to being, life, and thought; each of these is, in turn, the origin of a "hebdolm", a series corresponding to the chief divinities of the pagan pantheon, the "deeds" or "forces" of the gods, which alone are operative in nature, although, since they are the lowest derivatives, their efficacy is least. Matter, the antithesis of the One, is inert, dead, and can be the cause of nothing except imperfection, error, and moral evil. The birth of a human being is the descent of a soul into matter. The soul, which, however, may ascend, never, may descend, cannot ascend. The ascension of the soul is brought about by asceticism, contemplation, and the invocation of the superior powers by magic, divination, oracles, miracles, etc.

VII. The Last Neo-Platonists.—Proclus was the last great representative of neo-Platonism. His disciple, Marinus, was the teacher of Damascius, who, along with the Saracens the learned, was murdered, and was the successor of Proclus, who died in 529. Damascius was accompanied in his exile to Persia by Simplicius, celebrated as a neo-Platonic commentator. About the middle of the sixth century John Philoponus and Olympiodorus flourished at Alexandria as exponents of neo-Platonism. They were, like Simplicius, commentators. When they became Christians at the time of the suppression of paganism, Plato came to an end. The name of Olympiodorus is the last in the long line of scholarchs who began with Speusippus, the disciple and nephew of Plato.

VIII. Influence of Neo-Platonism.—Christian thinkers, almost from the beginning of Christian speculation, found in the spiritualism of Plato a powerful aid in their understanding of the spiritual world and human soul which pagan materialism rejected, but to which the Christian Church was irrevocably committed. All the early refutations of psychological materialism are Platonic. So, too, when the ideas of Plotinus began to prevail, the Christian writers took advantage of the support thus lent to the doctrine of the immortality of the human soul. The Christian world of matter. Later, there were Christian philosophers, like Nemesius (flourished c. 450), who took over the entire system of neo-Platonism so far as it was considered consonant with Christian dogma. The same may be said of Synesius (Bishop of Ptolemais, c. 410), except that he, having been a pagan, did not, as a logical consequence, feel that neo-Platonism had value as a force which unified the various factors in pagan culture. At the same time there were elements in neo-Platonism which appealed very strongly to the heretics, especially to the Gnostics, and these elements were more and more strongly accentuated in heretical systems; so that St. Augustine, who knew the writings of Plotinus in a Latin translation, was obliged to exclude from his interpretation of Plotinus many of the tenets which characterized the neo-Platonic school. In this way, he came to profess a Platonism which in many respects is nearer to the doctrine of Plato's "Dialectes" than is the philosophy of Plotinus. "Pseudo-Plotinian" oppositions of modern authors of neo-Platonism had the widest influence in later times, and who also reproduced most faithfully the doctrines of the school, is the Pseudo-Dionysius (see Dionysius, THE PSEUDO-APOPEGATHE). The works "De Divinis Nominibus", "De hierarchia coelesti", etc., are now admitted to have been written at the end of the fifth, or during the first decades of the sixth century. They are the pen of a Christian Platonist, a disciple of Proclus, probably an immediate pupil of that teacher, as is clear from the fact that they embody, not only Proclus' ideas, but even lengthy passages from his writings. The author, whether intentionally on his part, or by some mistake on the part of his readers, came to be identified with Dionysius who is mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles as a convert of St. Paul. Later, especially in France, he was further identified with Dionysius the first Bishop of Paris. Thus it came about that the works of the Pseudo-Apoepegate, after having been used in the East, first by the Monophysites and later by the Catholics, became known in the West and exercised a widespread influence through the Middle Ages. They were translated into Latin by John Scotus Eriugena about the middle of the ninth century, and in this form were studied and commented on, not only by mystic writers, such as the Victorines, but also by the typical representatives of
Scholasticism, such as St. Thomas Aquinas. None of the later scholastics, however, went the full length of adopting the metaphysics of the Pseudo-Arcopagite in its essential principles, as did John Scotus Eriugena in his “De divisione naturae.” After the reorganization of the Athenian school of philosophy by John Philoponus in the 5th century, the representatives of neo-Platonism went, as we have seen, to Persia. They did not remain long in that country. Another exodus, however, had more permanent consequences. A number of Greek neo-Platonists who settled in Syria carried with them the works of Plato and Aristotle, which, having been translated into Syriac, were afterward lost. It was, however, preserved. Thus, towards the middle of the twelfth century, began to re-enter Christian Europe through Moorish Spain. These translations were accompanied by commentaries which continued the neo-Platonic tradition commenced by Simplicius. At the same time a number of anonymous philosophical works, written for the most part under the influence of the school of Proclus, some of which were ascribed to Aristotle, began to be known in Christian Europe, and were not without influence on Scholasticism. Again, works like the “Fons vitae” of Avicebron, which were known to be of Jewish or Arab origin, were neo-Platonic, and helped to determine the doctrine of the scholastics. For this reason the Schoolmen, Scoto-Erasmianus is acknowledged by Scotus himself to be derived from Avicebron. Notwithstanding all these facts, Scholastic philosophy was in spirit and in method Aristotelian; it explicitly rejected many of the neo-Platonic interpretations, such as the unity of the Active Intellect. For this reason all unprejudiced critics agree that it is an exaggeration to describe the whole Scholastic movement as merely an episode in the history of neo-Platonism. In recent times this exaggerated view has been defended by M. Picavet in his “Esquisse d’une histoire comparée des philosophies médiévales” (Paris, 1907).

The neo-Platonic elements in Dante’s “Paradiso” have their origin in his interpretation of the scholastics. It was not until the rise of Humanism in the sixteenth century that the works of Plotinus and Proclus were translated and studied with that zeal which characterized the Platonists of the Renaissance. It was then, too, that the theurgic, or magic, elements in neo-Platonism were made popular. The same tendency is found in Bruno’s “Enchiridion Campestre,” and later in Plotinus in the direction of materialistic Pantheism. The active rejection of Materialism by the Cambridge Platonists in the seventeenth century carried with it a revival of interest in the neo-Platonists. An echo of this appears in Berkeley’s “Sirius,” the last phase of his opposition to materialism. Whatever neo-Platonic elements are recognizable in the transcendentalists, such as Schelling and Hegel, can hardly be cited as survivals of philosophical principles. They are rather inspirational influences, such as we find in Platonizing poets like Spenser and Shelley.

**Neo-Platonic philosophy.**—The ethicoreligious society founded by Pythagoras, which flourished especially in Magna Grecia in the fifth century B.C., disappears completely from history during the fourth century, when philosophy reached the zenith of its perfection at Athens. Here and there, however, there appears a philosopher who reverts to the Pythagorean doctrine of numbers, and in a general way manifests the tendency of the school towards religious ethics and the practices of asceticism. Beginning with the middle of the first century B.C., a more systematic attempt was made to philosophize on the speculative philosophy of the Pythagoreans and combine it with the practice of astrology and sorcery. The first of these systematic neo-Pythagoreans was Figulus, a Roman philosopher who lived at Alexandria about the middle of the first century B.C., and was a friend of Cicero. Other Romans also contributed to the movement, the chief of whom were Vatinus and the Sextites. It was, however, the Alexandrine school that was, of course, conceived without any reference to the claims of Christianity. Their original aim—to save the pagan world from moral and social ruin by the introduction of the religious element into the practice of astrology and philosophy—was, of course, conceived without any reference to the claims of Christianity. But as soon as the Christian religion came to be recognized as a factor in the intellectual and political life of the Roman Empire, philosophy, in the form of Neo-Pythagoreanism, made active campaign against the Christians, proclaimed its own system of spiritual regeneration, and set up in opposition to Christ and the Saints the heroes of philosophical tradition and legend, especially Pythagoras and Apollonius of Tyana.

**Speculative System.**—The neo-Pythagoreans were methodical eccentrics. They admitted into their speculative system not only the traditional teachings of the Pythagorean school but also elements of Platonism, Aristotelianism, and Stoicism. Besides, they derived from Oriental religions with which they were in contact at Rome as well as at Alexandria, a highly spiritual notion of God. There was, naturally, very little coherence in a system developed from principles so divergent. Nevertheless, there was a sort of unity in the school even in respect of fundamental tenets. Nevertheless, it may, in general, be said that the school placed God, the supremely spiritual One, at the head of all reality. This, of course, was Oriental in its origin. Next, they interpreted the Pythagorean doctrine in a Platonic sense, when they taught that numbers are the thoughts of God. Thirdly, borrowing from Stoicism, they went on to maintain that numbers, emanating as forces from the divine thoughts, are, not indeed the substance of things, but the forms according to which things are fashioned. From Aristotle they borrowed the doctrine that the world is eternal and that there is a distinction between terrestrial and celestial matter. They also accepted Aristotelian influence, is dominated to a great extent by the belief that the stars are deities and that the powers of air, earth, and sky are demons.

**Ethics and Religion.**—In their theory of conduct the neo-Pythagoreans attach great importance to personal asceticism, contemplation, and the worship of a purely spiritual deity. This asceticism is an essential part of their ethical system that freedom from the trammels of matter and final union with God are to be obtained only by invoking the aid of friendly spirits and God-sent men and by thwarting the efforts of malign demons. This latter principle led to the practice of magic and sorcery and eventually to a good deal of charlatanry. The principle that the friendly spirits and the souls of god’s special messengers aid
men in the struggle for spiritual perfection led to the practice of honouring and even deifying the heroes of antiquity and the representatives of wisdom such as Pythagoras and Apollonius. In view of the philosophers of this school wrote "Lives" of Pythagoras which are full of fabulous tales, stories in which more than natural wisdom, skill, and sanctity are attributed to the hero. They did not hesitate to invent where exaggeration failed to accomplish their aim, so that they gave only too much justification to the modern critic's description of their biographical activity as representing the "Golden Age of Apocryphal literature". In this spirit and with this purpose in view Philostratus, about the year A.D. 220, wrote a "Life of Apollonius" which is of special importance because, while it is not a professed imitation of the Gospels, it was evidently written with a view of rivalling the great narrative. Apollonius was born at Tyana in Cappadocia four years before the Christian era. At an early age he devoted himself under various masters, to the study of philosophy and the practice of asceticism. After the five years of silence imposed by the rule of Pythagoras, he began his journeys. Throughout Asia Minor he travelled from city to city teaching the doctrine of the sect. In time he journeyed to the far East in search of the wisdom of the magi and the brahmins, and, after his return, took up once more the task of teaching. Later he went to Greece, and thence to Rome, where he lived for a time under the emperor Nero. In 69 he was at Alexandria, where he attracted the attention of Vespopius, who enquired of his narrative. Apollonius was cast into prison, but escaped to Greece, and died two years later. The place of his death is variously given as Ephesus, Rhodes, and Crete. Into the framework of these facts Philostratus weaves a tissue of alleged miraculous events, prophecies, visions, and prodigies of various kinds. It is important to remark in criticism of this narrative that Apollonius lived one hundred years after the events which he describes. Moreover, according to Philostratus's own account, Apollonius did not lay claim to divine prerogatives. He believed that the "virtue" which he possessed was to be attributed to his knowledge of Pythagorean philosophy and his observance of its precepts. He held as a general principle that anyone who attained the same degree of wisdom and asceticism could acquire the same power. The parallele, therefore, which was drawn between his extraordinary deeds and the miracles narrated in the Gospels does not stand the verdict of criticism. Our Lord claimed to be God, and appealed to His miracles as a proof of His divinity. Apollonius denied his own divinity. Finally, it should be remembered that the Pythagorean biographers openly acknowledged "the principle of permitting exaggeration and deceit in the cause of philosophy" (Newman). The "Lives" of Pythagoras and Apollonius are to be judged by the standards of fiction and not by the canons of historical criticism. Those who have examined and criticised the distinction, have tried to make capital against Christianity out of this class of Pythagorean literature are Lord Herbert and Blount, mentioned in Newman's essay on Apollonius, and Jean de Castillon, who was instigated by Frederic the Great.
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NEO-SCHOLASTICISM.—THE NAME AND ITS MEANING.—Neo-Scholasticism is the development of the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages during the latter half of the nineteenth century. It is not merely the resuscitation of a philosophy long since defunct, but rather a restatement in our own day of the philosophy, which, elaborated by the Greeks and brought to the world. This purpose, in view of the philosophers of this school wrote "Lives" of Pythagoras which are full of fabulous tales, stories in which more than natural wisdom, skill, and sanctity are attributed to the hero. They did not hesitate to invent where exaggeration failed to accomplish their aim, so that they gave only too much justification to the modern critic's description of their biographical activity as representing the "Golden Age of Apocryphal literature". In this spirit and with this purpose in view Philostratus, about the year A.D. 220, wrote a "Life of Apollonius" which is of special importance because, while it is not a professed imitation of the Gospels, it was evidently written with a view of rivalling the great narrative. Apollonius was born at Tyana in Cappadocia four years before the Christian era. At an early age he devoted himself under various masters, to the study of philosophy and the practice of asceticism. After the five years of silence imposed by the rule of Pythagoras, he began his journeys. Throughout Asia Minor he travelled from city to city teaching the doctrine of the sect. In time he journeyed to the far East in search of the wisdom of the magi and the brahmins, and, after his return, took up once more the task of teaching. Later he went to Greece, and thence to Rome, where he lived for a time under the emperor Nero. In 69 he was at Alexandria, where he attracted the attention of Vespopius, who enquired of his narrative. Apollonius was cast into prison, but escaped to Greece, and died two years later. The place of his death is variously given as Ephesus, Rhodes, and Crete. Into the framework of these facts Philostratus weaves a tissue of alleged miraculous events, prophecies, visions, and prodigies of various kinds. It is important to remark in criticism of this narrative that Apollonius lived one hundred years after the events which he describes. Moreover, according to Philostratus's own account, Apollonius did not lay claim to divine prerogatives. He believed that the "virtue" which he possessed was to be attributed to his knowledge of Pythagorean philosophy and his observance of its precepts. He held as a general principle that anyone who attained the same degree of wisdom and asceticism could acquire the same power. The parallel, therefore, which was drawn between his extraordinary deeds and the miracles narrated in the Gospels does not stand the verdict of criticism. Our Lord claimed to be God, and appealed to His miracles as a proof of His divinity. Apollonius denied his own divinity. Finally, it should be remembered that the Pythagorean biographers openly acknowledged "the principle of permitting exaggeration and deceit in the cause of philosophy" (Newman). The "Lives" of Pythagoras and Apollonius are to be judged by the standards of fiction and not by the canons of historical criticism. Those who have examined and criticised the distinction, have tried to make capital against Christianity out of this class of Pythagorean literature are Lord Herbert and Blount, mentioned in Newman's essay on Apollonius, and Jean de Castillon, who was instigated by Frederic the Great.

"Philostratus's Life of Apollonius, and the Letters sacred to the latter were published in PHILOSTRATUS, Opera Omnia (Leipzig, ed. OLIVERIUS, 1789); (ed. of KNAPP, 1870-71); the works of NEWTON, LAMBCHURCH, in LAMBCHURCH, "Apuleius: De Morte"; (ed. of NAUMANN, 1877). ZELLER, "Philosophie des Altertums", III, 3rd ed. (Leipzig, 1873), 70 ff.; NEWTON, "Historical Sketches, 1 (London, 1895), 301 ff.; TURNER, "History of Philosophy" (Boston, 1903), 204 ff.
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through the active intellect (intellec tus agens) an ab-
stract representation of the sensible object is provided
for the intellectus possibile s. Hence the characteristic
of the idea, its non-materiality, and on this is based
the principal argument for the spirituality and immor-
tality of the soul. Here, too, is the foundation of logic
and of the theory of knowledge, the justification of our
judgments and axioms.

Upon knowledge follows the appetitive process,
sensory or intellectual according to the sort of knowl-
edge. The will (appetitus intellectualis) in certain con-
ditions is free, and thanks to this liberty man is the
master of his destiny. Like all other beings, we have an
intensity of the theory of knowledge, the justification of
our judgments and axioms.

Natural happiness would result from the full de-
velopment of our powers of knowing and loving. We
should find and possess God in this world since the
corporeal world is the proper object of our intelligence.
But above nature is the order of grace and our sup-
natural happiness will consist in the direct intuition of
God, the beatific vision. Here philosophy ends and
theology begins.

II. ADAPTATION TO MODERN NEEDS.—The neo-
Scholastic programme includes, in the next place, the
adaptation of medieval principles and doctrines to our
present needs and demands. Many of these are less in-
compatible with progress than out-and-out
relativism. Vita in motu. To make Scholasticism
rigid and stationary would be fatal to it. The doc-
trines revived by the new movement are like an
inherited fortune; to refuse it would be folly, but to
manage it without regard to actual conditions would
be worse. With this understanding the “Aquinas
should be our beacon, not our boundary” (“Der Ka-
tholismus und das zwanzigste Jahrh. im Lichte der
Kirchlichen Entwicklung der Neuzeit,” Stuttgart,
1902, 252). We have now to pass in review the vari-
ous factors in the situation and to see in what respect
the new Scholasticism differs from the old and how far
it adapts itself to our age.

(1) Elimination of False or Useless Notions.—Neo-
Scholasticism rejects the theories of physics, celestial
and terrestrial, which the Middle Ages grafted on the
principles, otherwise sound enough, of cosmology and
metaphysics; e. g. the perfection and superiority of
astral substance, the “incorruptibility” of the heav-
ens, the “animal spirits”, the “immortal souls” or the
“spirits”; the influence of the stars on the generation of
earthly beings, the four “simple” bodies, etc. It fur-
ther rejects those philosophical theories which are dis-
proved by the results of investigation; e. g. the
diffusion of sensible “species” throughout a medium
and their introduction into the organs of sense. Even
the Scholastic ideas that have been retained are not
all of equal importance; criticism and personal con-
viction may retract or modify them considerably,
without injury to fundamental principles.

(2) Study of the History of Philosophy.—The medi-
evial scholars cultivated the history of philosophy solely
with a view to its utility; i. e. as a means of gathering
the deposit of philosophical and theological truths of
ancients and, especially, for the purpose of refuting
error and thus emphasizing the value of their own doc-
trine. Modern students, on the contrary, regard
every human fact and achievement as in itself signifi-
cant, and accordingly they treat the history of philos-
ophy in a spirit that is more disinterested. With this
new attitude, neo-Scholasticism is in full sympathy;
it does its share in the work of historical reconstruction
by employing critical methods; it does not attempt to
condense the opinions of others into a syllogism and
refute them with a phrase, nor does it commend the
practice of putting whole systems into a paragraph or
two in order to unburden them with depth or inten-
tive. Neo-Scholasticism, however, does not confine
its interest to ancient and medieval philosophy; its
chief concern is with present-day systems. It takes
issue with them and offsets their theories of the world
by a synthesis of its own. It is only by keeping in
touch with actual living thought that it can claim a
place in the twentieth century and command the at-
tention of its opponents. And it is only by having
again from a discussion in which it encounters Posi-
tivism, Kantism, and other forms or tendencies of
modern speculation.

(3) Cultivation of the Sciences.—The need of a phi-
losophy based on science is recognized to-day by every
school. Neo-Scholasticism simply follows the exam-
ple of the Aristotelian and medieval philosophy in
taking the data of research as the groundwork of its
speculation. That there are profound differences be-
tween the Middle Ages and modern times from the
scientific point of view, is obvious. One has only to
consider the multiplication of the sciences in special
lines, the autonomy which science as a whole has
acquired, and the clear demarcation established be-
tween popular views of nature and their scientific inter-
pretation. But it is equally plain that neo-
Scholasticism must follow up each avenue of investi-
gation, since it undertakes, as Aristotle and Aquinas
did, to provide a synthetic explanation of phenomena
by referring them to their ultimate causes and deter-
mining their place in the universal order of things; and
this undertaking, if the synthesis is to be deep and
comprehensive, presupposes a knowledge of the details
furnished by each science. It is not possible to explain
the world of phenomena while neglecting the phenom-
en that make up the world. “All that exists, as con-
templated by the human mind, forms one large system
one complex fact.” “A man should be our beacon, not our boundary” (“Der Katholizismus und das zwanzigste Jahrh. im Lichte der Kirchlichen Entwicklung der Neuzeit,” Stuttgart, 1902, 252). We have now to pass in review the various factors in the situation and to see in what respect the new Scholasticism differs from the old and how far it adapts itself to our age.

(1) Elimination of False or Useless Notions.—Neo-
Scholasticism rejects the theories of physics, celestial and terrestrial, which the Middle Ages grafted on the principles, otherwise sound enough, of cosmology and metaphysics; e. g. the perfection and superiority of astral substance, the “incorruptibility” of the heavens, the “animal spirits”, the “immortal souls” or the “spirits”; the influence of the stars on the generation of earthly beings, the four “simple” bodies, etc. It further rejects those philosophical theories which are disproved by the results of investigation; e. g. the diffusion of sensible “species” throughout a medium and their introduction into the organs of sense. Even the Scholastic ideas that have been retained are not all of equal importance; criticism and personal conviction may retract or modify them considerably, without injury to fundamental principles.

(2) Study of the History of Philosophy.—The medi-
evial scholars cultivated the history of philosophy solely with a view to its utility; i. e. as a means of gathering the deposit of philosophy and theological truths of ancients and, especially, for the purpose of refuting error and thus emphasizing the value of their own doctrine. Modern students, on the contrary, regard every human fact and achievement as in itself significant, and accordingly they treat the history of philosophy in a spirit that is more disinterested. With this new attitude, neo-Scholasticism is in full sympathy; it does its share in the work of historical reconstruction by employing critical methods; it does not attempt to condense the opinions of others into a syllogism and refute them with a phrase, nor does it commend the practice of putting whole systems into a paragraph or two in order to unburden them with depth or inductive. Neo-Scholasticism, however, does not confine its interest to ancient and medieval philosophy; its
lidity met with no challenge, whereas, in the twentieth century, its very possibility is at stake and, to defend it against the concerted attack of Hume and Kant and Comte, the true significance of such concepts as being, substance, absolute, cause, potency, and act must be explained and upheld. It is true that, in a more technical sense, God is not unknowable; to rebut the charges preferred by Herbert Spencer against the traditional proofs of God's existence; to deal with the materials furnished by ethnography and the history of religions; and to study the various forms which monism and immanentism nowadays assume.

Cosmology can well afford to insist on the traditional proofs of matter and form, provided it pays due attention to the findings of physics, chemistry, crystallography, and mineralogy, and meet the objections of atomism and dynamism, theories which, in the opinion of scientific authority, are less satisfactory as explanations of natural phenomena than the hylomorphism (q. v.) of the Scholastics. The theory also allows, once the subject of ridicule, is nowadays endorsed by some of the most prominent scientists. In psychology especially the progressive spirit of neo-Scholasticism makes itself felt. The theory of the substantial union of body and soul, as an interpretation of biological, psychical, and psycho-physiological facts, is far more serviceable than the externalised spirit of Descartes on the one hand and the Positivism of modern thinkers on the other. As Wundt admits, the results of investigation in physiological psychology do not square either with materialism or with dualism whether of the Platonic or of the Cartesian type; it is only Aristotelian animism, which brings psychology into harmony with biology, can satisfactorily meet the case. The satisfactory metaphysical interpretation of experimental psychology ("Grundzüge d. phsiov. Psychologie" II, 540). So vigorous indeed has been the growth of psychology that each of its offshoots is developing in its own way: such is the case with critique, aesthetics, didactics, pedagogy, and the numerous ramifications of applied psychology. On the various lines, unknown to medieval philosophy, neo-Scholasticism is working energetically and successfully.

Its criminology is altogether new: the older Scholasticism handled the problem of certitude from the deductive point of view: God could not have misshaped the faculties with which He endowed the mind in such a way as to make knowledge of things possible. On the other hand, proceeds by analysis and introspection; it states the problem in the terms which, since Kant's day, are the only admissible terms, but as against the Kantian criticism it finds the solution in a rational dogmatism. Its aesthetics holds a middle course between the extreme subjectivism of many modern thinkers who would reduce the beautiful to a more impression, and the no less extreme objectivism which the Greeks of old maintained. It is equally at home in the field of experimental psychology which investigates the correlation between conscious phenomena and their physiological accompaniments; in fact, its theory of the substantial union of body and soul explains its covert influence on the various psycho-psychological theories corresponding to each psychical process.

The laws and principles which the modern science of education has drawn from experience find their adequate explanation in neo-Scholastic doctrine; thus, the intuitive method, so largely accepted at present as an essential element in education, is based on the Scholastic doctrine that nothing can be known through the avenue of sense. In the study of ethical problems, neo-Scholasticism holds fast to the vital teachings that prevailed in the thirteenth century, but at the same time it takes into account the historical and sociological data which explain the varying application of principles in successive ages. In view of contemporary systems which, on a purely experimental basis, attempt to set aside all moral imperatives and ideas of value, it is necessary to insist on the older concepts of good and evil, of finitude and obligation—a need which is easily supplied by neo-Scholastic ethics. As to logic, the most perfect part of Aristotle's great constructive work and therefore that which has been least modified up to the present time, its positions still call for defence against the inroads of writers like Mill, who regard the syllogism as a "solemn farce". Accordingly, with due consideration for modern modes of thinking, neo-Scholasticism adapts the teaching of the Middle Ages to actual conditions. Even as regards the relations between philosophy and religion, there are important changes to note. For the medieval mind in the Western world, philosophy and theology were identical until about the twelfth century. In the thirteenth the line of demarcation was clearly drawn, but philosophy was still treated as the preliminary training for theology. This is no longer the case; neo-Scholasticism assigns to philosophy a value of its own as a rational explanation of the world, on a par in this respect with Positivism and other systems; and it welcomes all who are bent on honest research, whether their aim be purely philosophical or apologetic.

Parallel with these modifications are those which affect the pedagogical phase of the movement. The methods of the earlier centuries were so closely dependent on the culture of that age; hence they have been replaced by modern procedures, curricula, and means of propagation. It would be ill-advised to wrap neo-Scholastic doctrine in medieval envelopes, e. g. to write books on the plan of the theological "Summe" or the "Quodlibetal Questions" which characterized, the thirteenth century. Without at all lessening its force, syllogistic demonstration gains in attractiveness when its essential characteristics are retained and clothed about with modern forms of presentation. In this connexion, the use of living languages as a means of exposition has obvious advantages and finds favour with many of those who are. Among these is another...
1904), Dupont, and Lepidi in Belgium; Farges and Dornet de Vorges (1910) in France, who with other scholars carried on the work of restoration before the First World War appealed for a clarification of the doctrine. For the first time, as true in various letters, recognized its importance; but it was the encyclical "Etterni Patris" of Leo XIII (4 Aug, 1879) that imparted to neo-Scholasticism its definitive character and quickened its development. This document sets forth the principles by which the movement is to be guided in a progressive spirit, and by which the medieval doctrine must take on new life in its modern environment. "If," says the pope, "there be anything that the Scholastic doctors treated with excessive subtlety or with insufficient consideration, or that is at variance with well-founded teachings of later date, or is otherwise improbable, we by no means intend that it shall be proposed to our age for imitation; . . . we certainly do not blame those learned and energetic men who turn to the profit of philosophy their own assiduous labours and erudition as well as the results of modern investigation; for we are fully aware that all this goes to the advancement of knowledge."

In Italy, the movement was vigorous from the start. The Academia di San Tommaso, founded in 1784, published, up to 1891, a review entitled "La Scienza Italiana." Numerous works were produced by Zigliara (1833-93), Satolli (1839-1909), Liberatore (1810-92), Barberis (1847-95), Schifini (1841-1906), de Maria, Talamo, Lorenzelli, Ballerini, Matusi, and others. The Italian writers at first laid special emphasis on particular problems without paying sufficient attention to the sciences or to the history of philosophy. Recently, however, this situation has undergone a change which promises excellent results.

From Italy the movement spread into the other European countries and found supporters in Germany and England. Stöckli, the "Glocke der philosophie Chrétienne" (Paris, since 1830); "Revue néo-scolastique de Philosophie" (Louvain, since 1894); "Revue de Philosophie" (Paris, since 1885); "Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques" (Kain, Belgium, since 1907); "Revue Thomiste" (Paris, since 1893); "Philosophisches Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie" (Paderborn, since 1887); "St. Thomas Blätter" (Ratisbon, since 1888); Bôlesleti-Folýóirat (Budapest, since 1886); "Revista Lulliana" (Barcelona, since 1901); "Cienas Tomista" (Madrid, since 1903) in addition to various periodical publications not specially devoted to philosophy have given neo-Scholasticism their cordial support.

Various commentaries on the Encyclical "Etterni Patris" by Van Wijngaarden, L. Encyclop. des Sciences philosophiques et religieuses, LXXI (1879); SCHRIND, Die Philosophie des N. Thomae und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart (Würzburg, 1881); ROYCE, Pope Leo's Philosophical movement and its relation to modern thought in Res. Cath. Pedag. (1903); MERCIER, Les origines de la psychologie contemporaine (Paris, 1882); LOUVAIN; SANTROUX, Was neue-scholastische Philosophie (Münster, 1906); GARCIA, Tomismo y neo-thomismo (San Luis Potosí, 1905); TALAMO, Il rinascimento del pensiero tomistico in Italia (Catania, 1887); SFRISCHNEECK, Die Psychologie der neuen Lünerer Schule (Lüneburg, 1898); BERGER, Deux centres du movement thomiste (Paris, 1894); LOUVAIN, Les derniers développements de la philosophie 1890-1904 (Louvain, 1904); HARRICH, Die neue-scholastische Philosophie der Lünerer Schule, introduction a la philosophie (1896); KERKE, Psychologie (Berlin, 1896); COFFET, Phystolog et les Sciences at Louvain, Appendix to DE WULF'S Scholasticism and Neo-Scholasticism (1904); ROYCE, Philosophie de la culture et de la science in La philosophie en Europe, in Revue de philosophie ancienne et moderne (Paris, 1904); FERREY, The Revival of Scholastic Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century (New York, 1907); LE MOUVEMENT Néo-thomiste, periodical founded in Louvain (1909); VAN BECKELAERE, La philosophie en France depuis les origines modernes (New York, 1907); DE WULF, Scholasticism and Neo-Scholasticism in the university catholique of Louvain (Madrid, 1901); VAN BECKELAERE, La philosophie en Amérique depuis les origines modernes in Revue de philosophie ancienne et moderne (Paris, 1909); roll of Scholasticism and Neo-Scholasticism in particular of the philosophy contemporaine, III (Lyons, 1899); Eucken, Neukantismus und die neue Wis- senschaftsphilosophie in Philosophia (1899); Propyläenstich (1900); MÜLLER, Der Katholische und der Neukant. Ein Kampf zweier Welten in Kantstudien (1901); IEREN, Das Wissenschaftliche Centrum des heutigen Thomismus (Münster, 1902); WILKINSON, Thomas Aquinas and Philosophy, Una escurion filosófica por España en Revista Ibero-americana (1902); MERCIER, Discours sur l'innovation de la philosophie en France (1902); PACE, St. Thomas and Modern Thought in Cath. Unit. Bulletin (1908); PICAVET, Le mouvement néo-thomiste in Revue des sciences philosophiques et de sciences théologiques (1909 and 1910); THE VALUE OF SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY, Judgment of a special Committee of the Priy council of Ireland after Precedents and evidence learned on October 15-19, 1909 (Dublin, 1909); MARKER, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); ROYCE, Principles of Logic (London and New York, 1888).

M. DE WULF.

Nephtali (A. V., Néphtali), sixth son of Jacob and Bala (Gen., xxx, 8). The name is explained by a paenonym, which causes no small perplexity to commentators. Modern interpreters, following Simonis and Gesenius, translate it "Wrestlings of God have I wrestled [D. V., "God hath compassed me"] with my sister, and I have prevailed." According to this rendering, Nephtali would mean "my wrestling", or simply "wrestling". But, according to Gen., xlix, 21, tell us Nephtali was the first to announce to Jacob that Joseph was alive; in another passage of the same Targum, Nephtali is mentioned among the five whom Joseph presented to Pharaoh (Gen., xlvii, 2). According to the apocryphal "Testament of the twelve Patriarchs", he died in his one hundred and thirty-second year in Egypt. These details, however, are unreliable; in point of fact, we know nothing with certainty beyond the fact that he had four sons: Jaziel, Gunni, Jezer, and Sallem (Gen., xlv, 24; Num., xxvi, 48 sqq.; I Par., vii, 13).

The Tribe of Nephtali numbered 35,400 men "able to go forth to war" (Num., i, 42), being thus the sixth in importance among the tribes of Israel. The second census brought it down to the eighth place, and reported only 45,400 warriors (Num., xxvi, 48-50). During the wanderings of the Israelites in the desert, the tribe of Nephtali, under the command first of
Ahira, and later on of Phedael, was always united with the tribes of Dan and Aser. When spies were sent from the desert of Pharan to view the land of Chanaan, Nahabi, the son of Vass, and with him the tribe in the expedition (Num., xiii, 15). The territory allotted to Neptali in Chanaan lay to the extreme north of Palestine, and was bounded (Jos., xix, 33-34) on the north by the River Leontes (Nahr el-Qasmiyeh), on the east by the course of the Jordan as far as 12 miles south of the Sea of Galilee, on the west by the tribes of Asir and Zabulon, and on the south by that of Issachar. Including some of the finest land in Palestine, "it invites the most slothful to take pains to cultivate it" (Joseph., "Bell. Jud.," III, iii, 2). Naturally, the Chanaanites of that district were most unwilling to give up their rich possessions; the Book of Judges possibly even implies that the Hebrews could not approach the inhabitants (Judges, v), or in the south, in the territory of Neptali, the tribe of Issachar, called on that account "Galilee of the Gentiles" (Isa., ix, 1; IV Kings, xv, 29). Finally, they banded together under Jabin and Sisara to drive the Israelites out of the land. How this confederacy was defeated by Barac, a man of Cedees, with the warriors of Zabulon and Naphtali, in the battle of the Jordan, and the glory of Neptali, needs not be recounted here (Judges, iv, v). Again, with Gedeon, warriors of Neptali took part in the pursuit of the Midianites in pursuit of the Midianites (Judges, vii, 23), and sent to David at Hebron a contingent of 1000 captains and 37,000 men "furnished with shield and spear" (I Par., x, 34). And the men of Neptali, according to Josephus (Antiq., xvi, 10, 1), "in accordance with Emath", the key to northern Palestine, were "inured to war from their infancy" ("Bell. Jud.," loc. cit.).

NEPEI

NEPUE

Jospephus, Judean Wars, I, iii; iii: Commentaries on Gen., Jos., and Josephus: Antiquities of the Jews; Bible Dictionary;
Thomson, The Land and the Book, II (London, 1881); DOREME, Ouvrages bibliques d'Asie in Revue Biblique (Apr., 1910), 192, 197; LAGONARD, La Propheie de Jacob in Revue Biblique (1898), 534.

CHARLES L. SOUVAT.

Nepi and Sutri (Nepesi et Sutrin), united sees of the province of Rome, central Italy, in the Ciminiæan region. Nepi is situated on a hill of tufts, and is surrounded by great walls; its cathedral, which occupies the site of an ancient temple of Jupiter, contains paintings by Titian, Perugino, and Zuccari; the communal palace was begun by Vignola, and the fort was built by Peter Louis Farnese. There still exist at Nepi the ruins of an amphitheatre and of ancient baths, from which several statues in the Vatican museum are taken. Later on, the church of St. King Nestanibis I, with an Egyptian inscription, Nepete and Sutriam, as these cities were called, belonged to the Faliscans, who called the Romans to their assistance when the Etruscans invaded them; the invaders (359, 311, 310), after twice defeating the Romans, went beyond the Ciminaire forest to attack the Etruscans in Etruscan territory. Wherefore, Livy calls these towns "clausura Etruria"; in 352, they became Latin colonies. In the Gothic War Nepi was one of the last strongholds of the Goths. The town was sacked by the Lombards in 569, and then fell into decadence. In the eighth century, however, it became the seat of Tuto, a Lombard dux, known for his interference in the papal election of 768. Whereupon, the struggle between the emperors and the popes, Nepi was imperial during the reigns of Alexander II, Nicholas II, Gregory VII, and Innocent II; on the one hand, in 1160, it fought against the commune of Rome, and in 1244, was besieged by Frederick II. A feudal possession, first of the precepts of Vico, and then of the Orsini, in 1537 to 1545, it was erected into a duchy in favour of Peter Louis Farnese; and when the latter was transferred to Parma, Nepi returned to immediate dependence on the Holy See. In 1798 the French set fire to the cathedral and to the episcopal palace, in which last edifice valuable archives were lost. The existence of an early Christian cemetery testifies to the great antiquity of the see, which is, as its evangelizer, St. Poltemus, who, it is claimed, was a disciple of the Apostles. In 419, Eudius, pope of Rome, Boniface I, was made Bishop of Nepi; Bishop Paulus was sent as visitor to Naples by St. Gregory the Great; Bishop Stephanus, in 685, was one of the presidents and papal legates of the Council of Constantine, being one of the solidi which were remitted to him at the tintinnabulum. The sees of Nepi and Sutri were united in 1435.

Sutri is placed, like a hanging garden, upon a steep hill on the Cassian Way; the ancient town occupied two hills connected by a bridge, and its walls, built of great tufa rocks, are yet to be seen. In the neighbourhood, there are many Etruscan tombs; the ancient amphitheatre, burned out of the solid rock, is a remarkable work. The cathedral is of the thirteenth century, modernized by frequent alterations. Santa Maria della Grotta is an interesting church. The history of Sutri in antiquity resembles that of Nepi, for Sutri also was taken by the Lombards in 569, but was retaken by the exarch Romanus; Luitprand likewise took the town by December in 973 and restored it to "St. Peter". As the city is on the Cassian Way not far from Rome, it was, as a rule, the last halting-place of the German emperors on their way to the city, and sometimes they received there the papal legate. Two famous synods were held at Sutri, one in 1046, at which Sylvester II was deposed, and resigned the tiara; the other in 1087. Here also the agreement of 1111 between Paschal II and the emperor Henry V was concluded. In 1120, the antipope Gregory VIII withdrew to Sutri, and was besieged there by Calixtus II; he was finally delivered up to the pope by the Sutrians (1121). After this, the possession of the city was frequently contested by the Guelfs, of Vico, and the Ghibelline prefects of Vico, especially in 1264. Sutri was contained in the Duchy of Nepi. This town also has an ancient Christian cemetery, where the body of St. Romanus was found, who is the patron of the city; the cathedral possesses a statue of him by Bernini. Among the martyrs of Sutri is St. Felix (about 273). The first bishop of known date was Eusebius (453); other bishops were Martinus, or Marinus, who was sent as ambassador to Otho I in 963; Benedictus, who, in 975, became Pope Benedict VII; the famous Bishop Bonitho (Bonizo), historian of the Gregorian epoch, who was driven from his diocese by the anti-papal faction between 1003 and 1013; Bishop Bonitho II, the last Bishop of Nepi, was united to Nepi under Bishop Luke de Tarlaris (1345); under Pomponius Cesu (1519), who became a cardinal, the cemetery of St. Savinella was discovered; Michael Ghislieri (1556) became Pope St. Pius V; Joseph Chianti (1701) founded the seminary; Camillus Simeoni (1782) was exiled by the French and became a cardinal. In the territory of this diocese is the city of Braciano on the lake of the same name (lacus Sabatius); it is believed by some to be the ancient Forum Claudii, the bishop of which was at the council of Pope Melchisedec in 303; others identify the Forum Claudii with Oriolo, which is in the Diocese of Viterbo. The united sees of Nepi and Sutri are immediately dependent upon Rome; they have 31 parishes, with 42,400 inhabitants, 13 religious houses of men, and 13 of women, 10 of which maintain schools.

CAPPELLUTI, La Chiesa d'Italia, V; RANCIMARTI, Memorie storiche della città di Nepi, etc. (Odò, 1845-47); NISI-LANDI, L'antica città di Sutri (Rome, 1897).

U. BEGNINI.

NEPVEU, Francis, writer on ascetical subjects, b. at St. Malo, 29 April, 1639; entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus 12 October, 1654, when but fifteen years old. Successively professor of Grammar, of Humanities and Rhetoric for six years, and of Philos.
ophy for eight years, he was afterwards employed in the government. In 1679 he was made superior at Nantes; in 1684 rector at Vannes; in 1694 and 1700 rector at Orleans; in 1697 at Rouen; in 1704 at Rennes where he was director of retreats until his death, 17 February, 1708. Father Nepveu, described as a man of great zeal and intelligence, wrote voluminously on theological and canon law subjects, and his works have passed through many editions, having been translated into various languages. Among his more important works are numbered the following: "De l'amour de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ, et des Moyens de l'acquérir" (Nantes, 1684), has gone through no less than fourteen editions in France, selections from it were printed in English, Dutch, and English, and a complete edition appeared in Paris, 1893, and it has been translated into German, Italian (six editions), Spanish, Flemish, Polish, and English, ed. by the Rev. Henry J. Coleridge, S.J. and issued by Burns and Oates, 1869; "Retraite selon l'esprit et la méthode de Saint Ignace" (Paris, 1677, 514 pp.), also numbers fourteen editions of the original and translations have been made into German, Spanish, Flemish, Italian, and six editions in Latin; "Méthode facile d'oraison, réduite en pratique" (Nantes), went through more than twelve editions in French and was several times issued in Spanish; "Pénitences et Réflexions Chrétiennes pour tous les jours de l'année" (4 vols, Paris, 1695), had eighteen French editions, and was joyfully received, being translated into some eleven editions in foreign languages; "L'esprit du Christianisme ou la Conformité du Chrétien avec Jésus-Christ" (Paris, 1700, 380 pp.), went through twenty-four editions, and three editions of extracts therefrom appeared in Belgium, also translated into foreign languages, ten editions coming out in the first twenty years of its appearance, of which number nearly a score, may be had in the authorities cited below.

Edward F. Garéché.

**Nereus and Achilleus, Domitilla and Pancratius, Saints and Martyrs.**—The commemoration of these four Roman saints is made by the Church on 12 May, in common, and all four are named in the Proper of the Mass as martyrs. The old Roman lists, of the fifth century, and which passed over into the Martyrologium Hieronymianum, contained the names of Nereus and Achilleus, on behalf of whom there was in the Catacomb of Domitilla on the Via Ardeatina; in the same calendar was found the name of St. Pancratius, whose body rested in a catacomb of the Via Aurelia. The notice in the more complete version given by the Berne Codex, runs as follows: "IIIId. Id. Maii, Rome in cimiterio Prætextati natalis Nerei et Achillei fratrum, et natalis Pancratii viam Aureliam milie secundo" (On 12 May at Rome in the cemetery of Prætextati the natal day of Nereus and Achilleus, and the natal day of St. Pancratius, on the Aurelian Way at the second milestone; "ed. de Rossi-Duchesne, Acta SS., Nov., 11. [90]. In the invocation of the Mass for their feast, in the "Sacramentarium Gelasianum," the names of Nereus and Achilleus alone are mentioned, and this is because only their invocation in the Mass was entered in the collection, the feast of St. Pancratius being celebrated in the church built over his grave on the Via Aurelia. In the Mass of his festival, the formula of which is unknown to us, his name is mentioned, and the mention of it is that of the fourth and following centuries there was celebrated on 12 May in both places, at the grave of Saints Nereus and Achilleus on the Via Ardeatina, and at that of St. Pancratius on the Via Aurelia, a special votive Mass. The Itineraries of the graves of the Roman martyrs, written in the seventh century, are unanimous in their indication of the resting-place of these saints (de Rossi, "Roma sottoterranea," I, 180—83). The church which was erected in the fourth century over the grave of St. Pancratius, stands today in somewhat altered style. The legend describing the martyrdom of the saint is of later origin, and not reliable historically; it is probable that he was put to death by a priest of Valerian (257—60) or in that of Diocletian (304—06). The church built over the grave of Sts. Nereus and Achilleus in the Via Ardeatina, is of the latter part of the fourth century; it is a three-naved basilica, and was discovered by de Rossi in the Catacomb of Domitilla. Amongst the numerous objects found in the catacombs there were two small gold cushions, a deëforium ornamented with sculptures representing the death of the two saints by decapitation; one of these pillars is perfectly preserved, and the name of Achilleus is carved upon it. There was also found a large fragment of a marble slab, with an inscription composed by Pope Damasus, the text of which is well-known from an ancient copy. This oldest historical mention of the two saints (Weyman, "Vier Epigramm des hl. Papstes Damasus", Munich, 1905; de Rossi, "Inscriptions christiannes," II, 31; Ihm, "Damasi epigrammata", Leipzig, 1895, 12, no. 8) tells how Nereus and Achilleus as soldiers were obedient to the tyrant, but suddenly being converted to Christianity, were put to death. In Achilleus was the martyr's death; as to the date of their glorious confession we can make no inference. The acts of these martyrs, legendary even to a romantic degree, have no historical value for their life and death; they bring no fewer than thirteen different Roman martyrs into relation, amongst them even Simon Magus, according to the apocryphal Acts of Peter and Paul. These Acts, written in Greek and Latin; according to Achelis (see below) the Greek was the original text, and written in Rome in the sixth century; Schuetz (see below) on the other hand holds the Latin to have been the older version, and seeks to prove that it emanated from the first half of the fifth century; so remote a date is improbable, and the sixth century is to be preferred as the source of the Acts. According to these legends Nereus and Achilleus were eunuchs and chamberlains of Flavia Domitilla, a niece of the Emperor Domitian; with the Christian virgin they had been banished to the island of Ponta, and returning to Rome they had put to death the two martyrs on an estate of the Lady Domitilla near the Via Ardeatina, close to that of St. Petronilla. The author of this legend places the two saints quite differently from Pope Damasus, in his poem: as Nereus and Achilleus were buried in a very ancient part of the catacomb of Domitilla, built as far back as the beginning of the second century, we may conclude that they are among the most ancient martyrs of the Roman Church, and stand in very close relation to the Flavian family, of which Domitilla, the foundress of the catacomb, was a member. In the Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul mentions a Nereus with his sister, to whom he sends greetings (Rom., xvi, 15), perhaps even the martyr was a descendant of this disciple of the Apostle of the Gentiles. Owing to the purely legendary character of these Acts, we cannot use them as an argument to aid in the controversy as to whether there were two Christians of the name of Domitilla in the family of the Christian Flavian, or only one, the wife of the Consul Flavius Clemens (see Flavia Domi-
tilla). As to other legends of martyrs, they are especially noted in the old martyrologies as martyrs of the faith in Africa, or as being natives of that country (e.g., in the Martyrologium Hieronymianum, 11 May, 15 or 16 October, 16 Nov.) though there is one of the name in the present Roman Martyrology under date of 18 Oct., nothing more is known.
Neri, ANTONIO, Florentine chemist, b. in Florence in the sixteenth century; d. 1614, place unknown. We have but few details of his life. Dr. Merret, an English physician, who translated his work only fifty years after its first publication, states in his preface that he could find no account whatever of the author. It is known however that he was a priest and devoted to the study of chemistry: he travelled somewhat extensively in Italy and Holland, and during these journeys gathered up the manufacture of glass and its treatment for various purposes. This knowledge he gave to the world in his book "L'Arte Vetraria", which for a long time formed the basis of most other works on this subject. It is a book rich in detail, giving the then known methods of making glass, of colouring it, and of imitating precious stones. The original work has appeared in the following editions: Florence, 1612; Florence, 1616; and Milan, 1817. In 1662 Merret translated it into Latin, adding to it notes and a commentary of his own; this was published at Amsterdam in 1668 and again in 1681. It was translated into German by Johann Kunckel, who published a revised and enlarged edition of it in 1670, and this was translated into French, "Art de la Verrerie de Neri, Merret et Kunckel", etc., "Traduits de l'Allemand par M. D.***" (Paris, 1752).

BRUNET, Manuel du Libraire, IV (Paris, 1863); Poedendorff, Handwörterbuch der Geschichte der exakten Wissenschaften, II (Leipsig, 1863); preface to the various translations mentioned above.

EDWARD C. PHILLIPS.

Nerinx, CHARLES, missionary priest in Kentucky, founder of the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross, b. in Herffelingen, Belgium, 2 Oct., 1761; d. at Ste. Genevieve, Mo., 12 August, 1824. He was the eldest of the fourteen children of Dr. Schenck, at Engghien, and studied at Engghien and Gheel, made his philosophy at Louvain, and entered the theological seminary of Mechlin in 1781. Ordained in 1785, he became vicar at the cathedral of Mechlin, where he was noted for his zeal among the working classes. In 1794 he obtained the pastoral charge of Evergigs-Meerbeke, where the devotion to the spiritual interest was people developed that deep love for children which later characterized his missionary labours in America. During his incumbency he wrote several theological treatises: the manuscripts of which are still preserved in the parish archives. The French Directoire repressed his activity and ordered his arrest, but he eluded the gens d'armes (1797) and for four years was in hiding at the Hospital of Dendermonde, where he continued his ministry amid continual dangers. He came to America in 1804, Bishop Carroll assigning him to Kentucky in 1805. The district given to his charge was over two hundred miles in length and over half the State. He lived in the saddle; every year of his apostolate was marked by the organization of a new congregation or the building of a church. Of all the missionaries who worked in that field none deserves so well the title of "Apostle of Kentucky". His direction of souls was so efficient and enlightened that to this very day the grand-children of his penitents are still profoundly known for the spirituality and worth of his teachings. He died at Louisville, 1809, the year of his return to the United States, and was buried in the crypt of the church of St. Mary, in the same city. His body was later removed to the crypt of his own church and now rests in repose beneath the altar.
emperor that, ascending the rostrum in the Forum Romanum, he himself placed the crown on the head of Tividates. At the same time a dangerous war broke out in Britain. Strong camps and forts had been built there in the first years of Nero’s reign, and the province grew over night; the fortunes of those who had been condemned at law, of freedmen, of all pretenders by birth filled the depleted exchequer, and the coin was deliberately debased. All efforts to stem these disasters were vain, and the general misery had reached its highest, when in A. D. 64 occurred the terrible conflagration which burnt entirely three, and partly seven, of the fourteen districts into which Rome was divided. The older authors, Tacitus and Suetonius, say clearly, and the testimony of all later heathen and Christian writers concurs with them, that Nero himself gave the order to set the capital on fire, and that the people at large believed this report. Nero was in Antium when he heard that Rome was in flames; he hastened thither, and is said to have ascended the tower of Maccenas, and looking upon the sea of flame in which Rome lay engulfed, to have sung on his lyre the song of the ruin of Antium.

In place of the old city with its narrow and crooked streets, Nero planned a new residential city, to be called Neronia. For six days the fire ravaged the closely built quarters, and many thousands perished in the flames; countless great works of art were lost in the ruins. Informers, bribed for the purpose, declared that the Christians had set Rome on fire. Their doctrine of the nothingness of earthly joys in comparison with the delights of immortal souls in heaven was an enduring reproof to the dissolute emperor. There began a fierce persecution throughout the empire, and through robbery and confiscation the Christians were forced to pay in great part for the building of the new Rome. In this persecution Saints Peter and Paul were martyred in Rome in A. D. 67. Broad streets and piazzas were planned by the imperial architects; houses of stone arose where before stood those of lime and wood; the Domus aurea, enclosed in wonderful gardens and parks, in extent greater than a whole former town-quarter astonished men by its wonder and beauty. In order to compass the colossal expenditures for these vast undertakings, the temples were stripped of their works of art, of their gold and silver votive offerings, and justly or unjustly the fortunes of the great families confiscated. The universal discontent thus aroused resulted in the conspiracy of Calpurnius Piso. The plot was discovered, and the conspirators and their families and friends condemned to death. Among the most prominently they were Seneca, Lucan, Petronius, and the Stoic Thrasea Petus, of whom Tacitus said that he was virtue incarnate, and one of the few whose courage and justice had never been concealed in presence of the murderous Caesar. Poppea too, who had been brutally kicked by her husband, died, with her unborn child soon after. Finally the emperor started on a
pleasure tour through lower Italy and Greece; as actor, singer, and harp player he gained the scorn of the worshippers in their temple at Acrocorinthus. He was educated by his grand uncle, Patriarch Gregor Vokasier and afterwards by the varthab, or doctor of theology, Stephen Manuk. Having been consecrated bishop by his brother, Patriarch Gregory III, he was sent to preach throughout Armenia. He was present at the Latin Council of Antioch in 1141 and closed the council with his own hands. In 1146, he was sent to the Latin Emperor Manuel Comnenus, laboured hard to unite the Greek and Armenian Churches. The union, however, was never consummated, the majority of the bishops remaining obstinate. Nerses is regarded as one of the greatest Armenian writers. His prose works include: "Prayers for every hour of the day" (Voskans, 1822); and "In the Letters of the Patriarch of Rome to Manuel Comnenus (tr. Latin by Capelleti, Venice, 1833). He wrote in verse: "Jesu Orti", a Bible history; an "elegy" on the capture of Edessa; a "History of Armenia"; two "Homilies", and many hymns. In the "Jesu Orti", the elegy on Edessa, and the first letter to Manuel Comnenus, we find testimonies to the barbarities of the Crusaders, and a wish that the throne of the Armenian emperor would sit on again upon the imperial throne.

Schiller, Gesch. der röm. Kaiser, I (Gotth., 1883); Stölzle, Tacitus über den Brand von Rom in Stammen aus Maria Losch, LXXVIII (Freiburg, 1910); 2; von Domasewicz, Gesch. der röm. Kaiser, II (Leipzig, 1909).

Karl Hoebner.

Nerses I-IV. Armenian patriarchs.—Nerses I, surnamed the Great, d. 373. Born of the royal stock, he spent his youth in Cessarea where he married Sandutch, a Maronite princess. After the death of his wife, he was appointed chamberlain to King Arshak of Armenia. A few years later, having entered the ecclesiastical state, he was elected catholicos, or patriarch, in 353. His patriarchate marks a new era in Armenian history. Till then the Church had been more or less identified with the royal family and the nobles; Nerses brought it into closer connection with the people. At the Council of Ashtarak he promulgated numerous laws on marriage, fast days, and Divine worship. He built schools and hospitals, and made a great number of dispositions. Some of these reforms drew upon him the king's displeasure, and he was exiled, probably to Edessa. Upon the accession of King Bab (369) he returned to his see. Bab proved a disloyal and unworthy ruler and Nerses forbade him entrance to the church. Under the pretence of seeking a reconciliation, Bab having invited Nerses to his palace poisioned him.

Nerses II, said to have been born at Aschdarag in Bagrekand, was patriarch from 548 to 557. He was a Jacobite Monophysite (cf. Ter-Minassiantz, 163-64). Under him was held the Second Council of Tivon or Dovin (554).

Nerses III of Ischkan, surnamed Schinogh, "the church builder", was elected patriarch in 641; d. 661. He lived in days of political turmoil. The Armenians had to choose between the Greeks and the Persians, and their new conquerors, the Arabs. Nerses remained friendly to the Greeks, whilst the military chiefs sided with the Arabs. Constans II (642-48) hastened into Armenia to punish the rebels and subject them to the Church's control, and a nephew of a rich man, a roof-bishop, went forth to meet him, and declared they accepted the Council of Chalcedon. Disagreement with the satrap Theodorus compelled Nerses to withdraw from the administration of the patriarchate from 652 to 658.

Nerses IV surnamed Klaïentši from the place of his birth, and Schnorkhal, "the Gracious", from the grace of his heart, was elected to the see in 1123. He was educated by his grand uncle, Patriarch Gregory Vokasier and afterwards by the varthab, or doctor of theology, Stephen Manuk. Having been consecrated bishop by his brother, Patriarch Gregory III, he was sent to preach throughout Armenia. He was present at the Latin Council of Antioch in 1141 and closed the council with his own hands. In 1146, he was sent to the Latin Emperor Manuel Comnenus, laboured hard to unite the Greek and Armenian Churches. The union, however, was never consummated, the majority of the bishops remaining obstinate. Nerses is regarded as one of the greatest Armenian writers. His prose works include: "Prayers for every hour of the day" (Voskans, 1822); and "In the Letters of the Patriarch of Rome to Manuel Comnenus (tr. Latin by Capelleti, Venice, 1833). He wrote in verse: "Jesu Orti", a Bible history; an "elegy" on the capture of Edessa; a "History of Armenia"; two "Homilies", and many hymns. In the "Jesu Orti", the elegy on Edessa, and the first letter to Manuel Comnenus, we find testimonies to the barbarities of the Crusaders, and a wish that the throne of the Armenian emperor would sit on again upon the imperial throne.

Schiller, Gesch. der röm. Kaiser, I (Gotth., 1883); Stölzle, Tacitus über den Brand von Rom in Stammen aus Maria Losch, LXXVIII (Freiburg, 1910); 2; von Domasewicz, Gesch. der röm. Kaiser, II (Leipzig, 1909).

Karl Hoebner.

Nerses of Lambron, b. 1153 at Lambron, Cilicia; d. 1198; son of Oschin II, prince of Lambron and nephew of the patriarch, Nerses IV. Nerses was well versed in sacred and profane sciences and had an excellent knowledge of Greek, Latin, Syriac, and probably Coptic. Ordained in 1169, he was consecrated Archbishop of Tarsus in 1176 and became a zealous advocate of the union of the Greek and Armenian Churches. In 1179 he attended the Council of Hroncla, in which the terms of the union were discussed; his address at this council is considered a masterpiece of eloquence and style. The union was decided upon but never consummated owing to the death of Emperor Manuel Comnenus in 1180. Manuel's successors abandoned the negotiations, and persecuted the Armenians, who, with the help of the Latins, returned to the Latins. Leo II, Prince of Cilicia, desirous to secure for himself the title of King of Armenia, sought the support of Celestine III and of Emperor Henry VI. The pope received his request favourably, but made the granting of it dependent upon the union of Cilicia to the Church of Rome. He sent Conrad, Archbishop of Mayence, to Tarsus, and the terms of union having been signed by Leo and twelve of the bishops, among whom was Nerses, Leo was crowned King of Armenia, 6 January, 1198. Nerses died six months afterwards, 17 July. Nerses is justly regarded as one of the greatest writers in Armenian literature. He deserves fame as poet, prose writer, and translator. He wrote an elegy on the death of his uncle, Nerses IV, and many hymns. His prose works include his oration at the Council of Hroncla (tr. Italian by Aucher, Venice, 1812; tr. German by Neumann, Leipzig, 1834); Commentaries on the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, and the Minor Prophets; an explanation of the liturgy; a letter to Leo II and another to a bishop of the see of Echmiadzin; a translation from Greek into Armenian of the Rule of St. Benedict; the "Dialogue" of Gregory the Great; a life of this saint; and the letters of Lucius III and Clement III to the patriarch, Gregory. From the Syriac he trans-
lated the "Homilies" of Jacob of Serugh and, probably, from the Coptic, the "Life of the Fathers of the Desert". Some writers ascribe to him an Armenian version of a commentary of Andreas of Caesarea on the Apocalypse: Nereus in his original writings frequently refers to the primacy and infallibility of the Pope.

Contemporary. The Armenian Version of Revelation (London, 1907); see also Nereus I-IV.

A. A. Varschalde.

Nesqually. See Seattle, Diocese of.

Nestorius and Nestorianism.—I. The Heresiarch. —Nestorius, who gave his name to the Nestorian heresy, was b. at Germanicia, in Syria Euphratesensis (date unknown); d. in the Thebaid, Egypt, c. 451. He was living as a priest and monk in the monastery of Euprepius near the walls, when he was chosen by the Emperor Theodosius II to be Patriarch of Constantinople in succession to Simplicius. He had a high reputation for eloquence, and the popularity of St. Chrysostom's memory among the people of the imperial city may have influenced the Emperor's choice of another priest from Antioch to be court bishop. He was consecrated in April, 428, and seems to have made an excellent impression. He lost no time in showing his zeal against heretics. Within a few days of his consecration he excommunicated a number of heretics from the West, but his action was not well received and he persuaded Theodosius to issue a severe edict against heresy in the following month. He had the churches of the Macedonians in the Hellespont seized, and took measures against the Quartodecimans who remained in Asia Minor. He also attacked the Novatians, in spite of the good reputation of their bishop, Philip, whom he accused of fleeing from the West, because of which he had been exiled, not being well acquainted with their condemnation ten years earlier. He twice wrote to Pope St. Celestine I for information on the subject. He received no reply, but Marius Mercator, a disciple of St. Augustine, published a memoir on the subject at Constantinople, and presented it to the emperor, who duly proscribed the heretics. At the end of 428, or at latest in the early part of 429, Nestorius preached the first of his famous sermons against the word Theokos, and detailed his Antiochian doctrine of the Incarnation. The first to raise his voice against it was Eusebius, a layman, afterwards Bishop of Dorylaim and the accuser of Eutyches, one of the priests of the city, Philip and Proculus had been bishops before 423; dates for the patriarchate, preached against Nestorius. Philip, known as Sisetas, from Side, his birthplace, author of a vast and discursive history now lost, accused the patriarch of heresy. Proculus (who was to succeed later in his candidature) preached a flowery, but perfectly orthodox, sermon, yet extant, to which Nestorius replied in a simple and discursive discourse, which  we also possess. All this naturally caused great excitement at Constantinople, especially among the clergy, who were clearly not well disposed towards the stranger from Antioch. St. Celestine immediately condemned the doctrine. Nestorius had arranged what he considered very much the running of a council. He now hastened it on, and the summons had been issued to patriarchs and metropolitans on 19 Nov., before the pope's sentence, delivered through Cyril of Alexandria, had been served on Nestorius (6 Dec.). At the council Nestorius was condemned, and the emperor, after much delay and hesitation, ratified its finding. It was confirmed by Pope Sixtus III.

The lot of Nestorius was a hard one. He had been handed over by the pope to the tender mercies of his rival, Cyril; he had been summoned to accept within ten days under pain of deposition, not a papal definition, but a series of anathemas drawn up at Alexandria under the influence of Apollinaris forgeries. The whole council had not condemned him, but only a portion, which had not awaited the arrival of the bishops from Antioch. He had refused to recognize the jurisdiction of this incomplete number, and had consequently refused to appear or put in any defence. He was now thrust out of his see by a change of mind on the part of the feeble emperor. But Nestorius was proud: he showed no sign of yielding, even when it came to terms; he put in no plea of appeal to Rome. He retired to his monastery at Antioch with dignity and apparent relief. His friends, John of Antioch and his party, deserted him, and at the wish of the Emperor, at the beginning of 433, joined hands with Cyril, and Theodoret later did the same. The bishops who were suspected of being Nestorian, were deposed. An edict of Theodosius II, 30 July, 435, condemned his writings to be burnt. A few years later Nestorius was dragged from his retirement and banished to the Oasis. He was at one time carried off by the Nabians (not the Blemmyes) in a raid, and was restored to the Thebaid with his hand and one rib broken. He gave himself up to the governor in order not to be accused of having fled.

The recent discovery of a Syriac version of the (lost) Greek apology for Nestorius by himself has awakened new interest in the question of his personal orthodoxy. The (mutilated) manuscript, about 800 years old, known as the "Bazaar of Heracleides," and recently published (Loofs, "Bazaar," 1910), reveals the persistent odium attached to the name of Nestorius, since at the end of his life he was obliged to substitute for it a pseudonym. In this work he claims that his faith is that of the celebrated "Tome," or letter, of Leo the Great to Flavian, and excuses his failure to appeal to Rome by the general practice of which he was the victim. A fine passage on the Eucharistic Sacrifice which occurs in the "Bazaar" may be cited here: "There is something amiss with you which I want to put before you in a few words, in order to induce you to amend it, for you are quick to see what is seemly. What then is this fault? Presently the mysteries are set before the faithful like the mess granted to his soldiers by the king. Yet the army of the faithful is nowhere to be seen, but they are blown away together with the catechumens like chaff by the wind of indifference. And Christ is crucified in the symbol [κατὰ τὸν τόπον], sacrificed by the sword of the prayer of the Priest; but, as when He was on the Cross, the disciples have already fled. Terrible is this fault,—the betrayal of Christ when there is no persecution, a desertion by the faithful of their Master's Body when there is no war" (Loofs, "Nestorians," Halls, 1905, p. 341).

The writings of Nestorius were originally very numerous. As stated above, the "Bazaar" has newly been published (Paris, 1910) in the Syriac translation in which alone it survives. The rest of the fragments of Nestorius have been most minutely examined, pieced together and edited by Loofs. His sermons show a real eloquence, but very little remains in the original Greek. The Latin translations by Marius Mercator in style and substance have been preserved. Batiffol has attributed to Nestorius many sermons which have come down to us under the names of other authors: three of Anthanasius, one of Hippolytus, three of Amphilectus, thirty-eight of Basil of Seleucia, seven of St. Chrysostom; but Loofs and Baker do not accept the ascription. Mercati has pointed out four fragments in the acta of the Bishop of Maron (ed. Amelii in "Sscript. Cassin."") (I, 1887), and Armenian fragments have been published by Lidtké.

II. The Heresy.—Nestorius was a disciple of the school of Antioch, and his Christology was essentially that of Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, both Cilician bishops and great opponents of Arianism. Both died in the Catholic Church. Dior
dorus was a holy man, much venerated by St. John Chrysostom. Theodore, however, was condemned in person as well as in his writings by the Fifth General Council, in 553. In opposition to many of the Arians, who taught that in the incarnation the Son of God assumed a human body in which His Divine Nature took the place of soul, and to the followers of Apollinaris of Laodicea, who held that the Divine Nature supplied the functions of the higher or intellectual soul, the Antiochenes insisted upon the completeness of the humanity which the Word assumed. Unfortunately, they represented this human nature as a complete man, and represented the Incarnation as the assumption of a man by the Word. The same way of speaking was common enough in Latin writers (assumere hominem, homo assumptus) and was meant by them in an orthodox sense; we still sing in the Te Deum: "Tu ad liberandum susceptorum hominem", where we must understand "ad liberandum hominem, humanum naturam suscepiens". But the Antiochene writers did not mean that the "man assumed" (δὲ ληφθεὶς ἄνθρωπον) was taken up into one hypostasis with the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. They preferred to speak of συνέλειται, "united"; rather than οἰκεῖος, "unified". They implied that the human dignity and power, and must be worshipped together. The word person in its Greek form ἄνθρωπος might stand for a juridical or fictitious unity; it does not necessarily imply what the word person implies to us, that is, the unity of the subject of consciousness and of all the internal and external activities. Hence we are not surprised to find that in the writings of the Sons, and that Theodore practically made two Christs, and yet that they cannot be proved to have really made two subjects in Christ. Two things are certain: first, that, whether or not they believed in the unity of subject in the Incarnate Word, at least they explained that unity wrongly; secondly, that they used most unhappily the language that the term person gave to the doctrine of the union of the Manhood with the Godhead—language which is objectively heretical, even were the intention of its authors good.

Nestorius, as well as Theodore, repeatedly insisted that he did not admit two Christi or two Sons, and that he frequently asserted the unity of the person. On arriving in Constantinople, he declared that the very different theology which he found rife there was a form of Arian or Apollinarian error. In this he was not wholly wrong, as the outbreak of Eutychianism twenty years later may be held to prove. In the first months of his pontificate he was implored by the Pelagian Julian of Eclanum and other expelled bishops of his church to recognize their orthodoxy and obtain their restoration. He wrote at least three letters to the pope, St. Celestine I, to inquire whether these petitioners had been duly condemned or not, but he received no reply, not (as has been too often repeated) because the pope imagined he did not respect the condemnation of the Pelagians by himself and his predecessors. Unfortunately, he did nothing of the kind. St. Cyril had sent to Rome his correspondence with Nestorius, a collection of that Patriarch's sermons, and a work of his which he had just composed, consisting of five books "Contra Nestorium". The pope had them translated into Latin, and then, after assembling the customary council, considered at Belf with great approval of St. Cyril's conduct, whilst he delivered the execution of this vague decree to Cyril, who as Patriarch of Alexandria was the hereditary enemy both of the Antiochene theologian and the Constantinopolitan bishop. Nestorius was to be summoned to recant, without which he and his followers must be rejected. The council can well be imagined. St. Cyril said himself obliged to draw up a form for the recantation. With the help of an Egyptian council he formulated a set of twelve anathemas which simply epitomise the errors he had pointed out in his five books "Against Nestorius", for the pope appeared to have agreed with the doctrine of that work. It is unfortunate to notice that up to this point St. Cyril had not rested his case upon Apollinarian documents and had not adopted the Apollinarian formula μαθημάτων σαρκομυθίας from Pseudo-Athanasius. He does not teach in so many words "two natures after the union", but his work against Nestorius, with his depth and precision of St. Leo, is an admirable exposition of Catholic doctrine, worthy of a Doctor of the Church, and far surpassing the treatise of Cassian. The twelve anathemas are less happy,
for St. Cyril was always a diffuse writer, and his solitary attempt at brevity needs to be read in connexion with the work which it summarizes.

The anathemas were at once attacked, on behalf of John, Patriarch of Antioch, in defence of the Anti-Chinese School, by Andrew of Samosata and the great Theodoret of Cyrus. The former wrote at Antioch; his objections were adopted by a synod held there, and were sent to Cyril as the official view of all the Oriental bishops. St. Cyril published separate replies to these two antagonists, treating Andrew with more respect than Theodoret, to whom he is contemptuous and sarcastic. The latter was doubtless the superior of the Alexandrian in talent and learning, but his views were so radical that he has no match for him as a theologian. Both Andrew and Theodoret show themselves captious and unfair; at best they sometimes prove that St. Cyril's wording is ambiguous and ill-chosen. They uphold the objectionable Anti-Chinese phraseology, and they reject the hypo-statis union (ordo et substantia) as well as the phrase ousia ousia as orthodox and unscriptural. The latter expression is indeed unsuitable, and may be misleading. Cyril had to explain that he was not summarizing or defining the facts about the Incarnation, but simply putting together the principal errors of Nestorius in the heretic's own words. In his books against Nestorius he had occasionally made mention of the anathemas; he gave a perfectly faithful picture of Nestorius's view, for in fact Nestorius did not disown the propositions, nor did Andrew of Samosata or Theodoret refuse to patronize any of them. The anathemas were certainly in a general way approved of by the Council of Ephesus, but they have never been formally adopted by the Church. Nestorius for his part replied by a set of twelve contra-anathemas. Some of them are directed against St. Cyril's teaching, others attack errors which St. Cyril did not dream of teaching, for example that Christ's Human Nature became through the union uncreated and without beginning, a silly conclusion which was later ascribed to the sect of Monophytes called Aeticites. On the whole, Nestorius's new programme emphasized his old position, as also did the violent sermons which he preached against St. Cyril on Saturday and Sunday, 13 and 14 December, 430. We have no difficulty in defining the doctrine of Nestorius so far as words are concerned: Mary did not bring forth the Godhead as such but the Godhead as God's Son. The two are distinct in the temple of the Godhead. The man Jesus Christ is this temple, "the animated purple of the King", as he expresses it in a passage of sustained eloquence. The Incarnate God did not suffer nor die, but raised up from the dead him in whom He was incarnate. The Word and the Man are to be worshipped together, and he adds: οψιν ουσιν ουσιν υποθεσης ουσι (Through Him that bears I worship Him Who is borne). If St. Paul speaks of the Lord of Glory being crucified, he means the man by "the Lord of Glory". There are two natures, he says, and one person; but the two natures are regularly spoken of as though they were two persons, and the sayings of Scripture about Christ are to be interpreted according to the Incarnation. The Man to whom the Word. If Mary is called the Mother of God, she will be made into a goddess, and the Gentiles will be scandalized.

This is all bad enough as far as words go. But did not Nestorius mean better than his words? The Oriental bishops were certainly not all unbelievers in the univarian doctrine; in the presence of Theodoret, Cyril made peace with them in 433. One may point to the fact that Nestorius emphatically declared that there is one Christ and one Son, and St. Cyril himself has preserved for us some passages from his sermons which the saint admits to be perfectly orthodox, and therefore wholly inconsistent with the rest. For example: "Great is the mystery of the gift! For this visible infant, who seems so young, who needs swaddling clothes for His body, who in the substance which we see is newly born, is the Eternal Son, as it is written, the Son who is the Maker of all, the Son who binds together in the swathing-bands of His assisting power the whole creation which would otherwise be destroyed. And again: "The Godhead is without beginning, the powerful God, so far, O Arius, is God the Word from being subject to God." And: "We recognize the humanity of the infant, and His Divinity; the unity of His Sonship we guard in the nature of humanity and divinity." It will probably be only just to Nestorius to admit that he fully intended to safeguard the unity of Christ in the presence of Theodoret. But he did not maintain the unity and his teaching logically led to two Christs, though he would not have admitted the fact. Not only his words are misleading, but the doctrine which underlies his words is misleading, and tends to destroy the whole meaning of the Incarnation. It is impossible to deny that teaching as well as wording which leads to such consequences is heresy. He was therefore unavoidably condemned. He reiterated the same view twenty years later in the "Bazaar of Heralclides", which shows no real change of opinion, although he declares his adherence to the Tome of St. Leo.

After the council of 431 had been made into a law by the emperor, the Anti-Chinese party would not at once give way. But the council was confirmed by Pope Sixtus III, who had succeeded St. Celestine, and it was received by the whole West. Antioch was thus isolated, and at the same time St. Cyril showed himself ready to make explanations. The Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria agreed upon a "creed of union" in 433 (see Eusebius, H. E. III). And some others would not accept it, but declared the word heretics to be heretical. Theodoret held a council at Zeugma which refused to anathematize Nestorius. But the prudent Bishop of Cyrus after a time perceived that in the "creed of union" Antioch gained more than did Alexandria; so he accepted the somewhat hollow compromise. He says himself that he commended the person of Nestorius whilst he anathematized his doctrine. A new state of things arose when the death of St. Cyril, in 444, took away his restraining hand from his intemperate followers. The friend of Nestorius, Count Ireneus, had become Bishop of Tyre, and he was persecuted by the Cyrillic party, as well as by his fellow countrymen. It had been a great teacher in that city. These bishops, together with Theodoret and Domnus, the nephew and successor of John of Antioch, were deposed by Dioscorus of Alexandria in the Robber Council of Ephesus (449). Ibas was full of Anti-Chinese theology, but in his famous letter to Maris the Persian he disapproved of Nestorius as well as St. Cyril, and at the Council of Chalcedon he was willing to cry a thousand anathemas to Nestorius. He and Theodoret were both restored by that council, and both seem to have taken the view that St. Leo's Tome was a rehabilitation of the Anti-Chinese theology. The same view was taken by the Monophysites, who looked upon St. Leo as the opponent of St. Cyril. St. Leo rejoiced at this reversal of Roman policy, as he thought it. Loofs, followed by many writers even among Catholics, is of the same opinion. But St. Leo himself believed that he was completing and not undoing the work of the Council of Ephesus, and as a fact his teaching is but a clearer form of St. Cyril's doctrine. It was seen that the reuse of Nestorius. But it is true that St. Cyril's later phraseology, of which the two letters to Successus are the type, is based upon the formula which he felt himself bound to adopt from an Apollinarian treatise believed to be by his great predecessor Athanasius; αἱ φασὶν τοῦ Ἀθανασίου ἑσταυρωθήσεται. St. Cyril found this formula an awkward one, as his treatment of it shows,
and it became in fact the watchword of heresy. But St. Cyril does his best to understand it in a right sense, and goes out of his way to admit two natures even after the union to begat, an admission which was to save Severus himself from a good part of his heresy.

That Loofs or Harnack should fail to perceive the vital difference between the Antiochene and St. Leo’s conception of the Catholic doctrine of the two natures, and therefore not catching the perfectly simple explanation given by St. Leo, is easily explicable by their being absolutely unable to understand the Catholic doctrine of the two natures, and therefore not catching the perfectly simple explanation given by St. Leo. Just as some writers declare that the Monophysites always took υἱοθετία in the sense of ἀνθρωποθετία, so Loofs and others hold that Nestorius took υἱοθετία always in the sense of ἀνθρωποθετία, and meant no more by ὑποστάσεις than he meant by ἀνθρωποθετίαι. But the words seem to have perfectly definite meanings with all the theologians of the period. That the Monophysites distinguished them, is probable (see MONOPHYSITES AND MONOPHYSITISM), and all admit they are unquestionably meant by ὑποστάσεις a subsistent nature. That Nestorius cannot, on the contrary, have taken nature to mean the same as ὑποστάσεις and both to mean esse in the sense is obvious enough, for three plain reasons: first, he cannot have meant anything so absolutely opposed to the meaning given to the word ὑποστάσεις by the Monophysites; secondly, if he meant nature by ἄνθρωποθετία he had no word at all for “substance” (for the word ἀρχή was too vague and elastic a concept even as “substance”); thirdly, the whole doctrine of the Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestorius’s own refusal to admit almost any form of the communicatio idiomatum, force us to take his “two natures” in the sense of subsistent natures.

The modern critics also consider that the orthodox doctrine of the Greeks against Monophysitism—that in fact the Chalcedonian doctrine as defended for many years—was practically the Antiochene or Nestorian doctrine, until Leontius modified it in the direction of conciliation. This theory is wholly gratuitous, for from Chalcedon onwards there is no orthodox controversialist who has left us any considerable remains in Greek by which we might be enabled to judge how far Leontius was an innovator. At all events we know, from the attacks made by the Monophysites themselves, that, though they professed to regard their Catholic opponents as Crypto-Nestorians, in so doing they distinguished them from the true Nestorians who openly professed two hypostases and condemned the words of St. Cyril. Hence it was not until Leontius of Antioch and Theodoret had made peace with St. Cyril, no more was heard in the Greek world of the Antiochene theology. The school had been distinguished, but small. In Antioch itself, in Syria, in Palestine, the monks, who were exceedingly influential, were Cyriacans, and a large proportion of them were to become Monophysists. It was beyond the Greek world that Nestorianism was to have its development. There was at Edessa a famous school for Persians, which had probably been founded in the days of St. Ephrem, when Nisibis had ceased to belong to the Roman Empire in 363. The Christians in Persia had suffered terrible persecution, and Roman Edessa had attracted Persians. Under the direction of Ibas the Persain school of Edessa imbibed the Antiochene theology. But the famous Bishop of Edessa, Rabbbula, though he had stood apart from St. Cyril’s council at Ephesus together with the bishops of the Antiochene patriarchate, the council of the Persians was a violent, Cyriacan, and he did his best against the school of the Persians. Ibas himself became his successor. But at the death of this protector, in 457, the Persians were driven out of Edessa by the Monophysites, who made themselves all-powerful. Syria then becomes Monophysite and produces its Philoxenus and many another writer. Persia simultaneously becomes Nestorian. Of the exiles from Edessa into their own country nine became bishops, including Barsumas, or Barsāmūn, of Nisibis and Acacius of Beit Aramaghe. The school at Edessa was finally closed in 459.

At this time the Church in Persia was autonomous, having renounced all subjection to Antioch and the "Western" bishops at the Council of Constantine 410. The ecclesiastical superior of the whole was the Bishop of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, who had assumed the rank of catholics. This prelate was Baburūs or Babowai (457–84) at the time of the arrival of the Nestorian professors from Edessa. He appears to have received them with open arms. But Barsāmūn, having become Bishop of Nisibis, the new sinking city of Edessa, broke with the weak catholics, and, at a council which he held at Beit Lapat in April, 484, pronounced his deposition. In the same year Babowai was accused before the king of conspiring with Constantinople and cruelly put to death, being hung up by his ring-finger and also, it is said, crucified and scourged. There is not sufficient evidence for the story which makes Barsāmūn his accuser. The Bishop of Nisibis was at the time in high favour with King Peroz (457–84) and had been able to persuade him that it would be a good thing for the Persian kingdom if the Christians in it were all of a different complexion from those of the Empire, and had no tendency to associate towards the Empire or Arabia. They therefore were now officially under the sway of the "Henoticon" of Zeno. Consequently all Christians who were not Nestorians were driven from Persia. But the story of this persecution as told in the letter of Simeon of Beit Arsam is not generally considered trustworthy, and the alleged number of 7700 Monophysite martyrs is quite incredible. The town of Jerash alone retained Monophysite. But the Armenians were not gained over, and in 491 they condemned at Valarapat the Council of Chalcedon, St. Leo, and Barsāmūn. Peroz died in 484, soon after having murdered Babowai, and the energetic Bishop of Nisibis had evidently less to hope from his successor, Balash. Though Barsāmūn at first opposed the new catholics, Acacius, in August, 485, he had an interview with him, and made his submission, acknowledging the necessity for subjection to Seleucia. However, he excused himself from being present at Acacius’s council in 484 at Seleucia, where twelve bishops were present. At this assembly, the Antiochene Christology was affirmed and the canon 117, after the controversy of the clergy was repeated. The Synod declared that they despised vainglory, and felt bound to humble themselves in order to put an end to the horrible clerical scandals which discredited the Persian Magians as well as the faithful; they therefore enacted that the clergy should make a vow of chastity; deacons may marry, and for the future a priest is to be ordained only a priest except a deacon who has a lawful wife and children. Though no permission is given to priests or bishops to marry (for this was contrary to the canons of the Eastern Church), yet the practice appears to have been winked at, possibly for the regularization of illicit unions. Barsāmūn himself is said to have married a nun named Mamōd; but according to Marco this was at the inspiration of King Peroz, and was only a nominal marriage, intended to ensure the preservation of the lady’s fortune from confiscation.

The Persian Church was now organized, if not thoroughly united, and was formally committed to the Christology of A, and the doctrine of the two natures by the king as envoy to Constantinople, was obliged to accept the anathemas against Nestorius in order to be received to Communion there. After his return he bitterly complained of being called a Nestorian by the Monophysite Philoxenus, declaring that he "knew nothing" of Nestorius. Nevertheless Nestorius has always been venerated as a saint by the Persian Church. One thing more was needed for the
Nestorian Church; it wanted theological schools of its own, in order that its clergy might be able to hold their own in theological argument, without being tempted to study in the orthodox centres of the East or in the numerous and brilliant schools which the Monophysites were now establishing. Babylon opened a school at Nisibis, which was to become almost as famous than its parent at Edessa. The rector was Narses the Leprous, a most prolific writer, of whom little has been preserved. This university consisted of a single college, with the regular life of a monastery. Its rules are still preserved (see Nisibis). At one time we hear of 900 students. Their great doctor was Theodore of Mopsuestia. His commentaries were studied in the translation made by Ibas and were treated almost as infallible. Theodore's Canon of Scripture was adopted, as we learn from "De Partibus Divinar Legis" of Junilius (P. L., LXVIII, and ed. by Kihn), a work which is a translation and adaptation of the published lectures of a certain Paul, professor at Nisibis. The method is Aristotelian, and must be connected with the Aristotelian revival which in the Greek world is associated chiefly with the name of Philoponus, and in the West with that of Boethius.

The fame of this theological seminary was so great that Pope Agapetus and Cassiodorus wished to found one of the same kind in the city of Ravenna. They attempted it, but the attempt was made impossible in those troublous times; but Cassiodorus's monastery at Vivarium was inspired by the example of Nisibis. There were other less important schools at Seleucia and elsewhere, even in small towns.

Barsadma died between 492 and 495, Accacius in 496 or 497. Narses seems to have lived long to see the Nestorian Church which they founded, though cut off from the Catholic Church by political exigencies, never intended to do more than prolong an autonomy like that of the Eastern patriarchates. Its history consisted mainly in its refusal to accept the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. It is interesting to note that it was under Narses nor under Epiros speaks of the school of Nisibis as heretical. They were probably aware that it was not quite orthodox, but the Persians who appeared at the Holy Places as pilgrims or at Constantinople must have seemed like Catholics on account of their hatred to the Monophysites, who were the great enemy in the East. The official teaching of the Church of the Mohammedans, Sarabantani, ed. Curston (London, 1842); and especially the rich information in the Nestorian texts themselves; Girmondi, LAmi e altri Scrittori di Nisibis (Ed. Illyrica), 2 vols., Rome, 1874; cocci. Vat., the Liber Turris (Arabic and Latin, 4 parts, Rome, 1890–99); BEDIAN, Histoire de Mar Jab-Alahia (1717), patriarches, et de Rabah Sauma (2nd ed., Paris, 1888); Synodicon of Echellees in Mal Scriptorum vett. nona. coll. X (1838); BRAUN, Das Buch der Synodakes (Stuttgart and Vienna, 1900); CHABOT, Synodicon Orienterale, ou recueil de Synodales Nestoriae in Notae et Extravas, Synodakes (Stuttgart and Vienna, 1900); CHABOT, Synodicon Orienterale, ou recueil de Synodales Nestoriae in Notae et Extravas, XXXVII (Paris, 1902); GUIDI, Osservazioni sopra alcune lettere di Pseudo Patriarche Bizantine, in lettere di Isidoro alla Soc. Asiat. Ital., IV; ADDAI SCHEH, Chronique de Stiri, histoire Nestoriane (Arabic and French), et Causa de la fondation de l'eglise de Nisibis et de Charchale, in L'Ami et al. (1908); BURGOS, ed. The Book of Governors, by Thomas Bishop of Marpa, 2 vols. (Syria and Eng.) (3 vols., London, 1803). The best English history is by Labarte, Le Christianisme Nestorian, 2 vols. (Paris, 1855) — and see also Petersen and Kessler in Realencylop., s. v. Nestorianen; FUNK in Kirchenlex., s. v. Nestorius und die Nestorianen; DUCHSENE, Hist. ancienne de l'Egypte, 2 vols., (Paris, 1910). — On the "Nestorian Monument," see PARKER in Dublin Review, CXIX (1905), 2, p. 380; CARUS and HOLM, The Nestorian Monument (London, 1910).

John Chapman.

Ne Temere. — See Clandestinity; Marriage, Moral and Canonical aspect of.

Netherlands (Ger. Niederlande; Fr. Pays Bas). — The.—The Netherlands, or Low Countries, as organized by Charles V, under whom the Burgundian era ended, comprised practically the territory now included in Holland and Belgium, thenceforth known as the Spanish Netherlands. For the previous history of this country see Burgundy and Charles V. Shorn of their northern provinces by the reorganization as the Commonwealth of the United Provinces (1579), the Spanish Netherlands, on theiression to Austria (1713–14) were reduced to the provinces now embraced in Belgium, subsequently called the Austrian Netherlands.

The Spanish Netherlands.—When Philip II by the declaration of his father, Charles V (v.), became sovereign of the Low Countries and took up the government of the Seventeen Provinces, he found them at...
the senith of their prosperity, as is evident from the description given in 1567 by Luigi Guicciardini in his "Descrittione di tutti i Paesi Bassi" (Tottius Belgii descriptio, Amsterdam, 1613).

Few countries were so well governed: none was richer. Antwerp had taken the place of Bruges as commercial metropolis; every day saw a fleet of 500 sea-going craft enter or leave its port. Of Ghent (Gand), his native town, Charles V used to say joicely: Je mettrais Paris dans mon Gand (I could put Paris in my glove (gand)). Luxury, however, corrupted the earlier good morals of the people, and humanism gradually undermined the faith of some in the upper classes. Protestantism too had already effected an entrance, Lutheranism through Antwerp and Calvinism from the French border. The Anabaptists also had adherents. In addition the more powerful of the nobility now hoped to play a more influential part in the government than they had done under Charles V, and were already planning for the realization of this ambition. The situation presented many difficulties, and unfortunately Philip II was not the man to cope with them. He had little in common with his Low-Country subjects. Their language was not his; and he was a stranger to their customs. From the day he quitted the Netherlands in 1556, he never saw them again, and it was as a foreigner he entered Spain. He was despotic, severe, crafty, and desirous of keeping in his own hands all the reins of government, in minor details as well as in matters of more importance, thereby causing many unfortunate delays in affairs that demanded rapid transaction. He was on the whole a most unsuitable ruler in spite of his reputation. He visited the different offices and the time and pains he consecrated to them.

It must be said in justice that from a religious point of view, he brought about one of the most important events in the history of the Netherlands when he caused the establishment of fourteen new dioceses. The want had long been recognized and the sovereigns, particularly Philip the Good and Charles V, had often thought of this measure. In all the seventeen provinces there were but four dioceses: Utrecht in the north; Tournai, Arras, and Cambrai in the West; and all of them were subject to foreign metropolitans, Utrecht to Cologne and the others to Reims. Moreover the greater part of the country was under the control of the Habsburgs, and a loyal advice was given Trier, Maastricht, Verden, St. Omer, Boulogne, Cambrai, Huy, Tournai, Arras, Cambrai, and Reims. Hence arose great difficulties and endless conflicts. The Bull of Pope Paul IV (12 May 1559) put an end to this situation by raising Utrecht and Cambrai to archiepiscopal rank, and by creating fourteen new sees, one of them, Mechlin, an archbishopric. The others were Antwerp, Gent, Bruges, Ypres, St. Omer, Samur, Bois-le-Duc (Herkenbosch), Roemden, Haarlem, Deventer, Leeuwarden, Groningen, and Middelburg. This act, excellent from a religious point of view, gave rise to many complaints. To endow the new sees it was found necessary to incorporate with them the richest abbeys in the country, and in certain provinces these carried the rights and privileges of a state, and did not hesitated being for the future exercised by the bishops, the result was that the king who nominated them gained a considerable influence in the Parliament, which had hitherto always acted as a check on the royal power. To aggravate matters, the Protestant faction spread a rumour that the erection of the new bishoprics was but a step towards introducing the Spanish Inquisition into the Netherlands. Lastly the abbeys began to complain of their lost autonomy—the place of the abbot being now occupied by the bishop.

The opposition of the nobles was led by two men, remarkable in different ways. On one hand was the Count of Egmont (see Egmont, Lamoral, Count of), the victor at St. Quentin and Gravelines, a brave man, frank and honest, a lover of popular—weak in character and lacking in political shrewdness. On the other hand stood William of Nassau, Prince of Orange, surnamed "the Silent", a politician and diplomat of the first rank, filled with ambition which he well knew how to conceal, having no religious scruples, being Catholic, Luther, or Calvinist, or a man who had made the downfall of Spanish rule the one aim of his life. Grouped around these two chiefs were a number of nobles irritated with the Government, many of them deeply involved financially or morally corrupt like the too-well-known Brederode. They kept up the agitation and demanded fresh concessions day by day. They insisted upon the recall of the Spanish soldiers, and the king yielded (1561). They demanded more moderate language in the public placard against heresy, and even sent the Count of Egmont to Spain to obtain it (1565); and Egmont, having been flattered and feted at the Spanish Court, came back convinced that his mission had been successful. Soon, however, royal letters dated from the Forest of Segovia, 17 and 20 October, 1565, brought the king's formal refusal to abate one jot in the repression of heresy.

The irreconcilable attitude of the king created a situation of increasing difficulty for the government of Margaret of Parma. Heresy was spreading everywhere, and with the fall of Liège it had obtained a foothold in the smaller towns and even in country places. Protestant preachers, for the most part renegade monks or priests, like the famous Dathenus, assembled the people at "sermons" in which they were exhorted to open war on the Catholic religion. Calvinism, a sect better organized than Lutheranism, began to make headway in the Countries. It had supporters in every grade of society; and although its members continued to be a small minority, their daring and clever propaganda made them a most dangerous force in presence of the inaction and sluggishness of the Catholics. Stirred up by these Calvinist preachers, Catholic and Protestant nobles formed an alliance which was called Le Compris des Nobles, with the object of obtaining the suppression of the Inquisition. A body of them numbering several hundred came to present a petition to that effect to the regent (3 April, 1566). It is related that as she showed signs of alarm at this demonstration Count de Berlaymont, member of the Council of the Indies, went up to her and said: "Rassurez-vous, Madame, ce ne sont que des guerres" (Courage, Madam, they are only beggars). The confederates at once took up the word as a party name, and thus this famous name made its entry into history.

On that same day the Gueux meant to remain faithful to the king, jusqu'à la beseuse (to beggary), as one of their mottoes had it. They seemed to have been made up of Catholics and Protestants, indiscriminately, who were partisans of religious tolerance; and Vire les Gueux was originally the rally-cry of a sort of national party. This, however, was a delusion soon apparent. The Calvinist leaders held the movement in their hands and did not hesitated to use the strength to disclose its real fanatical opposition to the Catholic Church. Roused and excited by the impassioned appeals of the preachers, the rowdy element of the people perpetrated unheard-of excesses. In the latter part of August, 1566, bands of iconoclasts scourched the country, wrecking and pillaging churches, and in a few days they had destroyed among them the magnificent cathedral of Antwerp. These crimes opened the eyes of many who up to that time had been too lenient with the sectarians. Public opinion condemned the iconoclastic outrages and sided with the Government, which thus suddenly found its position greatly strengthened. Once more, unfortunately, Philip II was not equal to the occasion. Instead of skillfully profiting by this turn of events to
win back those who were shocked by the violence of the heretics, he looked on all his subjects in the Nether-
lands as most by his lavish kindliness, as if he would make an example of them. Against the
advice of the regent, despite faithful Granvelle, in
spite of the pope, who exhorted him to clemency, he
dispatched the Duke of Alva to the Low Countries on
a punitive expedition (1567). Straightsided William of
Orange and the more compromised nobles went into
exile. Recklessly and trusting to his past services, the
Count of Egmont had refused to follow them. His
mistake cost him dear, for Alva caused him and Count
du Hornois to be arrested and brought before a sort of
court martial which he called the Conseil des Troubles,
but known more popularly as the Conseil du Sang
(Blood Tribunal). The accused men, being members of
the Golden Fleece and trusted to his only by their
order; but in spite of this privilege they were judged,
condemned, and executed (1568).

When the two counts were arrested, Margaret of
Parma resigned her office, and the Duke of Alva was
appointed her successor; with him began a system of
merciless repression. Blood flowed freely, and all the
treacheries of the people were used. In September
the Spaniard Juan Vargas, chief-justice of the Council
of Troubles, replied to complaint of the University of
Louvain that its privileges had been violated: non
curamus privilegios vestros. (We are not concerned with
your privileges.) Besides this, heavy taxes, 10
per cent on the sales of chattels, 5 per cent on the sale of
wine and tobacco, and the imposition of the popular discontent, and turned even a number of
good Catholics against the Government. The Protes-
tants, encouraged by these events, began military
operations by land and sea, and the gueux des bois
(Land-Beggars) and the gueux de mer (Water-Beggars)
started a guerrilla warfare and a campaign of pillage
which brought havoc and fear everywhere, followed by
the Duke of Orange and his brother, Louis of Nassau.
But the Duke of Alva frustrated all their efforts,
and when he had repulsed Louis at Jemmingen, and
prevented William from crossing the Geete, he caused
a statue of himself to be set up at Antwerp repre-
senting him crushing under foot the hydra of
anarchy. Then just as he thought he had mas-
tered the rebellion, news was brought that on
1 April, 1572, the Water-Beggars had taken the port of
Briel. Henceforth in the very heart of the Low
Countries they had a point for rally or retreat, and
their progress was rapid. In quick succession they
captured many towns in Holland and Zeeland. These
Vendetta perpetually pursued the invaders, but the
Marck, Lord of Lumen, for the most part ruffians devoid of all human feeling. When they
took the town of Gorkum they put to death in a most
barbarous manner nineteen priests and monks who re-
fused to abjure their Catholic Faith. The Church
venerates these brave victims on 9 July, under the
title of the Martyrs of Gorkum. About the same
time Louis of Nassau took Mons in Hainault, and
William of Orange made a second descent on the
country with an army of hirelings that committed
frightful excesses. But he failed before the superior
forces of the Duke of Alva. Mons was recaptured and
William once more driven out. Alva then turned his
arms against the provinces of the north: Zutphen,
Naarden, and Haarlem fell successively into his hands
and were treated most shamefully, but contrary to his
hopes the rest of the rebel country did not submit.

At last Philip II realized that the duke's mission
had failed. Yielding to the entreaty of his most
faithful subjects—the bishops and the University of
Louvain—Alva was again appointed governor and
successor Don Luis de Requesens. During his brief
regency (1573-75) Don Luis did not succeed in restoring
royal authority in the revolted districts, although he
showed greater humanity and an inclination to con-
ciliate the disaffected. Nor was he more successful
in capturing the town of Leyden which withstood one
siege after another. His death left the country in a state of anarch.

The Council of State took over the reins of govern-
ment pending the arrival of the new regent, Don John
of Austria, brother of Philip II. It was a favourable
moment for the ambitious schemes of William of
Orange. Thanks to the intrigues of his agents, the
members of the Council of State were arrested and did
not regain their freedom till those most attached to the
king's interests had been removed and others appointed
in their places. This packed council was but a tool of
the Prince of Orange, and its first act was to convene
the States-General to deal with the affairs of the coun-
try, without any reference to the king. On the motion of
the Council of State, the representatives of the
rebel provinces of Holland and Zeeland, where the
authority of the prince was still unquestioned, and
together they debated a scheme for
securing tolerance for all forms of worship until such
time as the States-General should have finally decided
the matter, also for obtaining the removal of the Span-
ish occupation. But in fact, an event happened which filled the whole country
with fear and horror. The Spanish soldiers, who for a
long time had received no pay, mutinyed, seized the
city of Antwerp, and pillaged it ruthlessly, seven thou-
sand persons perishing during these disorders, which
were usually referred to as the Spanish Fury. The
 Prince of Orange, who had been camped
near Ghent, despatched the famous
Pacification of Ghent on 8 November,
1576.

Thus triumphed the crafty and artful diplomacy of the
Prince of Orange. He had succeeded in causing
the loyal provincies to vote toleration of worship, while
the provinces of Holland and Zeeland of which he was
master were still restricted in their limits to the practice of the Catholic religion. No doubt it was
stipulated that this refusal was only provisional, and that
the States-General of the seventeen provinces
would finally settle the question; but meanwhile
Protestanism gained an immense advantage in the Catholi-
c province without giving anything in return.
Furthermore the prince had taken the precaution to
have it stipulated that he should remain admiral and
regent of Holland and Zeeland, and all these measures
were passed in the name of the king whose authority
they completely defied.

Such was the situation when the new regent arrived.
On the advice of his best friends he ratified by his
party perpetual the system of his predecessors in the
main clauses of the Pacification of Ghent, which rallied to
him a majority of the people. Then set about es-
ablishing his authority, no easy task in face of the
unwearying effort of the Prince of Orange to prevent
it. When, in order to obtain a reliable stronghold,
he seized the citadel of Namur, the States-General,
prompted by William of Orange, declared him an
enemy of the State and called in as regent Archduke
Matthias of Austria, to whom William succeeded in
being made lieutenant-general. Don John defeated the
army of the States-General at Gembloux, and Wil-
liam made a fresh appeal to foreign Protestants. From
all the neighbouring countries adventurers flocked in
to fight the Catholic Government. The Calvinists
took sorr of the large cities, Brussels, Antwerp,
Ghent, and held them in a state of terror. In the last-
named town two of the leaders, Hembyeze and Ryhove,
gave themselves up to every excess, persecuted the
Catholics, and endeavoured to set up a sort of Protest-
ant republic as Calvin had done at Geneva. To crown
these mistakes, the prince was stricken with ar
sclerosis by illness in 1578, and all seemed lost for the Catholic
religion and the royal authority.

But the eyes of the Catholics were at last opened.
Seeing that under pretext of freeing them from Span-
ish tyranny they were being enslaved under Protestant states they turned from William’s party and sought once more their lawful king, in spite of the just complaints they had against his government. This revolutionary movement was most marked in the Walloon provinces: Artois, Hainault, and French Flanders in the van; Namur and Luxemburg joining them later. It began as a league among the nobles of these provinces who styled themselves the Malcontents, and who broke with the States-General to recognize anew the authority of Philip II. It was they who prevented the realization of the great scheme of William of Orange to federate the seventeen provinces in a league of which he was to be the head, and which would ultimately cast off all allegiance to the king. When he assembled a greater number of the Malcontents and himself with them, the northern provinces in the Union of Utrecht (1579), under the name of the United Provinces, and with proclaiming the deposition of Philip II at least within these provinces. To the Malcontents, therefore, is due the credit of saving the royal authority and the Catholic religion in the Belgian provinces.

The new regent, Alessandro Farnese, son of the former regent, Margaret of Parma, grasped the situation admirably. He entered into negotiations with the Malcontents, and reconciled them with the king’s government by redressing their grievances; then with their support he set about recovering by force of arms the towns in the northern provinces which had fallen into Spanish hands. One after the other they were recaptured, some, like Tournai and Antwerp, only after memorable sieges, till at last Ostend alone of all Belgium remained in Protestant hands. And now the popular regent was preparing for a campaign against the northern provinces, demoralized by the assassination of their stadtholder in 1584, when once more, hapless II’s ill-ordered policy ruined everything. Instead of allowing Farnese to continue his military success in the Netherlands, Philip used him as an instrument of wild projects against France and England. At one moment obliged to take part in maritime preparations against England, and at another to cross the frontier in support of the League against Henry IV, Farnese had to leave his task unfinished, and he died in 1592 of a wound received in one of his French expeditions. His death was the greater misfortune for Belgium because Maurice of Nassau, son of William of Orange, and one of the greatest war-capitans of the age, was just then coming to the front.

It is not a happy policy must be tried. He betook himself of separating the Catholic Netherlands from Spain, and of giving the sovereignty to his daughter Isabella and her husband the Archduke Albert of Austria; in the event of their being childless the country was to revert to Spain (1586). This was one of the most important events in the history of Belgium, for in 1584, when once more, an independent nation, acquired a national dynasty, and might now hope for the return of former prosperity; that this hope was frustrated was the result of events which defeated the plans of statecraft and the wishes of the new sovereigns.

During the short space of their union (1588-1621) Albert and Isabella lavished benefits on the country. Ostend was recaptured from Holland after a three-years’ siege which claimed the attention of all Europe, and a truce of twelve years (1609-21) made with the United Provinces was employed to the greatest advantage. The damage done by the religious wars was repaired; more than three hundred chateaux and noble houses were founded or restored; local customs were codified by the Perpetual Edict of 1611, which has been called the most splendid monument of Belgian law; public education was fostered in every way, and the new sovereigns brought about the founding of many colleges by the protection they extended to the religious teaching orders. More over they showed themselves generous patrons of science, literature, and art, and protected the interests of commerce and agriculture. Blameless in their private life and deeply pious, they gave an example of virtue on the throne not always to be found there. Unfortunately they died childless, Albert in 1621, Isabella in 1633, and their death put an end to the preceding prosperity of Belgium. Once more the country was drawn into endless wars by Spain, who fought chiefly against France, and became the battle-field of numerous international conflicts. It was repeatedly despoiled of some of its provinces by Louis XIV, and cruelly plundered by all armies, friendly and hostile, that marched across its plains. The seventeenth century was the most calamitous of all to Belgium. The condition of Belgium until the peace of Utrecht (1713), which followed by that of Rastatt put an end to the long and bloody wars of the Spanish Succession which gave Spain to the Bourbons and handed over the Catholic Low Countries to the Hapsburgs of Austria.

It would be a mistake to suppose that all these calamities, domestic and foreign, had left Belgium entirely unfruitful from the point of view of civilization. Nothing could be more false; though it is a charge often made even in Belgium by writers whose prejudices would fain discover in Catholicism a retarding force for Belgium’s progress. The University of Louvain, which Bellarmine, and Justus Lipsius had taught, had always been the centre of orthodoxy, and did not cease even during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to manifest great activity, chiefly in the domains of theology and law, which were expanded there by a large number of eminent scholars. Side by side with Louvain stood the University of Douai founded in 1562 by Philip II as a breakwater against heresy, and it also sent forth many famous men. Among the new bishops were men whose fame for learning was only equalled by their well-known piety. It is no doubt true that the controversies of the day have left their mark on the religious life of that period. Thus, Michael Badius, a professor at Louvain, was condemned by Rome for his theories on free will, predetermination, and justification, but he retracted in all humility. His teaching came up again in a more pronounced form in a pupil of one of his pupils, Cornelius Jansen, Bishop of Ypres, and it is well known how the "Augustinians", a posthumous work of which appears in it, a work which is called Jansenism. Another manifestation of the intellectual and scientific activity of Belgium was the beginning of the celebrated collection known as the "Acta Sanctorum" by the Belgian Jesuits. Héribert Rowsewyde drew up the plans for the undertaking, and Father Jan van Bolland began to carry them out, leaving the continuation of the work to his collaborators, the Bollandists. Amongst these Hensen and Papelbroch in the seventeenth century contributed brilliantly to the work which has not yet reached its conclusion.

If, apart altogether from the religious aspect, we would complete the picture of Belgium’s culture in the seventeenth century, we have but to recall that art reached its acme in the Flemish School, of which Rubens was the head, and Van Dyck, Teniers, and Jordaens the greatest masters after him. It would thus be easy to prove that the Catholic Low Countries, though caught as in a vise between powerful neighbours and ever in the throses of war, did not give way to despair, but in the days of direct calamity drew from their own resources, and, as it were, were abased with abilities which have served to adorn even our present-day civilization.

THE AUSTRIAN NETHERLANDS.—The Treaty of Utrecht opened an era of comparative peace and prosperity for the Catholic Netherlands, but did not bring contentment. The Austrian regime under which the
country was now to exist was that of an absolute monarchy, which by continued encroachments on the traditional privileges of the people, drove them at length to rebellion. It was not merely its absolutism, it was the anti-religious atmosphere of the Government which really aroused the people. The actuating principle of the Government in its dealings with the Catholic Church was to assert its supremacy and to make rules for the Church, even in purely religious matters. This policy, which is known as Josephinism, from Joseph II, its most thoroughgoing exponent, had prevailed at the Austrian Court from the beginning. It found a theorist of great authority in the famous canonist Van Espen (1646-1728), a professor at the University of Leiden. His writings justified and all attacked on the liberty of the Church. The opposition between the tendencies of the Government, which threatened alike the national liberties and the rights of the Church, and the aspirations of the Belgian people, devoted alike to religion and liberty, gave rise during the Austrian occupation of the country to endless misunderstandings and unrest. The situation was not, however, uniformly the same. It varied under different reigns, each of which had its own peculiar characteristics.

Under the reign of Charles VI (1713-1740) Belgium quickly learned that she had gained nothing by the changing of her rulers. One of the clauses of the Peace of Utrecht had conferred upon the United Provinces, called the Treaty de la Barrière (the Frontier Treaty) entitling the United Provinces to garrison a number of Belgian towns on the French frontier as a protection against attacks from that quarter. This was a humiliation for the Belgians, and it was aggravated by the fact that these garrison troops were under the command of the Protestant Church of their religion, had many religious quarrels with the Catholic people. Moreover, the United Provinces, controlling the estuary of the Scheldt, had closed the sea against the port of Antwerp since 1585; so that this port which had at one time been the foremost commercial city of the north was now deprived of its trade. This was a fresh injustice to the Catholic Low Countries. To all this must be added the oppressive and ill-considered policy of the Marquess de Prié, deputy for the absent government-general, Prince Eugene of Savoy. Prié, like another Alva, treated the country with the utmost severity. When the labour guilds of Brussels protested vigorously against the government tactics, Prié, turning the river Zenne into a tidal channel, caused the aged François Annensess, syndic or chairman of one of these guilds, to be arrested and put to death (1719). The citizens of Brussels have never forgotten to venerate the memory of their fellow-townman as a martyr for public liberty. The Government compensated the nation by founding the East and West Indian Trade in 1722. This company, which was enthusiastically hailed by the public, was of immense benefit in the beginning, and promised an era of commercial prosperity. Unfortunately the jealousy of England and of the United Provinces sealed its fate. To win the consent of these two powers to his Pragmatic Sanction, by which he hoped to secure the undisputed succession of his daughter Maria Theresa, the emperor agreed to suppress the Ostend company and once more to close the sea against Belgian trade. His cowardly concessions were of no avail, and at his death in 1740 his daughter was obliged to undertake a long and costly war to maintain her inheritance and Belgium, invaded and conquered by France in 1792, was not restored to the empire till the Peace of Aachen in 1748.

Under the reign of Maria Theresa (1740-80) the Government was in a position to occupy itself peacefully with the organization of the Belgian provinces. On the whole it fostered the material interests of the country, but the principles underlying its religious policy revealed themselves in measures more and more hostile to the Church. The empress herself was of the opinion that the Church ought to be subject to the State even in religious matters. "The authority of the priesthood", she wrote, "is by no means arbitrary and independent in matters of dogma, worship, and ecclesiastical discipline". The state in her service, imbued as it was with the spirit of absolutism and republicanism, was zealous in applying these principles. The more famous among them were the Prince of Kauinz, the Count of Cobenzl, and Mæ Neny. On the slightest pretext they constantly stirred up petty and at times ridiculous conflicts with the ecclesiastical authorities, such as forbidding assemblies of the bishops; trying to prevent the clergy from using the law courts; interfering with the publication of books; forbidding the publication of books; forbidding the publication of books; forbidding the publication of books; and so on. They proceeded to issue decrees compelling the clergy to adopt the terms of the Council of Trent, and to suppress the various religious orders, and in general to bring the Church under the sway of the State. The effect of these measures was to make the Church less and less a power in the State.

But there came a great change as soon as Joseph II mounted the throne (1780). He was the son of Maria Theresa, a pupil of the philosophers, and inspired by their teachings, was ever ready to defy and disregard the Church. As was not unusual in his day he held the opinion that the State was the source of all authority, and the source of all civilizing progress. He set himself without delay to apply his policy of "enlightened despotism". Forgetful of his coronation oath to observe the constitutions of the several Belgian provinces he began a career of reform which ended by destroying the Church. By an edict of tolerance, which he was to publish in 1781 an edict of toleration, by which Protestants were freed from all civil disabilities, a just measure in itself, and one that might well be praised, it were not that, in the light of his subsequent actions it betrayed the dominant idea of his whole reign, namely, hostility to the Catholic Church. The Church, he thought, was a part of the creature of the State, subject to the control and supervision of the civil power. He undertook to realize this ideal by substituting for the Catholic Church governed by the pope a national Church subject to the State, along the lines laid down by Febronius, who had met with many supporters even within the ranks of the clergy. The measures he adopted to enslave the Church were endless. He forbade religious orders to correspond with superiors outside the country; he forbade the bishops to ask Rome for dispensations in matrimonial cases. He tried to gain control of the education of the clergy by erecting a central seminary to which he endeavored to force the bishops to send their future priests. He interfered with the Jesuits and the University of Louvain because he considered them too orthodox. He suppressed as useless all convents of contemplative orders and all pious confraternities, and replaced them by one of his own invention which he grandiosely called "The Confraternity of the Active Love of our Neighbour". He prohibited all
Nederlanden (5 vols., Antwerp, 1878-80); Piet, Le royaume de Marie-Thérèse dans les Pays Bas autrichiens (Louvain, 1874); DISCAILLON, Les Pays Bas sous le royaume de Marie-Thérèse (Brussels, 1872); DELPLACE, Joseph II et la révolution française (Bruges, 1971); HUBERT, Les guerres de la Bourgogne dans les Pays Bas autrichiens (Brussels, 1902); IDEM, Le voyage de Joseph II au Pays Bas (1781) (Brussels, 1900).

GODEFROY KURTH.

Netter, Thomas, theologian and controversialist, b. at Safron Walden, Essex, England, about 1375; d. at Rouen, France, 2 Nov., 1430; from his birthplace he was commonly called Waldensian. He entered the Carmelite Order in London, and pursued his studies partly there and partly at Oxford, where he took degrees, and spent a number of years in teaching, as may be gathered from the titles of his works (all of which are now either lost or untraced). He espoused the opinions of the Erasmians, which embrace the whole of philosophy, Scripture, Canon Law, and theology, that is, a complete academical course. He was well read in the classics and the ecclesiastical writers known at the beginning of the fifteenth century, as is proved by numerous quotations in his own writings. Only the dates of his ordinations as acolyte and subdeacon are record, 1394 and 1395. His public life began in 1409, when he was sent to the Council of Pisa, where he is said to have upheld the rights of the council. Back in England he took a prominent part in the prosecution of Wycliffites and Lollards, assisting at the trials of William Tailor (1410), Sir John Oldcastle (1413), John Wycliffe (1428), presenting his case against Lollardism, and writing copiously on the questions in dispute ("De religione perfectorum", "De paupertate Christi", "De Corpore Christi", etc.). The House of Lancaster having chosen Carmelite friars for confessors, an office which included the duties of chaplain, almoner, and secretary and which was extremely lucrative, Netter, who had succeeded Stephen Patrington as confessor to Henry V and provincial of the Carmelites (1414), while other members of the order held similar posts at the courts of the dukes of York and of Clarenc, of Cardinal Beaufort, etc. No political importance seems to have been attached to such positions.

In 1415 Netter was sent by the king to the Council of Constance, where the English nation, though small in numbers, asserted its influence. He must have interrupted his residence at Constance by one, if not several, visits to his province. At the conclusion of the council he, with William Cluyt, doctor in Divinity, and two knights, was sent by the English king as an embassy to the Archduke of Austria, the Duke of Lithuania, and the Grand master of the Teutonic Knights. The pope was represented by two Italian bishops, and the emperor by the Archbishop of Milan. The object of the mission was to bring about a mutual understanding and prevent the failure of the papal army against the Hussites. It has been asserted several times on this occasion Netter converted Vitore, Grand Duke of Lithuania, to Christianity, and was instrumental in his recognition as king and his subsequent coronation. Although all this is doubtful, it is possible that Netter did exercise some influence during his brief stay in eastern Europe, for he has been styled the Apostle of Lithuania; he also established several convents of his order in Prussia. He returned to England in the autumn of 1420, and devoted the remainder of his life to the government of his province and the composition of his principal work. Fragments of his correspondence late published throw a light on his endeavours in the former capacity, showing him a strict reformer, yet kind and clement.

Henry V having died in his arms, he appears to have acted as tutor (rather than as confessor) to the infant King Henry VI, whose piety may be attributed, at least in part, to Netter's influence. He accompanied the young king to France in the spring of
1430, and died six months later in the odour of sanctity. Miracles having been wrought at his tomb, the question of the confirmation of his cult is at present (1810) before the Congregation of Rites. Of his numerous works only the "Doctrina antiquitatem fidei ecclesiae catholicae" has permanent value. It is in three parts, the first of which might be termed "De vera religione," the second bears the title "De sacramentis adversus Wiclefistas" etc., and the last "De sacramentibus." The first two were presented to the pope, who on 8 August, 1437, expressed his satisfaction, encouraging the author to continue his useful and learned undertaking, and communicating to him the text of the Bull condemning the errors of Wyclif "Dudum ab apostolorum." Nevertheless the work, owing to its bulk, would have fallen into oblivion had not some Carmelites, notably Ludovicus de Berlino, discovered it in the library of Paris and secured its publication (1523). It was reprinted at Paris (1532), Salamanca (1557), Venice (1571 and 1757). It is a complete apologia of Catholic dogma and ritual as against the attacks of the Wycliffites, and was largely drawn upon by the controversialists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Zimmermann, Monumenta histor. Carmel., 1 (Lipsia, 1907), 442 sq.

Benedict Zimmermann.

Neugart, Trudpfort, Benedictine historian, b. at Villingen, Baden, 23 February, 1742; d. at St. Paul's Bernardin in Jerusalem, 15 December, 1825. Of middle-class origin Neugart studied in the classical schools of the Benedictine Abbeys of St. George and St. Blasien, entered the order at the latter monastery in 1759, and was ordained priest in 1765; in 1767 he was appointed professor of Biblical languages at the University of Freiburg. In 1789 he was made professor of theology. While engaged in this work he published a treatise on penance, "Doctrina de sacramentis penitentiae recte administrando" (St. Blasien, 1778). His abbot, Gerbert, had planned the publication of a Church history of Germany on a large scale ("Germania sacra"). In 1780 at his request Neugart began to collect the historical data for the Diocese of Constance. On Gerbert's death in 1793, Neugart declined the dignity of abbot but accepted the provostship of Krozingen, near Freiburg, so as to be able to devote himself entirely to historical studies. He published the original charters and documents for the history of the Diocese of Constance in a separate part dedicated by the author, "Episcopatus Constantiniensis sive transjurane circius dioecese Constantien-" (1, St. Blasien, 1791; II, St. Blasien, 1795). With this as a basis he wrote at Krozingen the first instalment of his history of the Diocese of Constance "Episcopatus Constantiniensis Alemannicus sub metropolit Moguntinum" (part I, vol. I, to the year 1100, St. Blasien, 1804). The number of manuscripts of the office antiphons, there being special rubrics in the liturgical books as to the days on which they should be sung or not sung. The more important use of the term is that in which it means the signs used in the notation of Gregorian Chant. Akin to this use is the one which applies it to the tones or groups of tones in MSS. notated in Roman notation. In this sense the term cannot be traced farther back than the eleventh century. The names of the various signs, too, seem to date from about the same period. Previously the general name for the notation was usus. The names of the single signs varied with time and place. The tables of names found in several MSS not only have different names for the same sign, or different signs for the same name. In this article we shall use the names as applied in the Preface to the Gradual recently issued from the Vatican printing establishment.

The neumatic notation of Plain Chant is first met with in MSS of the ninth century and, with slight modifications, is to be met with to this day. Whether its use goes much farther back, whether, in particular, St. Gregory the Great employed notation in his typical Antiphonarium, cannot be said with certainty. The fact that at the date of our earliest MSS. the insufficiency of the notation was felt, and various efforts were made to supply the defect, would seem to promise the development of considerable duration. On the other hand the fact that from the beginning we find several families of notation like those of St. Gall and Metz, which,
while agreeing in the main principles, show considerable divergence in matters of detail, would seem to suggest that at the time when these families started, only the fundamental idea had been conceived, while the full development of the whole system took place more or less independently at the various centres. Judging by the consideration mentioned first, we should have no difficulty in believing that St. Gregory used neumatic notation in his Antiphonary. In accordance with the second view, however, we should feel inclined to put the beginning of neumatic writing about the eighth century.

As to the origin of the neums students are now on the whole agreed that they are mainly derived from the accent marks of the grammarians. In that way, of course, they point back to Greece. From the fact, however, that some of the signs in the developed system look like signs in Byzantine notation, and that some of the names are Greek in origin, some investigators have concluded that the whole system was taken over from Greece. Recently J. Thibaut has defended this theory in a rather fanciful book, "Origine Byzantine de la Notation Neumatique de l'Eglise Latine". But the prevailing opinion is that the neumatic system is of Latin growth.

Accordingly the fundamental principle is that the rise and fall of the melody are expressed by the signs of the accentus acutus (\(\Upsilon\)) and the accentus gravis (\(\Sigma\)). The acutus, being drawn upwards, from left to right, indicates a rise in the melody, a higher note; the gravis, being drawn downwards, a fall in the melody, a lower note. From the combination of these two signs there result various group signs: (1) \(\Theta\), acutus and gravis, a higher note followed by a lower one, a descending group of two notes (clivis); (2) \(\Delta\), gravis and acutus, lower and higher notes (pes or podatus); (3) \(\Sigma\), acutus, gravis, acutus; a group of three notes of which the second is the lowest (porrectus); (4) \(\Upsilon\), gravis, acutus, gravis; a group of three notes of which the second is the highest (torculus); and so on. In these combinations the elements generally preserve their original form pretty clearly, except that the angles are often rounded off, as indicated below. When used singly, the acutus, too, retained its shape fairly accurately and from its shape received the name virga (virgula). The gravis, however, was generally converted into a short horizontal line (\(-\)), or a dot (\(\cdot\)), or something similar, and hence received the name of punctum. In this form it is also used in an ascending group of three or more notes (\(\times\), scandicus) and in a
similar descending group (\(\flat\), climaxus). More complicated combinations were designated as modifications of the simpler groups. The addition of a lower follows on the same syllable. An analysis of all the cases of liquescence occurring in the MS. Gradual 339 of St. Gall is made in the second volume of the “Palæographic Musicae” (pp. 41 sqq.), where the subject is treated very fully. This analysis shows that by far the largest number of cases (2450 out of 3504) occur when a vowel is followed by two or more consonants the first of which is one of the “liquida” (l, m, n, r) either within a word (like sanctor) or through the collocation of two words (as in le). A considerable number is found before an explosive dental at the end of a word followed by another word beginning with one or more consonants (317 before t, 48 before d). Forty-nine times it is found before a final s followed by another consonant (e.g. nobis Domine) and six times before in Israhel; seventy-three times before g, thirty-two times before two consonants the second of which is j (e.g. adjutor), forty-six times before single m, thirty-four times before a single g followed by e or i. One hundred and fifty-nine times on the diphthong au, and two hundred and eighty-eight times before a single j (including one hundred and fifty-three cases on aisleu).

It is clear from what has been said, that this liquescence must be connected with the proper pronunciation of the consonants. But as to what it should mean in the rendering, authors are not agreed. Thus the preface to the Vatican Gradual says: “ipse cogente syllabarium natura, vox de una ad alteram limpidi transiens tunc liquescit; ita ut in ore compressa non faciet videratur, et quasi dimidium a more, sed potestatis amittat.” This is not easy to translate, but it would seem that the last tone of the liquescent sound should “lose one half, not of its length, but of its strength”. The “Palæographic Musicae” on the other hand, says that in the exact pronunciation of certain combinations of consonants an obscure vowel sound enters between them, so that a word like confundantur would sound confundant-

Thus even the clivis (more correctly clinis) was at an early period called virga flexa, and the torculus could be considered as a pes flexus. The sign \(\\text{\textbullet}\) would be a porrectus flexus, the \(\\text{\textbullet}\) a torculus resupinus, etc. Again the placing of several puncta before a sign is expressed by the term prepuinctis, their addition after a sign subpunctas. In accordance with that a scandius is a virga prepuinctis; a clivus, a virga subpunctis; \(\\text{\textbullet}\), scandius subpunctus, or, also compoundas the last-named adjective indicating the addition of punctus before and after.

A special modification of the neum form is that which is called liquescent or semivocal. It consists generally of a shortening, attenuating, or curling of the last stroke. It occurs only at the transition from one syllable to the next and there only in certain circumstances. It is never found when another neum
mentioned above, which comprise the large majority of all the cases. Also to the case of single m and j (or i), the latter partaking of the nature of the liquid consonants. It would further apply to the case of gn, if we suppose that that combination was pronounced ny,

Intr. 

\[ \text{Aude-ámus * omnes in Dó-mi-no, di-em festum célebrántes sub honó-re Agathae Márt-y-rís: de cujus passió-ne gaudent Ange-li, et colláudant Fí-li-um De-i.} \]

Mrs. Ex. 2

and to the case of final s, if that consonant was voiced, when it also could be sung. In the case of the diphthong au the liquescence would consist in the transition from the first vowel to the second. The remaining cases of double consonants should be explained by analogy, the liquescence consisting simply in the shortening of the vowel sound made for the purpose of distinct pronunciation of the group of consonants without loss of time. This explanation would have the further advantage of being in accordance with the practice of the best choirs that nowadays make a peculiar study of Plain Chant.

Some of the liquescent neums have special names.

Intr. 

\[ \text{I-ti-éntes * vení-te ad a-quas, di-cit Dó-mi-nus: et qui non habé-tis pré-ti-um, vení-te, bi-bi te cum lae-ti-} \]

\[ \text{ti- a.} \]

Mrs. Ex. 3

Thus the liquescent politus is called epiphonus, the liquescent elvis, cephalicus, the liquescent climasus, anicus.

In addition to the neums which are derived from the accents and which form the groundwork of the neumatic system, there is another class which may be taken as indicating special effects. They have, as Wagner has pointed out, as a common feature, the book form. In the first place we mention the strophicus, having the shape of a comma (,). When occurring singly, it is called apostrophus, when doubled, distrophus; when trebled, tristrophus. The apostrophus is generally found at the end of another neum, or followed by a distrophus at a higher pitch; it is never used as a single note over a syllable. When added to a neum, it is generally represented in the later staff notation manuscripts at the same pitch as the last note of that neum. But there is reason to believe that originally there was an interval smaller than a semitone between those two notes. The distrophus and tristrophus indicate a quick repetition of the same note, possibly again with a minute difference of pitch between the repeated notes.

Akin to the apostrophus is the oriscus, having a shape somewhat like this : . Apostrophus and oriscus are sometimes interchanged in different manuscripts. In a few instances the oriscus, however, is

Grad. 

\[ \text{Ustus * ut palma etc. \&. Ad annun-ti-ándum ma-ne mi-se-rícorú-am tu-} \]

\[ \text{am, et veri-tátem tu-} \]

\[ \text{am * per no-stem.} \]

Mrs. Ex. 4

The illustrations which accompany this article are
of the Introit itself are merely indicated by the cues In Med., Et impieb., and Stola. The signs for the single notes are the plain virga and the round punctum, the former on the last syllable of xohannus, the second and third syllables of adimplens, etc., the latter on the second syllable of Gratia, the second syllable of Dei, the first of xohannis, etc. In the podatus the gravis is a short horizontal stroke, the acutus a straight virga joining almost at a right angle; see third syllable of Gratia, third of salutifer, third of dogmata, etc. There is also a second form consisting of a disjointed punctum and virga, see third syllable of Gloria (last line on left page), first syllable of xristus

Illustration II ("Palæogr. Mus.", IV, pl. A) is from a MS. written in the monastery of Einsiedeln at the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century. It belongs to the St. Gall school of notation. The affinity of this school to the Anglo-Saxon is evident. There are, however, a number of peculiarities. First we find a greater variety of signs. Thus the virga appears in two forms, one slightly curved to the right and vanishing at the top, the other straighter and with a thickening at the top. This second variety arises, graphically, from its being drawn downwards, the pen spreading itself a little at the start of the stroke. For the rendering it indicates a longer form of the note. We find the first form on the first syllable of Ostende, the fifth of misericordiam, etc., the second on the second syllable of Ostende (first sign),
on the first syllable of tuam (second sign), etc. Similarly we have for the punctum, besides the dot form, that of a short horizontal line. This is also sometimes used for one of the puncta of the clamicus (first syllable of tuam, third and sixth neums, etc.) and towards the end of the group neuma on nobis (fifth sign from the end) we see a trigon subpuncte, the last dot of the trigon and the added punctum being drawn out. The podatus appears in three forms; first with rounded corner, as on the third syllable of Alleluia (first sign); second with some pen pressure on the initial stroke and a fairly square angle, as on the fourth syllable of Alleluia (third sign); and third, with a more elaborate gravis, as in the final neuma of nobis (second last sign). The first may be considered as the normal form, the second marks a firmer rendering of the first note, and the third a decided leaning on it. The torculus appears in its plain form (second syllable of Ostende, fourth syllable of misericordiam) and with pen pressure on both graves (\textsuperscript{2/3}) marking a prolongation of the whole figure (first syllable of tuam, seventh sign). The two forms of the pressus, minor and major, are found in the final neuma of Alleluia (fourth last and last signs). Of liquescent signs we have a scandicus liquescenta on the first syllable of Alleluia, a distropha liquescenta on the third, an epiphon on the last syllable of misericordiam.

A second peculiarity of the St. Gall notation is the occasional addition of a little stroke to the neums, marking a prolongation of the affected note. The "Paléographie Musicale" (IV, pl. 17) has given the name epimasa to this little addition. Mention has already been made of the thickening of the head of the virga, which often amounts to a distinct stroke. Our illustration gives examples of a similar addition to the last note of the torculus: \(\text{O}^1\) instead of \(\text{O}\); the last of the porrectus, the first and the second of the clivis. The epimasic torculus is seen in the final neuma of nobis (before the first trigon). The first sign in the same neuma is also an epimasic torculus followed by another long punctum. On the first syllable of tuam we have an epimasic porrectus, followed by two puncta, while the plain porrectus appears on the first syllable of domine (third sign). The clivis with epimasa to the first note is found on the first syllable of tuam (first sign) and twice towards the end of the neuma on tuam. On the second syllable of nobis, after the torculus subpunctu already mentioned, we have a clivis with the epimasa attached to the second note, the clivis being preceded by two short puncta and followed by a long one.

Thirdly, we find as a peculiarity of this notation the addition of certain letters. These are often called "Romanian" letters, because a St. Gall writer of the eleventh century attributes their use to a singer named Romanus who, according to him, brought the chant from Rome to St. Gall towards the end of the eighth century (see "Pal. Mus.", IV, pl. 9; Wagner, "Einleitung", II, 114). The letterae significativa are of two classes, one referring to rhythm, the other referring to pitch. Of the former class we find in our illustration frequently the c (celeriter) and the t (tenete). At the beginning of the Offitory (last line of illustration) we find also the m (medioeciter) modifying the effect of the preceding c. Of the second class we find the c (equaliter) enjoining the same pitch between domine and misericordiam between the second and third syllables of misericordiam and between tuam and et.

To give a clearer idea of the meaning of the neums in this illustration we subjoin the notation of the same piece according to the Vatican edition, pointing out only the few differences in the two readings. On the first syllable of "Alleluia" the Vatican edition omits the liquescence; similarly on the third syllable of that word and on the final syllable of "misericordiam". It may be mentioned in this connexion that a very frequent use of liquescence is characteristic of the St. Gall school. The strophs on Alleluia and tuam are given as ordinary puncta. Similarly the special sign for the pressus has disappeared and is replaced by a doubling of the first note. The first of these two notes of the same pitch is then sometimes combined with the pre-
(the first punctum connected with the pes in the manner of a torculus and the second, liquecent, bent back to the left) on the second syllable of collaudant and a porrectus compunctis liqueces on the last syllable of filium. The oriscus is found after the podatus on

\[ \text{feat illum: et elegit cunx ex omni arte. Decit uti popeta et legem utr et discipline: rex illum feat uti. Statuisti uti retenementu creasti: et oriantur cum zona ushace.} \]

\[ \text{Et vindicta dieis coelona glo} \]

\[ \text{Ec. Judas ut pulae facer.} \]

IT \( \text{am} \) \( \text{ui} \) \( \text{am} \) \( \text{ui} \) \( \text{em.} \) \( \text{Stundum volatam.} \)

\[ \text{ill. vii.—ms. 411 (341) (xiv century)} \]

Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris

agatha and the quilisma, consisting of two books, on the second syllable of domino, the second of angeli and the first of dei, in each case a porrectus being joined to it.

Another peculiarity of this school is the frequent use of disjoint neums, all of which indicate a prolongation of the notes. Mention was made of a disjoint podatus in connexion with the first illustration. We find it here on in and the first syllable of celebrantes. A torculus of this kind is shown in the second syllable of martyris. The descending figures are indicated by the puncta placed perpendicularly. Thus we have a clivis on the second syllable of omnes, the second

\[ \text{ill. viii.—gothic neums (a. d. 1435)} \]

Cathedral Library, Trier

The comparison with the reading of the Vaticana will show a close resemblance. We only notice that on gaudenti and angeli the MS. adds a liquecent note to the podatus and porrectus subpunctis, and on celebrantes has twice a porrectus for the strophic clivis, which suggests that the apostrophia (oriscus) was sung slightly higher than the last note of the clivus, as mentioned above.

Illustration IV is taken from an eleventh-century MS. of Silos, written in the Mozarabic notation ("Pal. Mus.", I, pl. II) in order to show that even this is based on the same principles. The usual forms of virga, punctum, podatus, clivis, torculus, porrectus

(before the quilisma) and the third of domino, the third of angeli (where the lower one got attached to the l), etc.; a climacus on angeli, preceding the quilisma.

We note further the use of literae significationes. Thus we have the c used in the same sense as in the St. Gall school, on agader. Similarly a t appears at the bottom of the illustration under the word meli. The a on Gaudeamus stands here for augete and is, therefore, synonymous with the t, whereas in St. Gall

will be recognized easily. The other features will be explained with reference to the modern form of the Vatican Gradual. The piece occurs in the Roman Liturgy as Introit of the Saturday after the fourth Sunday of Lent. On the last syllable of Silentes the MS. has a pes subpunctis, with the puncta joined together, representing the same notes as the staff notation without the pressus. On the first syllable of semen the MS. has a clivis instead of the single note of the Roman version, on the second, the punctum and
torculus (placed one over the other) are only graphically different from the pes and clivis. On the first syllable of equas a tristopha takes the place of the trigon. On the second syllable of dicti the MS. omits the last note of the print. On the second syllable of dominus the disjunct punctum and clivis correspond to the conjoint torculus. The second figure on non is a liquecent torculus. It begins below with the graavis to which the acutus is attached in the usual manner, but the last, liquecent, graavis is represented by a curve to the left of the acutus. The remaining slight differences are like those already explained.

As has been sufficiently indicated, the neums merely marked the rise or fall of the melody. They gave, in themselves, no clear information as to the exact amount of the rise or fall. In other words, they did not mark the intervals. A podatus, e.g., may indicate a second, a third, a fourth or a fifth without change in its form. This may now be accepted as an established fact. The various efforts made from time to time, most recently by Fleischer in his "Neumenstudien", to find interval significance in the neums, have failed completely. It is clear then, that at no time could the melody be read absolutely from the neumatic notation. Rather this served merely as an aid to memory. Nor did the choir sing from the notation. The MS. was only for the choir-master, or at most for the solo singer. The whole body of the Plain Chant melodies had to be committed to memory in the rehersals and we know now that many of the contemporary writers that it took a singer several years to become acquainted with all the melodies. In the course of time, as oral tradition began to grow less reliable, a desire was felt to have also the amount of rise or fall fixed. Accordingly we find even at the date of our earliest MSS. the use of letters, added to the neums, to indicate to the singer how far the melody rose or fell, as we have mentioned above. These indications, however, were again merely vague and could not finally satisfy. Various efforts which space forbids us to detail here, were then made to supplement the neumatic notation. All of them, however, were destined to disappear before the introduction of a new principle, which was to distinguish the higher or lower pitch of the tones by the higher or lower position of the notations, grading the distances between the notes in strict accordance with the intervals. Attempts in this direction can be noticed even in the class of MSS. which have been considered up to this. Our example of Mets notation shows pretty clearly an endeavour on the part of the notator to reduce the notes to a common pitch. The full, systematic carrying out of this idea is found in the tenth century, first in the Lombardic notation, shortly afterwards in the Aquitanian. Illustration V, taken from an eleventh-century Versciullary and Procyry from St. Martial in Limoges ("Pal. Mus.", II, p. 80) belongs to the latter class, which is further illustrated by the notes accommodated to a pitch. The full, systematic carrying out of this idea is found in the tenth century, first in the Lombardic notation, shortly afterwards in the Aquitanian. Illustration V, taken from an eleventh-century Versciullary and Procyry from St. Martial in Limoges ("Pal. Mus.", II, p. 80) belongs to the latter class, which is further illustrated by the notes accommodated to a pitch. The full, systematic carrying out of this idea is found in the tenth century, first in the Lombardic notation, shortly afterwards in the Aquitanian. Illustration 

In the staff thus perfected the neums were written according to the forms that had been previously in use in the various localities, such modifications being introduced as were necessary in order to avoid ambiguity of the notes, notably the thickening of the head of the acutus. Illustration VI, taken from a twelfth-century Gradual of St. Evroult ("Pal. Mus.", III, p. 194), shows the process clearly. It has four dry lines drawn on the parchment, of which the one for f was coloured red, that for g green. The other two lines have the clef letters a and e.

From the thirteenth century the notes began to be written larger, so that they might be read by a number of singers at the same time. The thickening of the strokes at the exact place where notes occur also became more pronounced. Thus gradually in the Latin countries the type shown in the foregoing illustration evolved which is practically the one adopted in our modern chant books.

Illustration VII ("Pal. Mus.", III, pl. 207 B) is taken from a fourteenth-century plenary Missal belonging to Notre Dame in Paris. In the first line on the right-hand column the group a c b g has been written twice by mistake. Of interest is the disappearance of the g at the end of the final neuma, also the substitution of c for b on floreat at the end of the group on per (which word is written a little too far to the left).

Illustration VIII ("Pal. Mus.", III, pl. 146) shows the peculiar type of notation which developed in Germany and is called Hufnapelachrift (horseshoe-nail writing). The illustration is from a Gradual written at Trier in 1435. There are five black lines, but the f line was coloured red. The illustration shows clearly that a second line was drawn over the first. In the third staff we find the g clef and the red f line drawn in the space between c and g. Melodically the frequent substitutes of c for b is remarkable (Hufnapelachrift, etc.). This is a peculiarity of the German tradition.

For the rhythmic signification of the neums see the article on CLAVICERE.

The principal work on the subject is the "Puphlographia Musicula", published in quarterly issues since 1888, from the editorial board at Tournai. An exhaustive list of the earlier literature is given in the preface to the first volume. Supplemental to this are
the publications of the Plain Song and Medieval Music Society (London, since 1868). A good handbook is Wagner, Neumann's Bibliographie der Musikerportraits in den Gregorianischen Melodien (Freiburg, 1903). Also, Gregorian Melodies by the Benedictines of Stammhous (London, 1897); Fließbacher, Neumens-Studien, part I (Leipzig, 1896); part II (Leipzig, 1897); part III (Berlin, 1894); Molitor, Deutsche Choral-Vogendrucke, (Ratisbon, 1904); Thaler, Originals Briskan de la Notation Neumétique de l'Église Latine (Paris, 1907). On Byzantine notation see also Rieman. Die Byzantinische Notenschrift im 10. bis 15. Jahrhundert (Leipzig, 1899). On the Latin abbreviations of the monasteries, see Mocquereau, Le Nombre Musical Gregorien, I (Tourna, 1908).

H. BEWERRUDE.

Neumann, Johann Balthasar, b. 1867 at Eger; d. 1753 at Würzburg, master of the rocco style and one of the greatest and most productive artists of the eighteenth century; distinguished as a decorator, but more so as an architect. He came from Eger to Würzburg as a cannon founder, and served chiefly with the French army. After he had traveled to perfect himself as an architect, he followed that profession in southern Germany and on the Rhine, entering into such successful competition with the French masters of the period that de Cotte and Boffrand, who judged his plans for the episcopal palace at Würzburg, afterwards eagerly laid claim to the authorship. While in Pfedl, Bishop Frans von Schönborn, in 1719, Neumann laid the cornerstone of the palace (1720). It is ostentatious but habitable, a vast rectangle, 544 ft. by 169 ft., with five well laid out courts and three entrance gates ornamented with pilasters, columns, and balconies. The throne room with the splendid adjoining state apartments, and the court chapel, although externally remarkable, are thrown in sumptuous splendor with an enormous outlay in material and skill. The baroque style of the edifice is here replaced by the most finished decorative rocco. The details are frequently of marvellous beauty; the arrangement, notwithstanding the overcrowding, is not inharmonious, although in combination it is without the harmony and simplicity so obvious in his unrestricted power over material substances. The interior decoration for a palace built at Bruchsal for another Schönborn, Bishop of Speyer, are magnificent, though simpler. For a third Schönborn he built a castle at Coblenz which is the most interesting and inharmonious proportions and splendid arrangement. A palace in Werneck is also his work. He completed the designs for palaces in Vienna, Carlsruhe, etc. The cathedral of Speyer, destroyed by the French army, was restored by Neumann with a clever adaptation of the existing conditions. In the façade, which was later restored, Neumann is the prevailing taste in every detail. In the restoration of the west side of Main cathedral he was unsuccessful, and more so with his piecework on the cathedral of Würzburg. In addition to these restorations he built the Pilgrims' church at Vierzehnheiligen, and the collegiate church at Neresheim, both important buildings, with oval spires, vast arched windows, and exquisite porticoes, (La. Théâtre, 1894); III, Kirchen, Alg. Kunstgesch. (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, 1909).

G. GERTMANN.

Neumann, John Nepomucene, Venerable, fourth Bishop of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, U. S. A., b. at Prachatits, Bohemia, 28 March, 1811, erroneously set down as Good Friday by his biographers; d. at Philadelphia, 5 January, 1860. From childhood he evinced signs of a vocation to the priesthood, and entered the seminary of Budweis in 1831. A profound theologian, thoroughly versed not only in all branches of sacred learning but in the natural sciences as well, particularly in botany, he spoke fluently many Slavic dialects and at least eight modern languages, besides being master of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. When Bishop of Philadelphia he learned Irish to help the Irish immigrants in his diocese. Finishing his course at the University of Prague with distinction in August, 1855, he returned to Budweis, his native diocese, for ordination. While at the seminary, the letters of Father Baraga, afterwards Bishop of Marquette, Michigan, written to the Leopold Missionary Society, inspired Neumann with the desire of consecrating himself to the American missions. Accordingly, while yet a seminarian he landed in America (2 June, 1836), was adopted, and (25 June, 1836) ordained by Bishop Dubois of New York, who sent him without delay to western New York, where he laboured for four years amid incredible hardships. In 1840 he entered the Redemptorist Congregation, and was the first of its members to be professed in America, 16 January, 1842. For three years Neumann was superior of the Redemptorists at Pittsburg, where he built the church of St. Philomena and by labours especially among the German-speaking people, won the gratitude and praise of Bishop O'Connor. In 1846 he was made vice- provincial of the Redemptorists in America, and in 1852 at the suggestion of Archbishop Kenrick of Baltimore Pius IX gave Father Neumann a command under obedience to accept the Bishopric of Philadelphia, to which he was consecrated by Archbishop Kenrick at St. Alphonsus, Baltimore, 28 March, 1852. In his solicitude for his flock he visited the larger congregations of his diocese every year and the smaller ones every two years, remaining several days in the country places, preaching, hearing confessions, confirming, visiting, and anointing the sick. He once walked twenty-five miles and back to confirm one boy.

Indefatigable in the cause of education, both ecclesiastical and secular, he raised the standard of study and discipline at the Academy of St. Charles Borromeo, and founded (1859) an ecclesiastical preparatory college, to this day a credit and a blessing to the great diocese of Philadelphia. One of his first acts was to provide Catholic schools. At his consecration (1852) there were but two parochial schools in Philadelphia; at his death eight years later, their number was nearly one hundred. The boys he entrusted to the Christian Brothers, and the girls to different sisterhoods: St. Joseph, Charity, Immaculate Heart of Mary, Notre Dame of Namur and Notre Dame of Munich. These last he helped to establish firmly in the United States, and befriended in many ways. He introduced the Sisters of the Holy Cross from France to take charge of an industrial school. At the advice of Pius IX he founded the Philadelphia branch of the Sisters of St. Francis, and he was also the staunch
friend of the Colored Oblate Sisters in Baltimore, whom by his tact and charity he saved from dissolution. In five years he erected fifty churches and completed the exterior of the cathedral. Conspicuous at the first Plenary Council of Baltimore (1852), he was one of the American bishops invited by Pius IX to Rome in 1854 for the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. Noted for his devotion to the Most Blessed Sacrament, Neumann was the first American bishop to introduce the Forty Hours devotion into his diocese in 1853; he also inaugurated the practice now in vogue in Baltimore of reciting the Litany of the Blessed Virgin and the Rosary before High Mass on Sundays and Holy Days. His remains lie interred in a vault before the altar in the lower chapel of St. Peter's Redemptorist church, Philadelphia. Neumann left no published works except two catechisms of Christian Doctrine, which received the approbation of the First Plenary Council of Baltimore, a Bible history, confraternity manuals, a Latin pamphlet on the Forty Hours, and Acts of the synods held by him every two years. His pastoral letters are remarkable for their solidity, beauty, and unctuousness. On 15 December, 1896, he received the title of Venerable and the authorities of Rome have under consideration the act of beatification.


JOSEPH WISSEL.

NEUMANN, Franz, preacher, writer on theological, controversial and ascetical subjects, and author of many works in Latin and German, was born in Munich, 17 January, 1827; d. at Augsburg, 1 May, 1875. He entered the Society of Jesus 3 October, 1712, and after his studies in the Society, taught rhetoric and belles lettres for ten years. He then for two years preached on the missions, when he was made director of the celebrated Latin sodality at Munich, a post which he filled for seven years. From 1752 to 1763 he preached at the cathedral of Augsburg with extraordinary success. His controversial sermons, directed in a great part against the false teachings of the Lutherans, and in particular against the apostate monk Rothfischer, and Chladonium, were of a solidity of argument that baffled all the efforts of his adversaries. Father Neumann produced a surprising number of volumes: Latin plays for the use of his Latin sodality, which periodically staged such productions for the pleasure and edification of the literary men of Munich; sermons which he had delivered in the pulpit of Augsburg cathedral; works on asceticism, treatises on Rhetoric and Poetry, and some essays on theology in defence of the Jesuit system. Some of his Latin plays were republished in his two collections "Theatrum Asceticum" and "Theatrum Politicum," "Theatrume Asceticum, sive Meditationes Sacre in Theatro Congregationis Latinæ de B. V. Marie, ab Angelo Salutati exhibite" Monachi verno ipsojuni temporibus anno 1747," 571 pp., Innsbruck and Augsburg, 1747 (5 editions), contains dramatic renderings of such subjects as the conversion of St. Augustine, devotion to the B. V. Mary, the evil of sin, the fear of God, Divine Mercy and Love. "Theatrume Politicum sive Tragediae ad commenda-tionem Virtutis et Vitiorum detestationem," Augsburg and Innsbruck, 1760, 518 pp., contains epitaphs on the lives of Emperor, Papianus, Anastasius, Dicoros, Tobias, and Sara, etc. One amusing title which occurs is "Procursus judiciales contra fortes temporis". These plays, besides numerous others, were published also in separate booklets. On his ascetical writings probably the most famous and most valuable is the excellent little book "Ideae Theologiae Asceticae," Scientiae Sanctorum, de summa fama elegantissima work first published in Rome by Alexander Monaldi in 1839. It has gone through five editions in Latin and has been translated into various languages. The English edition bears the title: "The Science of the Spiritual Life." He wrote also several works in defence of Probabilism. Of his literary treatises the "Ideae Poetici" deals with the precepts and use of Rhetoric: "Ideae Poetici" is a similar volume on poetry and in the title he tells us the uses of the art, "Ad Ingeniorum Culturam, Animorum Oblac-tationem ac Morum Doctrinam"—ends which he had very well kept in mind in his own dramatic works. A tribute to Father Neumann on the occasion of his jubilee in religion styles him: "The Champion of Faith and Good Morals, a Follower and Rival of the great Paul, the Hammer of the Heretics, Physician of Sinners and Oracle of the Just!" His works, as enumerated in Sommervogel, number 112 books and pamphlets.


EDWARD F. GARESCHE.

NEUSUM, DIACORE (HUNG. BÉSZTERCÉBÁNTA; LAT. NEUSOLIENSIS), founded in 1776 by Maria Theresa. Cardinal Peter Paxmány had already contemplated founding four new sees in order to give the Archdiocese of Gran; one of these was Neusohl, but this project was dropped in 1636. Instead of four sees, four Jesuit colleges were established in Kassa, Neusohl, Koszy, and Szarfon. After the suppression of the Jesuit Order the project of the new diocese was again taken up. On 7 December, 1775, Maria Theresa informed the cathedral chapter of Gran that it had been decided to establish a new see, and asked the chapter to state what revenues would be assigned to it. On 11 January, 1776, the new diocese was founded by royal decision, and on 13 March, the papal decree was made public. Baron Franz Berchold was named the first bishop (1776-90), and in 1778-85 held the first canonical visitation. His efforts to meet the diocese materialy were unsuccessful, and the great fire of 1782, which destroyed the episcopal residence, had such a bad effect upon the see, that Joseph II contemplated giving it up, and planned the transfer of Berchold to the see of Gran, but the bishop opposed the plan, as well as the use of the diocese with that of Székcs and Roessnyó. The cathedral, lyceum and the four archdeaneries were founded in the time of Bishop Anton Mackay (1818-23). A diocesan synod was held at Neusohl 21 November, 1821, where the diocesan constitution was drawn up, which is valid to this day. Bishop Joseph Rudnycziuk (1841-50) was persecuted by the Austrian Government on account of his political views, and on 20 August, 1846, was arrested and sentenced to six years imprisonment, and deprived of his episcopal honours. He retracted in 1850, whereupon he was released from prison. Among the more recent bishops Arnold Tottenham was distinguished. He was appointed bishop in 1885. The present bishop is Wolfang Radnó (1885-91) since 1855 the cathedral chapter possesses its own insignia, and is composed of six members; there are also six titular canons. The diocese has a provost, 112 parishes, and 371 chapels; there are 168 priests and 49 clerics, 2 monasteries and 2 nunneries. In 1902 the Catholic population numbered in all 223,779 souls.

Das Katolische Ungarn (Catholic Hungary) (Budapest, 1901): Schematismus diocesis Neusolensis pro anno 1868.

A. ALDÁST.

NEUTRA (NITHIR; NTITTRA), DIACORE (NITRIN- SIS), in Western Hungary, a suffragan of Gran. The
exact date of its foundation is unknown. Some attribute the foundation to Fridigit, wife of Rosenmund, the Marco Polo of the Thirteenth Century, who visited Svatopuk in the Thirty-fifth year of his life, but without any more evidence than the alleged foundation by Archbishop Wolf of Lorech. Nor is the see a direct continuation of one which existed in Svatopuk's time and was suffragan of Prag-Potzeover; neither is it probable that the saintly King Stephen founded it. The see was probably founded in the time of King Colomus, but about 1185-87, although St. Ladislaus had it in contemplation, for a royal document still exists, in which he endows the church at Neutra with much property. The church, dedicated to St. Emmeram, was there in the lifetime of St. Stephen, and is supposed to have been endowed by Queen Gisela. Gervasio was the first bishop (1105-14) followed by many others, but the see was not restored to the archbishopric of Prague till 1460, when St. Ladislaus increased the revenues of the see to which the city of Neutra belonged from the middle of the thirteenth century. The cathedral chapter was in all probability established at the same time as the see; but until the seventeenth century very little is known about it. There were only nine canons in the thirteenth century, but the number was increased to ten in 1780. The see shared the fate of the country, the invasion of the Turks, the Hussites, internal quarrels, all of which wrought much mischief, especially the disastrous battle of Mohacs (1526). The see was in time deprived of its revenues which fell into the hands of the laity. Valentine Toore Bres, a wealthy citizen, bought them and had them confirmed by the Emperor Thurló, after which the latter's brother, Bishop Franz Thurló, acquired them, but later on became a Protestant. The Reformation found a foothold in Neutra, owing to the sympathy of certain noble families. Bishop Paul Bornemissos tried to restore the financial conditions of the see, but unsuccessfully; during the wars of the Empire, the city was seized by the imperial troops and only returned to Neutra in 1607. Bishop Franz Forzach was the first bishop to oppose the spread of the Reformation (1596-1607); his work was carried on by his successors, especially by the Jesuits, who since 1645 worked zealously for the re-establishment of the Catholic religion. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries religious orders settled in the diocese. The cathedral as it stands to-day was erected by Ladislaus Erdomyl (1796-36). Among the more famous bishops was August Roskoványi (1859-92), famed as a theologian and canonist. Bishop Emmerich Bende has been bishop since 1893; his coadjutor with right of succession is Count William Bathynay. The see includes an area of 471 square miles and is divided into 4 archdeaconies. There are 148 parishes, 237 priests, 194 of whom are parish priests; also 15 religious orders, numbering 145 members, of both sexes. In 1907 the Catholic population numbered 350,398. The cathedral chapter is composed of ten canons, and there are six titular canons, also 3 titular abbots.

Die Komitats und Stades Ungarn. Komitat Nyitra (Budapest, a. d.); Das Katholische Ungarn (Budapest, 1901); Schatzkammer des Hunni-archiepp. zu Pozsony; Haino, a. o. a. (Pozsony, 1770); Memoria episcoporum Nitraeensium (Pozsony, 1835). A. ALDÁSY.

NEVADA, a Western state of the United States, bounded on the North by Oregon and Idaho, on the East by Utah and Arizona, and on the South and West by California. It lies between the latitudes of 35° (in its extreme southern point) and 42° north, and between the meridians of 114° and 120° longitude. The extreme length of the state from north to south is 483 miles, while its extreme breadth from east to west is 320 miles. The total area of the state of Nevada is 110,590 square miles.

CLIMATE.—The climate of Nevada is dry, pleasant, and healthful. Summers are, as a rule, very warm, except in the high mountainous districts, while the winters are generally long and sometimes severe. In late spring and early autumn there prevails a warm, dry, north wind which has often disastrous effects, as it is generally accompanied by sand storm. The mean temperature in January is 28°, while that of summer is 71°. The average rainfall throughout the year is ten inches, and the greater part of this precipitation comes between the months from December to May.

POPULATION.—The history of the population of Nevada since 1850 presents some of the most interesting figures in the United States Census records. From the time of the early settlements in 1850-60 to the years of the great mining developments (1855-1860), the population rapidly increased from a few hundred pioneers to 60,000 people, while after 1885 (decentralization of silver) it declined until the end of the century, and from that time began to increase very rapidly. The figures showing the population of Nevada, according to U. S. Census Reports, are significant of these fluctuations: 1860, 6,857; 1870, 42,491; 1880, 62,226; 1890, 45,761; 1900, 42,335; 1910, 81,575.

MINERAL PRODUCTION.—The mineral production of Nevada consists chiefly of gold and silver. For the year 1908 the entire mineral production, consisting of gold, silver, copper, lead, and a little lead, was valued at $19,043,820, while in 1909 the gold production alone was valued at $15,908,400 and that of silver at $4,657,000, or a total production of $20,565,400 in gold and silver alone.

Agriculture and Stockraising.—The agricultural products of Nevada for 1909 were valued thus: wheat, $1,074,000; oats, $1,165,000; barley, $228,000; potatoes, $459,000; hay, $5,187,000. From these figures it can be seen that the production of hay is an important one, being greater in 1909 than the entire production of silver. In stock raising the most important industry is that of sheep. In 1909 the entire number of sheep in the state was 1,635,000 and the total number of wool produced was 21,740,972 lbs. Cattle raising is also an important industry.

Histori.—The first European to visit what is now the State of Nevada, was, in all probability, the Franciscan Friar Francisco Gárces. Father Gárces started from Sonora, in northern Mexico, with Colonel Anza for California in 1775. In this famous journey, Gárces stopped at the junction of the Gila and Colorado Rivers, in order to explore the surrounding country and establish a mission. No settlements were made or mission founded, but from the account of Father Gárces' journey as given by Father Pedro Font, who accompanied Gárces and wrote a fairly complete history of their travels, it seems practically certain that they visited Nevada, which was then, and in fact until 1850-60, a nameless desert. The next to visit Nevada were also Franciscan missionaries. These were Fr. Atanasio Domínguez and Fr. Silvestre Velez de Escalante, who on their journey to Monterey, California, turned to the East, crossed the Colorado River at the 37° parallel, crossed the extreme southern part of what is now Nevada, and proceeded to explore Utah. These friars also merely explored these regions and no settlements were made nor missions established. After these visits of the Franciscans it is very probable that the military expeditions
from New Mexico from time to time reached the Colorado River near Nevada, but we have no record of any expedition having actually crossed over into the territory in question. In 1825, however, Peter Skeen Ogden, an American trapper from the Columbia River in the North-West, accompanied by a few men started to explore the country to the south-east and reached the river now known as the Humboldt River, in the present State of Nevada, which was in 1825 a nameless country, lying between California (which was then an indefinite stretch of country north of southern California) and New Mexico, which included in 1825, Arizona and parts of Utah and Colorado. All the above territories, with unsettled boundaries on the north and east, belonged to Mexico until the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848, and the Mexican War, when they were ceded to the United States. Long before these events, however, Utah and Nevada were settled by Americans and even provisional government established. After the explorations of Ogden and his companions, American adventurers, mostly trappers, went to Utah and Nevada, among whom was Kit Carson (then living in Taos, New Mexico), who in company with many others visited the country in 1831, 1833, 1844, 1845. In 1843-44, Fremont with Carson and Godey, conducted various explorations, largely hunting expeditions, into Nevada, and in 1844-45, Eliza Stevens, with a small party, among whom were two women, passed through Nevada on his journey from California. Fremont's expedition was the first caravan to traverse all this stretch of territory. After the Mexican cession of 1848 and the discovery of gold in California, Nevada was frequently traversed by the gold seekers and other western pioneers on their way to California. Shortly after the signing of the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the Mormon settlements were formed in the valleys of Salt Lake, established the State of Deseret, a commonwealth which was to include what is now Utah, Nevada, Arizona, parts of Colorado, Wyoming, Oregon, and California. These Mormons found it profitable business to meet the travellers on their way to California and furnish them provisions. In these trading expeditions they advanced south and west from Salt Lake City, and in 1849, they founded the first settlement in what is now Nevada near the Carson River. In 1850, Congress organized the territories of Utah (what is now Utah and Nevada), New Mexico (what is now New Mexico and Arizona), and the State of California. The territory now comprising the State of Nevada was formed into the Territory of Nevada, under the political control, therefore, of the Mormons. Congress had fixed the western boundary of the Territory of Utah as the Sierra Nevada. The fact that the Sierra Nevada was continually kept in mind as the barrier between Utah and California, may have given an occasion to call the adjacent territory east of Nevada, Nevada, though the name does not come into prominence until 1860. By 1856, the mines were being strongly developed and American immigration was rapidly settling Carson County. A political conflict between the Mormons and the Gentiles for the control of the governmental affairs of Carson County (which included practically all of what is now Nevada) lasted for several years. In 1865 the citizens of this county, mostly gentiles, petitioned the Government of the United States to be annexed to California or be organized as a separate territory. The Government gave little heed to these demands, and for five years the political struggle raged fiercely between the two factions. Congress at last allowed the citizens of Nevada to organize a state government, and in 1861 Nevada County, Utah, was organized as the Territory of Nevada. James W. Nye was appointed as the first territorial governor. Three years later a constitutional convention was held, a State constitution adopted, and in 1864 Nevada was admitted as a State, and H. G. Blaisdel was elected the first governor. During the years 1865-85, the material developments in Nevada made rapid strides, though continually hampered by a heavy debt contracted since the early days of territorial legislatures.

**Government.**—Nevada was a part of the Territory of Utah from 1850 to 1861, a separate territory from 1861 to 1864, and organized as a State in 1864. The State constitution when first adopted secured various privileges to mining interests. While at first this seemed to be an incentive to the development of the rising mining industries, it soon proved to be unfair to the commonwealth at large. A long series of litigations, costly to both sides, ensued between the State and the mine owners, in view of the amendments to the constitution and the series of developments of the American War, when they were ceded to the United States. Long before these events, however, Utah and Nevada were settled by Americans and even provisional government established. After the explorations of Ogden and his companions, American adventurers, mostly trappers, went to Utah and Nevada, among whom was Kit Carson (then living in Taos, New Mexico), who in company with many others visited the country in 1831, 1833, 1844, 1845. In 1843-44, Fremont with Carson and Godey, conducted various explorations, largely hunting expeditions, into Nevada, and in 1844-45, Eliza Stevens, with a small party, among whom were two women, passed through Nevada on his journey from California. Fremont's expedition was the first caravan to traverse all this stretch of territory. After the Mexican cession of 1848 and the discovery of gold in California, Nevada was frequently traversed by the gold seekers and other western pioneers on their way to California. Shortly after the signing of the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the Mormon settlements were formed in the valleys of Salt Lake, established the State of Deseret, a commonwealth which was to include what is now Utah, Nevada, Arizona, parts of Colorado, Wyoming, Oregon, and California. These Mormons found it profitable business to meet the travellers on their way to California and furnish them provisions. In these trading expeditions they advanced south and west from Salt Lake City, and in 1849, they founded the first settlement in what is now Nevada near the Carson River. In 1850, Congress organized the territories of Utah (what is now Utah and Nevada), New Mexico (what is now New Mexico and Arizona), and the State of California. The territory now comprising the State of Nevada was formed into the Territory of Nevada, under the political control, therefore, of the Mormons. Congress had fixed the western boundary of the Territory of Utah as the Sierra Nevada. The fact that the Sierra Nevada was continually kept in mind as the barrier between Utah and California, may have given an occasion to call the adjacent territory east of Nevada, Nevada, though the name does not come into prominence until 1860. By 1856, the mines were being strongly developed and American immigration was rapidly settling Carson County. A political conflict between the Mormons and the Gentiles for the control of the governmental affairs of Carson County (which included practically all of what is now Nevada) lasted for several years. In 1865 the citizens of this county, mostly gentiles, petitioned the Government of the United States to be annexed to California or be organized as a separate territory. The Government gave little heed to these demands, and for five years the political struggle raged fiercely between the two factions. Congress at last allowed the citizens of Nevada to organize a state government, and in 1861 Nevada County, Utah, was organized as the Territory of Nevada. James W. Nye was appointed as the first territorial governor. Three years later a constitutional convention was held, a State constitution adopted, and in 1864 Nevada was admitted as a State, and
to the West of the same meridian, belong ecclesiastically to the Diocese of Salt Lake, Province of San Francisco, while the territory west of the 117th meridian, with the exception of Austin and the country bordering on the Reese River, belong to the Diocese of Sacramento, of the same province. According to the Bureau of the Census of the United States (Bulletin No. 105, Religious Bodies, 1906) the Catholic population of Nevada was then 9,970, or 66% of the entire religious population of the State. The following are the principal denominations of the State and the church members in each: Catholics 9,970, or 66% of the total; Episcopalian 1,210, or 8%; Latter Day Saints 11,455, or 74% (Jews 3,306, or 4%); Presbyterians 520, or 3 1/4%; Baptists 316, or 2%.

Catholic Immigration.—Catholics have gone to Nevada at different times, along with the general influx of population into the Western States from the Middle States in 1845-75. Since the very beginning of the history of the State, the Catholic Church has been an important factor in the upbuilding of the commonwealth and the welfare and education of the people. The difficulties encountered were not easy to overcome in the midst of an unsettled, careless, and often lawless community in the years 1850-70. After the establishment of the first Catholic churches in the new country by Fathers Gallagher, Monteverde, and Murray, and the Monongahela Fathers in 1843, a Catholic mission was established in 1853 in Nevada. In 1864, the Nevada orphan asylum, two Catholic schools, St. Mary's school for girls and St. Vincent's school for boys, and St. Mary's hospital, all under the care of Sisters.

Religious Polity.—The State constitution guarantees to all individuals absolute freedom of worship and tolerance of religious sentiment. By statutory law, all amusements, business transactions, opening of saloons and gambling, are forbidden on Sundays, but the law has never been rigidly enforced. There is no law demanding a compulsory administration of a fixed form of oath, and a simple affirmation or negation suffices before the law. There are no statutory laws or regulations that prohibit blasphemy or profanity. It is customary to open the Legislature, the school year at the State University and many of the public schools with prayer, but there are no laws either for or against such practices. By statutory law, however, religious instruction of any kind is absolutely forbidden in the public schools, and the public school funds cannot be used for sectarian purposes. Sunday, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Thanksgiving, and Christmas are designated by law as non-judicial days and are observed as legal holidays. There is no law recognizing religious holidays as such. No statutory law exists as regards the seal of confession, but it is presumed that there is the same inviolability. Church or public church property that is used only for church purposes is by law exempt from taxation, and malicious injury to churches or church property is by law punishable by fine or even imprisonment. The lawfully licensed clergy of all denominations is exempt from jury and military service. Marriages by any licensed minister, or a civil judge. With the consent of the parents marriage may be contracted by a man and woman of the ages of eighteen and sixteen respectively, and without the parents' consent only at the ages of twenty-one and eighteen or over respectively. The parties contracting marriage must not be near kin than second cousins, or cousins in the second blood. The divorce laws of the State are very liberal. By the State law, divorces may be granted for impotency, adultery, desertion, infamy, cruelty, drunkenness, or neglect to provide.

Banking, History of Nevada, Colorado and Wyoming (San Francisco, 1890); Biennial Reports of the Nevada Legislative Council, Public Instruction of Nevada (Carson City, 1900); Bureau of the Census of the United States: Bulletin No. 105, Religious Bodies (Washington, 1906); Cutten, Compiled Laws of the State of Nevada, 1881-1900 (Carson City, 1900); Catholic Directory (Milwaukee and New York, 1910); History of Nevada (Oakland, 1881); International Year Book (New York, 1900); Report of the United States Commissioner of Education (Washington, 1908, 1909); University of Nevada, Register for 1899-1900 (Carson City, 1910).

AURELIO M. ESPINOSA.

Neve, titular see of Arabia, suffragan of Bostra.

Two of its bishops are known: Petronius, who attended the Council of Ephesus in 431, and Jobius, who was present at that of Chalcedon in 451. Isaac, a third bishop, mentioned by Le Quen about 540 ("Oriens christ."); II, 864) was not a bishop of Neve but of Nineve, and lived at the end of the seventh century. Of "Echos d'Orient", IV, 145, Neve is noticed in the "Nothitia episcopatum" of Antioch in the sixth century ("Echos d'Orient", X, 145), and the city of Neve is referred to by George of Cyprus ("Descriptio orbis romanis", ed. Gelzer, 54) in the next century. The "Revue biblique" published (III, 625) some Greek inscriptions from the locality. The Museum of the Bibliothèque Nationale in the Palais de l'Institut, now occupies the site of this former see and the tower of the ancient Christian church is still visible. Neve must not be confounded with Mount Nebo, situated about 94 miles south of the town.

S. VAILLÉ.

Nève, Félix-Jean-Baptiste-Joseph, orientalist and philologist, b. at Ath, Belgium, 13 June, 1816; d. at Louvain, 23 May, 1889. His parents were devout Catholics. Graduated with distinction from the Catholic college of Lille, Nève completed a course of academic studies at the University of Louvain, obtaining in 1838 the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy and Letters. His pronounced taste for classical and oriental languages led him to pursue higher studies under the tuition of the most distinguished scholars of his age. Professors Lassen of Bonn, Tierisch of Munich, and Burnouf of Paris. He became acquainted with many oriental scholars, some of them already famous, others destined like himself to win fame in after years. Among these were Muir, Wilson, A. Weber, Kuhn, Max Müller, and the distinguished orientalist and Catholic priest, Dr. W. H. Goetze. In 1841 Nève was appointed to the chair of Greek and Latin Literature in the University of Louvain, and while teaching the classics, gave a course of studies in the Sanskrit language and literature. This work he kept up with unsparing energy and marked success for thirty-six years, at the same time making known the results of his studies in books and in articles contributed to the "Journal Asiatique", "Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne"). "Correspondant", and other periodicals. When in 1877 he was released from his arduous duties with the title of professor emeritus, his industry continued unabated, and for the next fifteen years a series of publications came from his pen. He was a member of the Asiatic Society of Paris, the Asiatic Society of London, the Royal Academy of Belgium, and was a Knight of the Order of Leopold.

To Nève belongs the honour of giving the first impulse to the cultivation of Sanskrit studies in Belgium. The most important of his numerous publications in this field are: "Études sur les hymnes du Rig-Veda, avec un choix d'hymnes traduits pour le premier fois en français" (Louvain, 1842); (2) his fine study of the ancient Brahmin cult of the Ribhanas, "Études sur les hymnes du Rig-Veda, avec un choix d'hymnes traduits pour le premier fois en français." (Louvain, 1842); (3) his fine study of the ancient Brahmin cult of the Ribhanas, "Étud...
addressés a ces divinités" (Paris, 1847); (3) his translation of the Indian drama based on the story of the epic hero Rama, "Le dénouement de l'histoire de Rama. Outtara-Rama-Charita, drame de Bhavabhouti, traduit du sanskrit" (Brussels, 1880); (4) his collection of essays on the Vedanta philosophy and the epic and dramatic poetry of India, published under the title "Époques littéraires de l'Inde" (Brussels, 1883).

Nève was also learned in the Armenian language and literature. A number of valuable translations and studies based on Armenian texts came from his pen. Among these may be mentioned: (1) the Armenian story of the Tatar invasion, "Exposé des guerres de Tamerlan et de Schah-Rokh dans l'Asie occidentale, d'après le chronique arménienne inédite de Thomas de Medzoph", published in "Mémoires de l'Académie Royale de Belgique" (1861); (2) the Armenian account of the exploits of Godfrey de Bouillon, "Les chevs belges de la première croisade d'après les historiens arméniens" (Brussels, 1859); (3) the valuable collection of studies on early Christian Armenian prayers and hymns entitled "L'Arménie chrétienne et sa littérature" (Louvain, 1888). Among the publication of Nève bearing on philosophy, a place of honour should be given to his account of the learned men who in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries laboured for the upbuilding of the University of Louvain, "La renaissance des lettres et l'essor de l'érudition ancienne en Belgique" (Louvain, 1893); LEFEVRE, Née en Annuaire de l'Université de Louvain (1894); WILLEM, Née in suppl. of Journal de Bruxelles (Aug., 1892).

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

NEVERS, DIocese of (NIVERNEM), includes the Department of Nièvre, in France. Suppressed by the Concordat of 1801 and united to the See of Autun, it was re-established in 1823 as suffragan of Sens and took over a part of the former Diocese of Autun and a part of the former Diocese of Auxerre (see SENS). The "Gallia Christiana" mentions as first Bishop of Nevers St. Eligius, restored to health in the reign of Clovis by St. Severinus, Abbot of St. Maurice. According to Duchesne the first authentic bishop is Tauricanus, promoted by St. Odovaces in 517. A number of former bishops of Nevers are venerated as saints: St. Arey (Ariqius) 549–52; St. Agriculta (580–94); St. Jerome (800–10) who rebuilt in honour of the martyrs Quiricus and Julitta, the cathedral until then dedicated to Sts. Gervaisius and Protasius. It is possible that in the seventh century three other saints occupied the See of Nevers: St. Dit (Dedatus), the same person who died a hermit in the Vosges; St. Nectarius and St. Itier (Itherius). The following bishops of Nevers were notable: the future cardinal Pierre I Bertrandi (1320–22) who, in 1329–30, defended ecclesiastical immunities against the barons in the celebrated conferences of Paris and Vincennes presided over by Philip VI; Charles de Bourbon (1540–47) subsequently cardinal and whom the Leaguers wished to make King of France under the name of Charles X; Spifame (1548–58) who became a Calvinist in 1559, and was afterwards accused of forgery and beheaded at Geneva in 1556; the polemist Sorbin de Ste-Foi (1578–1600) a voluminous writer. Among the saints of this diocese must be mentioned: St. Ambrose, priest; Pérux and Pérélion, martyrs between 272 and 303; St. Paroże (Patrinus), Abbot of Nevers in the sixth century; the hermit St. Franchy (Francoacius); the priest St. Vincent of Magny in the ninth century; Blessed Nicholas Apollaine, canon of the collegiate church of Prémery (fifteenth century) whose cassock Louis XI claimed as a relic. Claude Seuchet, constitutional Bishop of Calvados during the Revolution, was a native of the diocese.

In 1168, William IV, Count of Nevers, willed to the Bishop of Bethlehem in Palestine the small town of Pantenon near Clamecy, also the hospital at Clamecy founded by his father William III in 1147. In 1223, owing to the incursions of the Musulmans in Palestine, the Bishop of Bethlehem settled at Clamecy, and received jurisdiction over the hospital and the faubourg of Pantenon; his successors were chosen by the counts, later by the dukes of Nevers, with the approval of the pope and the king. In 1413 Charles VI tried to obtain for the titular bishops of Bethlehem the privileges enjoyed by the other bishops of the realm, but the French clergy were opposed to this and the titular of Bethlehem was always considered a bishop in partibus infidelium. The assembly of the clergy of France in 1635 granted the bishops of Bethlehem an annual pension. Christopher Aubry, founder of the Missionary Priests of the Congregation of the Blessed Sacrament and celebrated for his sermons to the galleys-slaves of Marseilles was Bishop of Bethlehem 1651–63. The Abbey of La Charité-sur-Loire, founded in 1056, and known as the "eldest daughter" of Cluny, was inaugurated in 1106 by Pascal II; the celebrated Suger, then a simple cleric, left an account of the ceremony. The Benedictine Abbey of Corbigny, founded under Charlemagne was occupied by the Huguenots in 1563, as a basis of operations. Bernadette Soubrère (see LORDES, NOTRE-DAME DE) died in the Visitation Convent of Nevers, 12 December, 1875. The chief places of pilgrimage in the diocese are: Notre Dame du Port, in the district of d'Heuille, dating from the fourteenth century; Notre Dame de Fauboulvin at Corancy, dating from 1590; Notre Dame du Morvan at Dun-sur-Grand Ry, dating from 1876. Prior to the enforcement of the law of 1901, the Diocese of Nevers counted Marists, Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Oratorians, and several orders of teaching brothers. A special section for women which originated in the diocese must be mentioned: the Ursuline nuns, a teaching order founded in 1622 at Nevers by the Duke of Gonzaga and the Nevers aldermen; the Hospitalers, founded in 1639 at La Charité-sur-Loire by Sister Méard-Varet; the great congregation of Sisters of Charity and Christian Instruction, founded in 1850, mother-house at Nevers. At the beginning of the
twenty-first century the religious congregations of the diocese had charge of 22 day nurseries, 5 orphanages for girls, 2 sewing rooms, 18 hospitals or asylums, 1 large retreat house, and 1 large palace. The abbey, 2 religious houses for the care of the sick in their own homes. In 1908 the Diocese of Nevers had 313,972 inhabitants, 95 parishes, and 272 successor parishes.

Gilles Christian, XII, sous (1770), 525-65; Instrumentum, 297-358; Duchesne, Fasces Episcopi, II, 475; Filoux, France pontificale, Nevers (Paris, 1866); Poumberneu, Histoire des comptes et des ducs de Nevers (Paris, 1897); de la Peltrie, Monument aux morts d'Abbaye (Paris, 1852); CHNOYER, Hagiologie Nivernoise (Nevers, 1858); Obsc. Monographie de la cathedrale de Nevers, suivie de l'histoire des évêques de Nevers (Paris, 1854).

GEORGE GOYAU.

Neville, EDMUND (alias Sales), a Jesuit, b. at Hopeut, Lancashire, 1605; d. in England, 18 July, 1647. Educated at St. Omer, he entered the English College, Rome, 20 June, 1621, where he distinguished himself in philosophy. He joined the Jesuits, 24 May, 1626; was stationed at Ghent, 1636, and sent on the London mission, 1637. He was professed, 3 August, 1640; served in the Oxford district, 1642, and in South Wales, 1645. Being a suspected priest he was seized under the Commonwealth but succeeded in escaping to the "Palm of Charity and Fortitude" (St. Omer, 1630), an account of the Japanese persecutions; a "Life of St. Augustine" and "Second Thoughts" both unprinted. (2) His uncle EDMUND NEVILLE (alias Elijah NELSON), probably the son of Sir John Neville of Liversedge, b. in Yorkshire about 1563; d. 1643, his death hastened by the treatment at the hands of the Roundhead agent. Ordained for the English mission, 12 April, 1608, he entered the Society, 1609. He is considered to have been the de jure seventh Earl of Northumberland. (3) Many members of the Scarsbrick family of Scarsbrick Hall, near Ormskirk, became Jesuits during the penal times and assumed the alias "Neville". Among them were Edward SCARBRICK (Neville), b. at Scarsbrick, Lancashire, 27 April, 1616; d. at St. Omer, 10 July, 1675. He entered the Society at Watten, 7 September, 1660, and was stationed at Liége, 1671, and St. Omer, 1675. Sent to England, he was one of Oate's intended victims. James II appointed him royal chaplain. He was instructor of the Jesuit tertiates at the Warren, 1662. He returned to Lancashire where he died 19 Feb., 1670-9. He wrote "Life of Lady Warner" (St. Omer, 1691); "Catholic Loyalty" (London, 1688); "Rules and Instructions for the Sodality of the Immaculate Conception", etc.

(4) EDWARD NEVILLE (Scarbrick), b. 1663; d. 15 November, 1735. He became a Jesuit, 1682; served on the London mission, 1701, and after 1729 at Bushey Hall, Waltham, Essex. (5) EDWARD NEVILLE (Scarbrick), b. 1698; d. 7 July, 1778. He entered the Society, 7 September, 1728. Superior of the Derbyshire mission in 1764, he laboured also in Lancashire. (6) SIR EDWARD NEVILLE, son of Baron Bergavenny, a courtier of Henry VIII, took part in the war in France, and was made the king's standard bearer, 1531. He married Elizabeth, daughter of Lord Windsor. Arrested 3 November, 1538, on the charge of conspiracy with the brother of Cardinal Pole, he was sent to the Tower, tried at Westminster, and beheaded for the faith, 5 December.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

New Abbey.—The Abbey of Sweetheart, named New Abbey Pow, or New Abbey, in order to distinguish it from Dundrennan in the same county, is situated near the River Pow, in the parish of Loch Ken-droch, Kirkcudbrightshire, Diocese of Galloway, about eight miles from the town of Dumfries, Scot-

land. The title of Abbey of Sweetheart was given by the foundress of the abbey, Lady Devorgilla, daughter of Alwyn, Lord of Galloway, in 1204. The monastery in order to keep in it a casket of ivory and silver, in which was emblemated the heart of her husband, King John de Baliol. Sweetheart is the last in order of the Cistercian abbeys in Scotland. It was begun in 1275, being a daughter of Dundrennan, of the lineage of Clairvaux. Henry, the first abbot, built a magnificent church therein, in English style; it measured 203 feet in length, with a central tower 22 feet high; it had a nave with aisles, transepts with chapels on their eastern sides, and a choir without aisles. The monastic buildings were in proportion, and were surrounded with a massive granite enclosing wall, from eight to ten feet high, large portions of which still remain. "The history of Sweetheart, except that the Maxwells, lords of Kinkoon, whose castle was near by, and who were descendants of the Maxwell kings, were great benefactors of the place. The most celebrated superior of the abbey was Abbot Gilbert Broun, the last of the line. He continued to uphold the Catholic faith long after the Reformation, being the eloquent opponent of Protestantism. He was denounced several times on the charge of enticing to "papistry" from 1578 to 1605; he was seized by his enemies in 1605 in spite of the resistance of the whole countryside, taken prisoner, and conveyed to Edinburgh, whence he was banished. He then became rector of Borthwick College, Paris, where he died in the age of eighty-four. The possessions of Sweetheart Abbey passed into the hands of Sir John Spottiswoode in 1624, and with them the title of Lord of New Abbey. The monastery soon became a mere quarry for those who wanted ready-cut material for building. The chapter, with the remains of the library over it, and a part of the church were inclosed in 1527. HENRIQUEZ, Menologium Cisterciense (Antwerp, 1630); JONGERUS, Notitia Abbatiarum Ord. Cistercensium (Cologne, 1640); LIEUWES, Origines Cisterciensium Tomus I (Venetiis, 1677); BARRETT, The Scottish Cistercians (Edinburgh); REGIA, S. M. de Newbottle: A Statistical Account of Scotland.

EDMUND M. OBRECHT.
olics at Mount Hope, Macopin, Basking Ridge, Tren-
ton, Ringwood, and other places. The settlement at 
Macopin (now Echo Lake) was made by some German
Catholics sometime before the Revolution and their
descendants make up the parish to-day.

During the Revolution Father Francis' army brought
many Catholics through the State. In the camp at
Morristown the Spanish agent Don Juan de Miralles,
died 28 April, 1780, and his funeral was conducted by
Father Seraphin Bandol, chaplain of the French Minis-
ter, who came specially from Philadelphia to adminis-
ter the last sacraments to the dying Spaniard. Wash-
ington and the other officers of the army attended the
ceremony. When in the following May the remains
were removed to Philadelphia, Congress attended the
Requiem Mass in St. Mary's church. It was at Mor-
rrstown in 1780, that the first official recognition of St.
Patrick's Day is to be found in Washington's order
book, still preserved there at his headquarters. Mar-
bois, writing from Philadelphia, 25 March, 1785, gives
the number of Catholics in New York and New Jersey
as 1700; more than half of these were probably in
New Jersey. There were many French refugees from
the West Indies in Princeton, Elizabeth, and its vicin-
ity, and Fathers Vianney, Tissotarr, and Malou used
to minister to them from St. Peter's, New York, in the
early part of the century. Filled churches, and conser-
vatories, and other industries started in various sec-
tions of the State, brought Catholic immigrants. The
Auguistinian Missionary, Father Philip Larisy, vis-
ited Paterson about 1821, and the first parish in the
State, St. Francis, Trenton, was established in 1814.
Newark's first church, St. John's, was opened in 1823,
the second in 1828. In 1830, Bishop Matthew H. Mull
er erected the first church in Paterson. In New Bruns-
wick the first Mass was said by Rev. Dr. Power of New
York in 1825, and the first church was opened by Rev.
Joseph A. Schneller, 19 December, 1831. In Jersey
City, originally called Paulus Hook, Mass was first
said in 1830, and the first church opened by the Rever-
end Robert Handley, Bishop Muller's successor in 1833,
was the wooden church of the German Congregati-
on of German Catholics before mentioned had a
church as early as 1829. Thus during the first
half of the nineteenth century there was a slow but
steady growth of the Faith all over the State, and as it
was receiving a substantial share of the great inflow
of Catholic immigrants, the Holy See deemed the time
opportunity to separate it from the Diocese of New York,
and the See of Newark was erected. The Reverend
James Roosevelt Bayley (q. v.), then secretary to
Bishop Hughes of New York, was chosen the first
Bishop of Newark, and consecrated 30 October, 1853.
There were then between fifty and sixty thousand
Catholics in his diocese, for the most part Irish and
German.

In organizing the new diocese Bishop Bayley found
he could count on only twenty-five priests. There
were no diocesan institutions except small orphanages,
and the people were poor and of little social influence.
In the interest of Catholic education, one of his chief
concerns, he founded the Madison Congregation of
the Sisters of Charity (q. v.), and to supply the lack of
funds for the work of new churches, he obtained
assistance from the Association of the Propagation
of the Faith of Lyons, France, and the Leopoldine
Society of Vienna. Seton Hall College was opened
by him in September, 1866, and everywhere the dio-
cesan responded to the energy of his zeal and practical
effort. In the year 1867, 97 priests to 63, and a monastery of Benedictines and
another of Passionists was established. The Sisters
of Charity became a community of 87 members, con-
ducting 17 different establishments. Other notable
additions were 2 convents of Benedictine nuns, 2 of
German Sisters of Notre Dame; 2 of Sisters of the
Loreto, and 1 of St. Francis Xavier's. The Academy
for young ladies, a boarding school for boys, and par-
ish schools attached to most of the churches, while the
old wooden chapels had been replaced by buildings of
brick and stone. "All this has been done," the bishop
wrote, "in the midst of a population of emigrants,
comparatively poor, without incurring a great debt!".
In twelve years the Association of the Propagation
of the Faith gave the diocese $26,600. This progress,
too, was made in spite of much local narrowness and
bigotry, the culmination of which on 5 November,
1854, resulted in a riot during which an anti-Catholic
mob desecrated and sacked the little German church
of St. Mary in Newark served by the Benedictine
Father Nicholas Balleis. In this disturbance a Cath-
olic was killed and several others wounded.

Bishop Bayley was promoted to the Archdiocese
of Baltimore, 30 July, 1872, and his successor as
second bishop of the see was the Right Reverend
Michael Augustine Corrigan (q. v.) consecrated 4
May, 1873. He successfully overcame a number of
problems, problems, which demanded the attention of
a House of the Good Shepherd for girls 24 May, 1875,
in Newark, a protectory for boys about the same time
at Denville, and in June, 1880, in Newark a community
of Dominican Nuns of the Perpetual Adoration, from
Ouilly, France. On 8 and 9 May, 1878, an import-
ant synod was held, and in July, 1881, the Diocese of
Newark, which clove the portion of the Newark
territory in the southern section, was estab-
lished. On 1 October, 1880, Bishop Corrigan was
made titular Archbishop of Petra and coadjutor of
New York, and to succeed him as third Bishop of
Newark, the Rev. Dr. Winand M. Wigger, then pastor
at Madison, was chosen and consecrated 18 October
1881. Bishop Wigger was born of German parents in
New York City, 9 December, 1841, and made his
classical studies at St. Francis Xavier's College, New
York. His theological course was followed at Seton
Hall and at the college of Brignole-Sale, Genoa, Italy,
where he was ordained priest 10 June, 1865. Follow-
ing the example of his predecessors Bishop Wigger
organized the diocesan schools and undertook the chief solicitude. In 1883 he removed the Catholic
Protectory to Arlington and established the Sacred
Heart Union to aid in its maintenance. The Fifth
Diocesan Synod was held by him 17 November, 1886,
at which strict regulations were enacted in regard to
funerals and the attendance at parochial and public
schools. On 11 June, 1899, he laid the corner stone
of a new cathedral church at Newark, and soon after
was forced to go abroad in search of rest and health.
On his return he took up his duties with zeal, but died
of pneumonia, 5 January, 1901. The record of his
administration shows a character entirely disinterested
and unselfish united to a poverty truly apostolic.
Bishop Edward V. O'Hare, the Vicar-General and
successor of J. O'Hara, was elected the choice of
the Holy See as fourth bishop, and was consecrated
25 July, 1901. Born at Newark, 11 June, 1855, he
made his college course at Seton Hall. In 1873 he
was sent to the American College at Rome where he
spent four years. After another year at Louvain he was
ordained priest 22 December, 1877, and on his return
to Newark, was appointed rector of Seton Hall College
where he became Director of the Seminary in which
he remained for the following eighteen years. He was
then named vicar-general and on 30 October, 1895, rector of St. Joseph's. Early in his adminis-
tration he adopted measures for the completion of
the new cathedral of the Sacred Heart, begun by Bishop
Wigger, making with the latter the jubilee of the diocese.
At this it was shown that in
the brief space of fifty years, there had been an increase of tenfold in the number of churches and ninefold in the number of priests, with 10,000 Catholic children attending 167 Catholic schools and institutions, and 396 priests attending the 416 churches and chapels throughout the State. Religious communities now represented in the diocese are: men: the Jesuits, Passionists, Benedictines, Carmelites, Dominicans, Franciscans, Salesians, Pious Society of the Missions, the Christian Brothers, Alveriors, and Xaverians; women: Sisters of Charity (Newark), Sisters of St. Benedict, Sisters of Christian Charity, Sisters of St. Francis, Sisters of Charity (Gray Nuns), Dominican Sisters of the Perpetual Rosary, Sisters of St. Dominic, Sisters of St. Francis, Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, Sisters of the Good Shepherd, Sisters of St. Joseph, Daughters of St. Paul, Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace, Little Sisters of the Poor, Felician Sisters, Sisters of the Sorrowful Mother, Pallotine Sisters of Charity, Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart, Daughters of Our Lady of Help, Franciscan Sisters of the Immaculate Conception, Baptistine Sisters.

Societies (1910): Priests, 368 (regulars, 88); churches with resident priests, 192; missions with churches, 36; stations, 10; chapels, 82; seminary, 1, students, 42; students in Europe, 7; seminaries of religious, 3, students, 31; colleges and academies for boys, 6; academies for girls, 12; parish schools, 116, pupils, 52,600; orphan asylums, 12, inmates, 2,400; industrial and charitable institutions, 1, boys, 1, inmates, 180; young people under Catholic care, 56,000; hospitals, 10; houses for aged poor, 2; other charitable institutions, 8; Catholic population, 385,000.

New Brunswick. See CHATHAM, Diocese of; SAINT JOHN, Diocese of.

New Caledonia, Vicariate Apostolic of.—New Caledonia, one of the largest islands of Oceania, lies about 900 miles east of Queensland, Australia, between 20° 10' and 22° 16' S. lat., and between 164° and 167° E. long. It is about 250 miles long by 30 broad, and has an area of 7650 square miles. It is a French colony, its principal dependencies being the Isle of Pines and Loyalty Islands (including Lifou, Mare, and Uvea). Its population, together with that of these dependencies, is estimated at 33,000 inhabitants (15,000 free; 11,100 of convict origin); 29,000 of the inhabitants of New Caledonia are deeply indented, and the island is almost entirely surrounded by an immense madreporic reef, which now retires to some distance from and now approaches close to the shore, but regularly leaves a broad channel of water between itself and the island. This species of canal, in which the sea is always calm, greatly facilitates communication with the various settlements on the coast. The island is very mountainous, and about one half of its area is thus uncultivable. The so-called central chain, which divides the island into an eastern and a western section, attains the height of over 5500 feet. The hills which fringe the coast, and at times rise sheer from the water, do not in general exceed 1000 feet. The bays, however, between these lesser ranges stretch good-sized plains of great fertility, admirably watered by numerous streams which the natives skillfully utilize for purposes of irrigation. The streams of the same basin usually unite to form one river which is navigable for vessels of light draught for about a dozen miles from the coast. Unlike most intertropical regions, the island has no well-defined wet season, some years being very rainy and others characterized by prolonged droughts. The scenery is wonderfully beautiful and for salubrity of climate is almost unrivaled. The temperature rarely reaches the extremes of 96° by day during the hot season (December to March) and 36° by night during the cold months. May and July are the intermediate months. The population has divided the island into three sections: the convict settlement, that reserved exclusively for the natives, and the remainder which is leased to colonists by the French Government. The chief agricultural products are coffee, maize, sugar, grapes, and pineapples, while efforts are being made at present to foster the cultivation of wheat. The island yields also valuable deposits of nickel, cobalt, chrome, and copper ores, all of which are being exploited chiefly by Australian miners. Discovered by Captain Cook in 1774, the island was occupied by the French in 1853, and on 2 Sept. 1863, a decree was passed authorizing the establishment of a convict settlement there. In May, 1864, the first convicts arrived, and between that date and 1896, an aggregate of about 22,000 were transported thither. As no convicts have been sent since 1896, the convict element of the population is rapidly diminishing. Nouméa is the chief town and the seat of government. It has an excellent harbour for the improvement of which a large sum of state money has been expended. The colony is administered by a governor, assisted by a council consisting of various officials and two notables nominated by the governor. There is also an elective general council.
The ethnology of the natives, whose number is gradually decreasing, is somewhat uncertain, but they probably spring from a mixed Melanesian and Western Polynesian stock. Their height is above that of the average South Sea Islander; they are as a rule well built and quite erect; their colour varies from a very dark brown to a light complexion, and their hair is coarse and woolly. Cannibalism, which was generally practised, and occurred at all events in the south, appears in consequence of the strict measures taken by the administration. Although the men of the same tribe live together in the greatest harmony (such being in fact a leading dictate of their religious belief) intertribal wars have been always frequent, and have been in the past almost the sole occasion of cannibalism. The mode of death is usually as exciting as the most intelligible of their numerous and in very many cases peculiar taboos. The native religion is so closely intertwined with superstitions that distinction is rather difficult. The natives undoubtedly have a firm belief in a future life; the dead are supposed to live under the great mountain Mo, where the good are welcomed after death and where the general conditions bear some striking analogies to the Harmonic Hades. Ancestral worship is universally practised among the pagan natives, and there is a special class whose office it is to feed the deceased kinsmen, partly by consuming the food as their proxies and partly by exposing it for them in a taboo hut. The natives live together accordance to the tribes under the authority of a chief, who unless under a taboo, is an extensive authority in purely native affairs. The food of the natives consists of yams, taros, sugar-cane, dried fish, and shell-fish. At various places on the island are held markets, at which the natives of the coast and of the mountains meet to exchange produce, dancing forming a regular feature of the transaction.

New Caledonia was separated from Central Oceania and erected into a distinct vicariate Apostolic by decree of 2 July and Brieaf of 13 July, 1847. Besides the main island, the vicariate includes the Isle of Pines and the Belep and Loyalty Islands. The mission is entrusted to the Marist Fathers, who, besides ministering to the French settlers and convicts, have devoted themselves sedulously and with the greatest success to the conversion of the natives. According to the latest statistics the vicariate includes: 35,000 Catholics (11,500 natives); 48 missionary priests and 40 brothers of the Marist Congregation; 126 sisters; 61 catechists; 68 churches and several chapels; 48 schools with 800 pupils; 15 institutions for 150 boarders, and present vice Apostolic, who is the fourth to fill the office, is Mgr. Chaurion, titular Bishop of Caropoli.


THOMAS KENNEDY.

Newcastle. See HEXHAM AND NEWCASTLE, DioceSE OF.

Newfoundland, a British colony of North America (area 42,734 square miles), bounded on the north by the Strait of Belle Isle, which separates it from its dependency Labrador (area 120,000 square miles), on the east and south by the Atlantic Ocean, and on the west by the Gulf of St. Lawrence, lies between 46° 35' and 51° 40' lat. N., and 52° 35' and 59° 25' long. W. It was the first portion of North America discovered by European voyagers. The Cabots sailed from Bristol in 1497, and on 24 June of that year, the festival of St. John the Baptist, they landed in the harbour to which they gave the name of St. John's, which is now the present capital. The Cabots, like all the early navigators, had in view not only the discovery of new lands, and the increase of the power and wealth and territory of the mother country, but also the spread of the Gospel and the conversion of the heathens to the Christian Faith. Hence they brought with them priests and missionaries. Those who accompanied Cabot were Augustinians or "black friars". We may be sure that Mass was celebrated on these shores in 1497.

In the year 1500 the Portuguese under Gaspar de Cortereal took possession of the country and founded the settlement and Church of Placentia. In 1534 the French voyager, Jacques Cartier, visited the country, and explored the Gulf of St. Lawrence. He was followed by chaplains with him who celebrated Mass at Catalina in Newfoundland, and Brest, or Old Fort, on Labrador. In 1622 Lord Baltimore founded his colony of Ferryland. He brought out three Jesuit Fathers with him, and had Mass celebrated regularly, "and all other ceremonies of the Church of Rome were used in a manner as free and liberal as in Italy." In 1660 a complaint made against him to the Board of Trade by the Protestant clergyman, Mr. Stouarton. In 1650 the French founded a church at Placentia on the site of the one abandoned by the Portuguese. But none of these attempts succeeded. The real foundation of the Catholic Church in Newfoundland is due to priests from Ireland, who came out towards the close of the eighteenth century.

The population of the country by the last census, taken in 1901, was 217,037. Of these the Catholics number 75,657, members of the Church of England 71,470, Methodists 60,700. The remainder belong to different denominations, viz. Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, and others.

All denominations are equally recognized by the law, and there is no Established Church. In the early history of the country the Catholics were looked on as a proscribed class by the governors of the time, who were generally commanders of British war-ships. Priests were hunted and persecuted, people who harboured them were fined. Mass was not to be celebrated in their houses, they were imprisoned, and hanged, and their houses either burned or pulled down. In one unique case a house where Mass had been celebrated was towed into the sea and sunk. These acts were undoubtedly illegal, as there was no law in the statutes of the country penalizing the exercise of the Catholic Religion, but the penal laws of Ireland were supposed to be applicable to Newfoundland. However, the principle would not work both ways, and when Catholic Emancipation was granted to Ireland these same interpreters of the law held that the privileges of Emancipation did not apply to Newfoundland. During the whole course of his episcopate Bishop Fleming fought against the laws, and succeeded in obtaining full freedom for the Catholics.

In educational matters Catholics also enjoy every freedom. The denominational system is established by law. A sum is granted by Government amounting to about $1.13 per capita of the population, or $5.25 per pupil actually attending school. It is true this amount is small as compared with some of the Canadien Provinces, or States of the Union, but a large amount is paid by private individuals to Catholic colleges and convents which is not included in the above figures. The results compare most favorably with those of other countries. About thirty years ago a branch of the Irish Christian Brothers was introduced, an immediate impulsion was given to education throughout the island, and it is now at a very high standard. The Brothers have charge of two very large schools in St. John's—St. Patrick's and Holy Cross schools. There are ten class-rooms, containing about a thousand boys. The Brothers also have charge of the college in which some of the best boys in the island are educated. Here are trained the pupils teachers who will have charge of the public schools throughout the island. The college is affiliated to the Oxford Examination Board and the London University Board. A local council of higher education (non-denominational) looks at the local Examinations.
The Rhodes bequest gives three places for Newfoundland in perpetuity. They are all filled this year for the first time, and of the three occupant two are pupils of the College of St. Bonaventure. There are thirteen convents of Sisters of the Presentation Order in the country (9 in St. John's Diocese, 3 in Harbor Grace, and 1 in St. George's), and eight convents of the Sisters of Mercy (5 in St. John's, 2 in Harbor Grace, and 1 in St. George's). The Presentation order have free schools, the nuns being paid out of the Government grant. The Sisters of Mercy have, besides free schools, a paying school and a boarding academy. The total number of children attending school is over 13,000. There are also two orphan asylums, or industrial schools, one under the Sisters of Mercy for girls, and one under the Sisters of the Bonaventure, both containing about 200 orphans, or one for every 375 of the Catholic population, which, considering that this is a maritime and fishing colony, and the losses at sea are abnormal, is not an excessive number.

The Catholic religion is not only holding its own, but advancing rapidly in Newfoundland. The most harmonious relations exist between the different denominations, which are only interrupted on occasions of public excitement, when persons aspiring to political position and honours do not scruple to stir up feelings of religious bigotry and theological hatred among the more simple-minded of the people. A great future is opening up for religious denominations. Large industries are being developed, and every year brings some of the new developments being principally in the Dioceses of Harbor Grace and St. George's.

M. F. Howley.

New Granada. See Colombia, Republic of.

New Guinea, the second largest island and one of the least known countries of the world, lies immediately north of Australia, extending from the equator to about 12° S. lat. and from 130° 50' to 154° 30' E. long. It is 1490 miles in length, its maximum breadth is about 430 miles, and its total area some 310,000 sq. miles. Its population is placed at the purely conjectural figure of 875,000. An examination of the report of D'Abreu, who was long credited with the discovery of New Guinea (1511), shows that he only reached the eastern coast of Further India (Cambodia); whether José de Meneses (1520), Saavedra (1536), and Grijalva (1537) reached New Guinea is still uncertain. But there can be no doubt in the case of Jingo Ortiz de Retas (1545), who landed at the mouth of the St. Augustine (near modern Pointe Carpentier). A Spanish settlement in the country in the name of the King of Spain. It was he who gave the island the name of Nueva Guinea. On Mercator's map of 1569 New Guinea and numerous places and islands on its northern coast are indicated. Luis de Torres (1606), whose name is commemorated in the strait separating New Guinea from Australia, was the first to circumnavigate the island. The voyages of Tasman (1643-44), Vuiik (1653), and Kayto (1674) added greatly to our knowledge of the southern and eastern coasts, and in the eighteenth century, thanks to the efforts of Dutch, English, and French explorers (Schouten, Lemaire, Capt. Cook, De Bougainville, etc.), the picture of the island began to assume a more vivid reality.

However, Captain William Dampier's map of the north-western portion of the island, while exhibiting a great advance beyond the preceding, shows how erroneous still were the views concerning the exact contour of the island. The rapid growth of European interest in Australia in the nineteenth century resulted in 1853 in the French voyages of exploration multiplied, although, owing to the warlike and cannibal character of the natives, landings were still few. It was only during the last decades of the century that active exploration of the island began. Numerous successful expeditions (Maco-
Jubilee River (navigable by whale boat 120 miles) and the Fly (navigable by whale boat 600 miles), both of which discharge into the Gulf of Papua. No important river is known to exist in the western section of the island, which is of course still a terra incognita.

The climate of New Guinea is characterized in general by its great heat and humidity, and in the low-lying districts fever abounds. Although, generally speaking, the temperature seldom rises above 104° in the most exposed portion, it rarely falls below 88°. The climate is, however, tempered by the regular winds from the south-east and north-east, and at an altitude of 3000 feet above sea level is pleasantly cool. The annual rainfall varies from 30 to 130 inches along the coasts, rain falling more abundantly in the north and north-east than along the southern seaboard. The so-called climate is aggravated by the numerous mosquitoes and the leeches, which infest themselves through the most closely woven clothing and whose bite often occasions burning ulcers.

To the great uniformity seen in the geographical build of the island corresponds a general ethnical uniformity among its inhabitants (see, however, "Journal of the Ethnological Society of Great Britain and Ireland", XXIX, London, 1909, pp. 246 sqq., 314 sqq.). In the case of a country so vast and still so little explored, we must confine ourselves to indicating the general characteristics of the inhabitants, passing over the local differences which manifest themselves in the native customs and mode of life. The Papuans, as their name indicates, are dark-skinned people of southeast Asia, closely related to the Malay: they are taller than the Malay, with dark brown or black in colour, have a smooth skin, narrow forehead, dark eyes, dolichocephalous skull, and prominent nose. Their black, naturally frizzled hair is usually artistically arranged. They wear a lavish number of bracelets (mostly of stone), with unguent obsidian and ostrich feathers; they are employed by certain tribes as an outward token of mourning. Necklaces are also generally worn: they are usually made of rings of vegetable fibre or, in the case of the wealthier natives, of wild boar's teeth. The lower limbs are less usually adorned, except on festive occasions. Agriculture is as yet little developed; the natives depend for their sustenance mainly on their hunting (wild boar, opossum, crocodile, wild fowl), fishing, and the wild sago, which grows in the greatest abundance in the valleys and marshy lands and which, according to the missionaries, largely responsible for the unprogressive state of the natives.

A comparatively high sense of justice exists among the native tribes, each community possessing its strictly defined hunting and fishing grounds and sago fields. Many of the tribes are celebrated for their skill in boat-building. Commerce is carried on between the maritime and inland tribes. The trading is not confined to exchange: wild boar's tusks and in certain districts bracelets and stone hatchets are accepted in payment. Of the greatest value and universally recognized as a medium of exchange are the small glass pins and jewelry. These are generally believed to be the product of the old Indian glassworkers, and the natives instantly detect modern productions, which are little valued. While cannibalism still exists on the island, the members of the same tribe or community live together in the greatest peace. In general the strictest endogamy is practised, and there are certain well-defined degrees of relationship within which marriage is forbidden. The wife, for whom payment is almost always made to her relatives, attends not only the birth of her child, but also her death, and the custom is almost always practised: all observers testify to the kind manner in which wives are treated, and to the modesty and high moral character of the Papuan women in general. Though with no definite views concerning a deity, the Papuan believes in another self or soul, which deserted the body temporarily during sleep and finally after death. Disease and death never result from natural causes: they are always the result of evil spirits, acting either directly or through a poisoner. Against these evil influences talismans (mostly pieces of carved wood, crocodile teeth, etc.) are carried. The native weapons are the bow and arrow, knives of bamboo, stone clubs, spears, and hardwood shields and clubs.

New Guinea is divided politically into the Dutch, German, and English protectorates, the last two being known officially as Kaiser-Wilhelmland and the Territory of Papua. In 1884 Great Britain proclaimed its protectorate over the south-eastern portion of the island, and in 1885, after Germany had annexed the north-eastern section, the delimitation of the boundaries of the two countries was effected by the Anglo-German treaty of that year, Holland retaining the portion of the island west of 141° E. long. The boundary line between the German and British sections runs from 5° S. lat. at the 141st meridian E. to 8° on the coast. The Anglo-Dutch Treaty of May, 1885, opened the island to the Dutch. The black population of the British territory is 90,540 sq. miles; its population about 500,000 natives and 1250 whites. Cocos-nuts, rubber, sisal hemp, Mirva fibre, coffee, tea, and tobacco are cultivated. The forests contain valuable timbers (sandalwood, etc.); gold is found in the Louisiade Archipelago, on the mainland, and on Woodlark Island. The chief rivers are Bara, Barai, and Sarmesi, Daru, and Bonagai. The German territory has an area of about 70,000 sq. miles, and a population of 110,000 (?) natives and 391 foreigners (184 white). Its development is entrusted to the German New Guinea Company, but its administration is undertaken by the Imperial Government. The principal settlements are Bismarck. The principal vegetable produce is sago,橡胶, and sago palms, bamboo, ebony, and other woods abound: coco-palms and casouchou are grown on the small area yet under cultivation. Gold has been recently discovered on the Bismarck Mountains. Dutch New Guinea has an area of 150,000 sq. miles; its population is estimated purely conjecturally at 292,000. Although it is considered by some authorities the richest part of the island, very little attempt has been made to develop it. Extensive coal-fields exist near the north-western coast. The principal settlement is Merauke. The fauna of New Guinea is very poor in mammals; only about seventy-five species are known, the most important being the wild cat, mouse, bat, seal, and dog. The avifauna is, on the other hand, both numerous and various, and includes among the five hundred known species many (such as the celebrated bird of paradise) which are peculiar to New Guinea and some other islands in this region.

Mission History.—On 1 July, 1885, the first Catholic priest, Father Verjus, set foot on Papuan soil. He devoted himself immediately to the care of the sick and the study of the native language, but was soon compelled to withdraw in consequence of the opposition of the Protestant missionaries and the pressure they brought to bear on the British authorities. A change of governors allowed the return of the Catholic missionaries, and on 1 May, 1889, British New Guinea was erected into a vicariate Apostolic and Father Navarre appointed vicar Apostolic. He introduced the Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Issoudun, who rendered valuable assistance by instructing the native girls, taking charge of the churches and chapels, and even founding stations in the interior. On 12 April, 1893, the pms were consecrated by Bishop Léonard of Limyra and coadjutor to Mgr Navarre. The task of conversion is attended with great difficulty, as the adult native, though he shows no resentment to his religious customs being ridiculed, obstinately adheres
to them, even when they cause him excessive physical exertion. The latest statistics assign to the mission: 20 missionaries, 21 brothers, 38 sisters (all of the Sac- cred Heart of Jesus Congregation), 15 catechists, 7 stations with church and school, 2 orphanages, 28 schools with 1400 pupils. The Prefecture Apostolic of Dutch New Guinea was separated from the Vicariate Apostolic of Batavia on 22 December, 1902. Attended at first by the Jesuits, it was later entrusted to the Missionary Fathers of the Sacred Heart of Issoudun. The present prefect is Rev. Patrice Noyene (residence on the Island of Langur), appointed in January, 1903. The mission now contains 14 Fathers and 11 Brothers of the Sacred Heart; 7 Sis- ters of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart; 16 native cate- chists; 2911 Catholics; 210 catechumens; 4 churches with resident priest; 12 churches without residence; 12 sub-stations; 16 schools with 300 pupils. (For Ger- man New Guinea, see KAISERWILHELMSLAND.)

THOMAS KENNEDY.

NEW HAMPSHIRE. New Hampshire, the most northerly of the thirteen original states of the United States, lying between 70° 37' and 72° 37' west long., and between 42° 40' and 45° 18' 23' north lat. It comprises an area of 9305 square miles, and according to the census of 1910, has a population of 430,572. New Hampshire is bounded on the south by Massachusetts, the dividing line passing through the center of the state. It is about 28 miles north of the Merrimac; thence westerly, following the course of the river at the same distance to a point three miles north of Pawtucket Falls, thence westerly fifty-five miles to the western bank of the Connecticut; on the east by the Atlantic for about eighteen miles from said southern boundary to the mainline of the railroad; thence due north to the State of Maine to the Canada line, the dividing line between Maine and New Hampshire beginning at the middle of the mouth of Pisquetqua harbour, thence up the middle of the river to its most northerly head, thence north, two degrees west, to the Canada line; on the north by the Province of Quebec, the dividing line passing through the center of the state at the rivers emptying into the St. Lawrence from those emptying into the sea; on the west by the Province of Quebec, southerly to the forty-fifth parallel of latitude, and by the State of Vermont, the line passing from the north-west head of the Connecticut river along the middle of that river to the forty-fifth parallel of latitude, thence due west to the Canada line, following the western bank of that river to the Massa- chusetts line. The south-west part of the Isles of Shoals, off the coast of New Hampshire, belongs to that state, the rest to Maine, the dividing line passing between Cedar and Smutty Nose Islands, Maine and Star Island, the most populous of the group in New Hampshire.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS. New Hampshire is a state of hills and mountains, sloping gradually from north to south. A range of hills runs through the state from the southern boundary nearly to its nor- thern extremity, buttressed at uneven intervals, south of the White Mountains, by Mounts Monadnock, Kearsarge, and Gilpin. The country between sprays into the plateau of the White Mountains, some thirty miles long by forty-five wide, and from sixteen to eighteen hundred feet high. From this pla- teau arise some two hundred peaks in two groups: the White and Sandwich Mountains to the eastward, and the Franconia to the westward. This range divides the waters of 1200 Androscoggin, the Saco, and the Merrimac rivers on the east from those of the Con- necticut on the west. The White Mountain region is strikingly grand. Here Mount Washington (6290 feet) and Mount Adams, Jefferson, Clay, Monroe, and others each rise nearly a mile in height. The fame of the beauty and sublimity of this region is world-wide and attracts countless visitors. In the south-eastern por- tion of the state, from the Merrimac valley to the sea, the land is lower and much of it fertile. Two-thirds of the largest cities and towns of the state are in this section. The cli- mate is rugged and healthy, the air pure and bracing. In summer the summers are short and change- able, but the autumn is generally delightful. The winters are very severe, though less so in the valleys of the Connecticut and Merrimac. Cold weather usually lasts eight months, with snow half that period.

RESOURCES. Agriculture. The soil of the state outside the mountain regions is well watered and fairly productive, and good crops are raised of the ordinary farm staples: hay, corn, oats, potatoes, etc., but the chief food supply comes from the west. The industries: The growth of the last census was a point of 900 the gross value of the manu- factures in the state is placed at $123,610,904, the net value at $85,008,010. These manufactures are largely confined to the cities and leading towns, which contain 65.8 per cent. of the establishments, manufactu- res 79.2 per cent. of the value, and pay 81.4 per cent. of the wages. Among the chief manufactures are for goods of leather, about $20,300,000; leather goods, $23,000,000; lumber, $9,125,000; woolens, $7,700,- 000; paper and pulp, $7,125,000; machinery, cars, car- rriages, and furniture. Minerals. Chief among the mineral products is granite, of which there are valuable quarries at Concord, Hooksett, Mason, and other towns. Steatite or soapstone is also found in quanti- ties at Franconia and at Galeford. Apples, at Franconia being one of the most valuable in the Union. Graphite, mica, limestone, and slate are also found. Commerce. New Hampshire has but one sea- port, Portsmouth, which has considerable coasting trade. The importation of foodstuffs and raw ma- terial, and the distribution of her vast volume of manu- factures constitute the chief domestic commerce, carried on chiefly by rail. Foreign importations come chiefly through Boston. The coast is covered by a network of steam and electric railroads, connecting every city and town of any importance with the business centres.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM. The state has always care- fully provided for education. Under the Constitution (Part II, art., 52), it is the duty of the legislature and magistrate to cherish the interests of literature, the sciences, and all seminaries and public schools; to en- courage private and public institutions, rewards, and immunities for the promotion of arts, sciences, etc.; but no money raised by taxation shall ever be applied for the use of the schools or institutions of any religi- ous denomination. The law directs that every child from eight to fourteen shall attend school at least twelve weeks each year. Practically every town is a
school district and may raise money by taxation for school purposes, and may, separately or uniting with other districts, establish a high school, or contract with academies in its vicinity for instruction of its scholars. The districts are under the general control of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, appointed by the governor. In 1908 there were 2127 public schools, with a membership of 54,472 pupils, under 2990 teachers, of whom 255 were men. Manual training is provided in Manchester, Concord, Portsmouth, Rochester, and Berlin.

Evening schools are maintained in three cities, intended by 365 pupils, of which 308 are male. In places of 4000 people and over, 796 children attend kindergartens. The New Hampshire School for the Feeble Minded, at Laconia, has 89 inmates, under 4 instructors. There were 53 public high schools, with 243 teachers (84 men), and 5250 pupils. The State Normal School at Plymouth (founded 1870) has 14 teachers and 181 pupils. The model schools Another normal school is in prospect. The total revenue from taxation for the public schools (1906–7) was $1,293,013. Apart from Catholic schools, there are 24 secondary schools reported in 1908, with 167 teachers and 3235 pupils, over 900 of these being elementary. Among the private academies, the Henry School of Wolfeboro has special mention. The New Hampshire College of Agriculture and the Mechanical Arts at Durham (founded 1867) is an excellent and liberally endowed state institution with 196 students (1908), 9 men and 13 women in general science; 48 men and 2 women in agriculture, and 124 men in engineering; professors and instructors, 21, with 18 professors, 3 assistants, and 156 students. There is a fine state library at Concord and excellent libraries in all the cities. Every town of any importance either has its own library or is in easy reach of excellent library accommodations.

HISTORY.—Civil.—The first to settle in the limits of New Hampshire seems to have been David Thomson, a Scotchman, who in 1622 was granted 6000 acres and an island in New England (N. H. State Papers, XXV, 715). Forming a partnership with some Plymouth merchants in his case of a lot south of the Piscataqua, calling the place Little Harbor. Nothing is known of this settlement, except that about three years afterwards Thomson moved to an island in Boston harbor which still bears his name. It is claimed with reason that at about the same time William and Edward Hilton settled a few miles further up the Piscataqua at what was called Hilton's Point or Northam, now Dover, though the formal grant of their patent was 1630 (Belknap, "Hist.,” 8). Also, that all these men were sent by John Mason, Ferdinando Gorges, and a company of English merchants. In 1621, 1622, and 1629, Sir Ferdinando Gorges, an officer in the English navy, and Captain John Mason, merchant, and afterward a naval officer and Governor of Newfoundland, both royal favorites, procured various grants of what is now New Hampshire and a great deal more, from the Plymouth Company, organized by James I "for the planting, ruling, and governing of New England”, and apparently under some arrangement with Thomson and others interested, sent over some 60 men and women duly supplied and furnished, by whom settlements were made on both sides of the Piscataqua near its mouth. Building a house, called Mason Hall, they began salt works, calling the settlement Strawberry Bank; while at Newitchwannock, now South Berwick, Maine, they built a saw mill. Things went along presumably well till Mason died in 1653, after which the houses and cattle were taken to satisfy the wages and claims of his servants. Neither he nor Gorges seem to have reaped any profit from their investment. The claims of the Mason heirs were a bone of contention till 1758, when a settlement was effected. On two different occasions they delivered the colony from Massachusetts's sway on account of the influence the claimants had first with Charles II in 1679 and again with William III in 1692.

The settlements spread slowly, the people coming chiefly from Hampshire County, where Mason had held a lucrative office under the crown and from which he had named the plantation "New Hampshire". In 1650 John Wheelwright and a number of his followers were franchised and banished from Boston for his religious opinions, settled, with some adherents, at Squamscott Falls, as being outside the Massachusetts patent, calling the place Exeter, and here they organized a local government, creating three magistrates, the laws to be made by the townsmen in public assembly, with the assent of the magistrates. The settlement of Dover and Strawberry Bank (Portsmouth) soon followed the example of Exeter and established local self-government. It is important to note that Mason, Gorges, Thomson, the Hiltans, and the wealthy merchants associated with them, were devoted supporters of the Church of England. The powerful Massachusetts Bay Company, alarmed at the intense Puritanism, soon turned its attention to the struggling Anglican colonies on its northern borders, which it determined to seize. Proceeding with consummate craft and skill, they laid out the town of Hampton, clearly within the Mason patent, and set it with people from Norfolk (Belknap, 1, 38), over whom they had absolute control. Among these were Lord Say and Brook, others, to buy up the Hilton patent at a cost of £150, and to send over large numbers of West of England Puritans and a minister who built and fortified a church on Dover Neck (Belknap, 1, 32). Jealousies, fears, and factions arose between the old settlers and the new comers. Then emissaries from the Bay appeared at the time on the Piscataqua (Fry, 37), “to understand the minds of the people and to prepare them”, and their report was entirely satisfactory to their principals. They then (1641) got the purchasers of the Hilton patent to put it solemnly under the government of Massachusetts. And the time being ripe, and England too distracted with other affairs, Massachusetts assumed jurisdiction over the New Hampshire settlements (October, 1641). Very soon after Puritans appeared among the settlers and obtained possession of the principal offices, dividing among themselves a goodly share of the common lands (Fry, 30). They silenced the Anglican minister of Portsmouth, seized the church and school, and the fifty acres of glebe that had been granted that church by Governor Williams and the people, and in due time turned them over to a Puritan minister. Minister Wheelwright left Exeter and went to Maine.

For nearly one hundred years, or until the capture of Quebec by Wolfe and the subsequent surrender of Canada (1759–63), the development of New Hampshire was seriously impaired by the Indian wars, her territory being not only the borderland, but also in the
war-path of the Indians from Canada to the New England settlements. These wars seem to have been occasioned by the misdeeds, aggression, or treachery of the whites (Belknap, "Hist," I, 133, 242). There is no doubt that encroachments on their lands and fraud in trade gave sufficient grounds for a quarrel and kept up jealousy and fear (Belknap, I, 123). And the same writer gives the eastern settlers of New England but a poor character or religion and deems their conduct unattractive to the Indians (Hist., II, 47). Such would surely be the drowning by some rascals of the Sacc chief Squando's babe; while the treachery of Major Waldron in 1676 in betraying them in time of peace in his own home, and consigning two hundred of them to slavery or death, was never forgotten nor forgot by the white people (Kane, 33), and on the people till it was avenged in his blood on his own hearth-stone in the Indian attack on Dover in 1689. But through war or peace the population steadily increased. Estimated at between 3000 and 4000 in 1679, it was placed at 52,700 in 1767, and in 1775 at 85,300. The settlers, of course, were mainly English, but about 1719 a colony of one hundred families of Ulster Protestants came from Ireland to Massachusetts and after many trials a number of them settled on a tract in New Hampshire above Haverhill, known as Nutfield, where they established the towns of Londonderry and Derry; the rest settling in different parts of the country. They were hardy and industrious; they cleared the colony, the somnolent, and fit it to be the New Testament. After the capture of Quebec the settlements increased more rapidly, soon clashing in the west with New York's claims, till the boundary was settled by royal decree in 1764.

None of the thirteen colonies was better satisfied with British rule than New Hampshire. She had an extraordinary governor and had received fair treatment from the home government. It is true that patriots took alarm at the assumption of power to tax the people without their consent, and at the severity exercised towards the neighbouring sister colony; and took due precautions to consult for the common safety; also, that when the king and council prohibited the exportation of powder and military stores to America, the citizens, in December, 1774, quietly removed one hundred barrels of powder, the light cannon, small arms, and military stores from Fort William and Mary in Portsmouth harbour to more convenient places. The provincial convention, early in 1776, in forming a provisional government, publicly declared that the people, observing the British emperor would rejoice if a reconciliation could be effected, but when they saw the home government persevere in its design of oppression, the Assembly at once (15 June, 1776) instructed its delegates at Philadelphia to join in declaring the thirteen colonies independent, and pledged their lives and fortunes thereto. This pledge was well redeemed through the war from Bunker Hill to Bennington and Yorktown, and New Hampshire's soldiers under Stark and Sullivan, Scammell and Gilley, and others, did their full part and more; while the hardy sailors of Portsmouth and its vicinity did gallant service in the navy under Paul Jones, whose ship, "The Ranger" was built and fitted out at that port. After careful consideration New Hampshire adopted the Constitution, 21 June, 1788, being the ninth state to do so; thus making the number required to give it effect. During the war of the Rebellion, notwithstanding considerable difference of party opinion, the state supported Lincoln and contributed its full share of men to the Union army and navy.

Ecclesiastical.—It was not eighty years from Henry VIII to Mason, and so it was that men imbued with the spirit of the English penal laws settled New Hampshire, whether of the Cavalier stripe, such as Mason, Gorges, and the Htons, or Puritan, such as Higgins, the Waldrons, and the Moodies. In the book of the Puritan the word "toleration" was not written, or only mentioned to be denied and scoffed at by the gravest and most venerable of their teachers and upon the most solemn occasions. President Oakes calls toleration "The first born of all abominations" (Election Sermon, 1673). "Having its origin," says Shepherd, "with the devil!" (Election Sermon, 1662). As Dr. Belknap sums it up, "Liberty of conscience and toleration were offensive terms and they who used them were supposed to be the enemies of religion and government" (Hist., 84). The rigidity with which this idea was carried out towards their brethren who differed with them is shown in the case of Roger Williams, and the people of Salem, who were disfranchised and had their property righted over them, all in the favour of liberty of conscience; Williams escaping only by flight to Narragansett Bay; and in multitudes of other instances, as well as in their merciless persecution of the Quakers, extending to imprisonment, scourging, mutilation, and death; as witness their laws from 1656 to 1661, and the barbarities perpetrated under them. It was during Massachusetts' usurpation in New Hampshire, and probably by one of the parties she colonized on the Hilton Patent, the notorious Richard Waldron, that the three Quakers, Anna Coleman, Mary Tomkins, and Alice Ambrose were ordered to be whipped, like infamous criminals, from Dover through eleven towns, and to the diaphragm of the church by John Brown, the sawyer; and that the Quakers were ordered to leave the Massachusetts line; where the victims were rescued and set free by some ruse of the Cavalier Doctor Barefoot, and some friends, as the story goes, Waldron's warrant running in Massachusetts also.

Such being their attitude towards their Protestant brethren, it is easy to understand why so few Catholics appeared among the early settlers. Finally they were banned by the charter of the Plymouth Council, which excluded from New England all who had not taken the Oath of Supremacy. Catholics were denied the right of freemen under the Royal Commission of 1679, which required the Oath of Supremacy and this was endorsed by the General Assembly held at Portsmouth the following year; and in 1680 an odious and insulting test-oath was imposed on the people under pain of fine or imprisonment. The proscription of Catholics continued to disfigure the state constitution even after the adoption of the federal constitution. The State Constitutional Convention of 1791 refused to amend the constitution of 1784, by abolishing the test oath. In 1832, by the thirteenth amendment, it became the duty of governor, councillor, state senator, and representative, the vote standing thirty years to fifty-one nays. It is significant that the names of those voting nay are not entered on the record (Journal, p. 52). The convention of 1876 abolished all religious disqualifications, and this was adopted by the people except as to one measure empowering the governor to reside at their own expense for public, "Protestant" teachers of religion and morality. The convention of 1889 voted to abolish this distinction; but this vote also failed of ratification, and the discrimination still remains a blot on the fairest and first of all written American state constitutions.

First Catholic Missions.—In 1816 Rev. Virgil Barber, an Episcopal minister and principal of an Academy at Fairfield, N. Y., son of Rev. Daniel Barber of Claremont, N. H., observing a prayer-book in the hands of a Catholic servant, made inquiries which resulted in his giving up his school and pastorate and becoming a Catholic. Afterwards, by agreement between himself and his principal, he and his son entered the Jesuits, and Mrs. Barber and her four daughters entered convents. Father Barber was ordained in 1822 and sent to Claremont, where he built a small brick church and academy, still standing; and according to Bishop Fenwick in 1825 there were
about one hundred and fifty persons, almost all converts, attending it. The following year Father Barber was sent by Bishop Fenwick to visit the eastern part of the diocese and found one hundred Catholics in Dover, eager for a church. In 1828 Father Charles Frenche was assigned to that mission, which extended from Dover to Bangor. Father Frenche built the church of St. Aloisius in Dover (dedicated 1830), the second Catholic church in the state. In 1833 Father Lee was appointed resident pastor, and the following year he was succeeded by Father Patrick Canovan. In 1835 the Catholic population of the state is given as 385; in 1842 it was placed at 1370, ministered to by Fathers Daly and Canovan. Then came the emigration from Ireland, first to Manchester, N. H., in 1848 there were five hundred Catholics, and Bishop Fitzpatrick sent thither Rev. William McDonald, a wise, far-seeing, zealous, and devoted priest. A church was soon built, the present church of St. Anne, rebuilt in 1852. In 1857 he built a convent near the church for the Sisters of Mercy, organized schools, using the basement of the church till he could build or purchase buildings. The influx of Irish Catholics continuing, in 1867 he built St. Joseph’s church, now the cathedral. He secured eligible sites for a church, a school, and charitable purposes; an orphan asylum, a Home for Aged Women, and a fine brick school for girls. Emigration from Canada set in, which extended into New England, and in 1871 a Catholic priest, Rev. J. H. Chevalier, was sent to Manchester, where he built a fine church and developed a flourishing parish. Father McDonald died in 1885, greatly beloved, honoured, and lamented by his fellow citizens, irrespective of creed. A beautiful mortuary chapel was erected by Bishop Bradley over his remains. He was succeeded in 1888 by the late Father O’Donnell and Millette of Nashua, Barry of Concord, Murphy of Dover, O’Callaghan of Portsmouth and other zealous priests built up fine parishes in the chief manufacturing centres.

In 1853 Maine and New Hampshire were created a diocese. Father David W. Bacon, consecrated bishop in 1855, died in 1874, and was succeeded (1875) by the Right Rev. J. A. Healy. In 1884 the state was made the Diocese of Manchester with Father Denis M. Bradley, then pastor of St. Joseph’s, as its first bishop. Under Bishop Bradley, a man of great mental power and breadth of view, of quick perception and sound judgment, singularly sweet in manner, and suddenly devoted to his calling, the progress of the diocese was almost incredible. The tide of French Canadian immigration to the manufacturing centres of the state now increased tremendously and the new bishop spared no pains to procure the best pastors to care for the ever-increasing flock. Two other magnificent brick churches, for 3600 elements, St. Mary’s and St. George’s, with schools for each sex, and convents for the sisters, were built, together with all the usual parish institutions. In 1884 there were 45,000 Catholics in the state, with 27 churches, 5 convents, 40 priests, and 3000 children in the parochial schools. After nineteen years, there were 100,000 Catholics, 91 churches, 24 chapels, 32 stations, 107 priests, 12,000 children in the parochial schools, 4 hospitals, 4 homes for aged women. Bishop Bradley died 13 December, 1903, and was succeeded in 1904 by Bishop John B. Delaney, whose untimely death in June, 1906, cut short his administration. His successor is the present bishop, Right Rev. George Albert Guertin. The new prelate has evidently brought to his position, administrative ability that marked his career as a priest, and his work thus far has already borne rich fruit. There are now in the diocese over 126,000 Catholics, with 118 secular priests, and 19 regulars; 99 churches, 24 chapels, and 34 stations; over 15,000 children in the parochial schools, 7 orphan asylums, caring for 718 orphans, 5 homes for working girls, with many other charitable institutions. No Catholic has yet held the office of Judge of the Supreme Court; recently a Catholic, Hon. John M. Mitchell of Concord, was appointed judge of the Superior Court of the State.

Religious Polity.—Freedom of worship is now recognized as 'a natural and unalienable right' under the Constitution; and no one can be held to account for exercising the same as his conscience dictates, or for his sentiments or persuasion; or be compelled to pay to the support of another persuasion; and no subdivision of one denomination to another shall ever be established by law (Bill of Rights, Art. 6). All work, business, and labour of one's secular calling are to be free from the disturbance of any person or property for exercising the same as his conscience dictates, or for his sentiments or persuasion; and no person shall engage in any play, game or sport on that day (Gen. laws; Ch. 271). The form of oath of office prescribed in the Constitution is, 'I do solemnly swear, etc.—so help me God.' Or, in case of persons scrupulous of swearing, "This I do under the pains and penalties of perjury." The same forms are followed in respect to witnesses in the courts, but any other form may be used which the affidavit professes to believe may be more binding on the conscience. Open denial of the existence of God, or wilful blasphemy of the name of God, Jesus Christ, or the Holy Ghost, or to curse the name of God, or the Bible, are punishable with severe fine and sureties for good behaviour for a year. Profane cursing or swearing is punishable by fine of one dollar for first offence, and two dollars for subsequent offences. Opening the legislature by prayer is a matter of custom since 1745, though not as early as 1809, the Assembly was opened by one's own prayer or reading the Lord's Prayer. Christmas Day is a religious festival on the first day. Under the Puritan regime whoever kept Christmas Day had to pay five pounds, over twenty-four dollars (Commissioners Rep. to King). The seal of confession is not recognized by law. No instances of its being attacked have arisen, and probably public opinion would frown down any such attempt.

Incorporation of Charities.—Apart from special incorporation by the legislature, easily obtainable, any five persons may associate themselves together and become a corporation for religious or charitable purposes, by filing articles of agreement with their town clerk, and the Secretary of State. The law does not put any restraint on such societies. A religious society, though not incorporated, is a corporation in this state, for the purpose of holding and using donations or grants worth not more than $5000 a year. Any officers, such as trustees or deacons, of any church, if citizens, shall be deemed a corporation, to hold any grants or donations of the above value, except to them and their successors, to their church or to the poor. No religious society shall be dissolved, or its right to any property affected, by failure to hold its annual meeting, to choose its officers, or for any informality in electing or qualifying its officers, or for any defect in its records.

Taxation.—All "Houses of Public Worship" are exempt from 3% taxation; also twenty-five hundred dollars of the value of parsonages owned by religious societies and occupied by their pastors; also school houses and "Seminaries of learning." Ordained ministers are exempt from jury duty, but not from military duty. The sale of liquor is regulated by a stringent high licence law, sale for sacramental purposes being expressly recognized and coming under a low licence fee, ten dollars.

Marriage and Divorce.—The age of consent, for females is thirteen, for males fourteen. Marriages to the degree of first cousins are incestuous and void, and the issue illegitimate. Marriages may be solemnized by a justice of the peace in his county, or by an ordained minister in good standing, resident in the
STATE; also by ministers out of the state, commissioned by the governor to be legally authorized officers. Children born before marriage and duly acknowledged thereafter are deemed legitimate. The legitimacy of the children is not to be affected by decree of divorce unless so expressed in the decree. If one of the parties thereto believed they were lawfully married and the marriage was consummated, it is valid, although before a supposed but not actual justice or minister, or under an informal or defective certificate of intention. The causes for legal divorce are impotency, adultery, extreme cruelty, conviction of crime entailing over a year's imprisonment; treatment seriously injuring health or reason, habitual drunkenness, refusal to cohabit or support, and refusal for six months, when conjoined with religious belief (Gen. Stat. Ch. 174). Where legal cause for divorce exists, all the objects of separation—non-access, non-interference, non-publishing of name, alimony, custody of children—can be obtained without a legal divorce, should the injured party so desire (Stat. 1906).

PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES.—The rules of all prisons, houses of correction, or public charitable or reformatory institutions, shall provide for suitable religious instruction and ministration to the inmates. These are to have freedom of religious belief and worship, but may not interfere with proper discipline. Each prison shall have a place for the religious instruction of twenty-one years of age, and sound mind (married women included), may dispose of any right in property by will in writing, signed by the testator and subscribed in his presence by three credible witnesses. No seal is required. Husband or wife may waive the provisions of a will and take the share allowed them respectively by law.

CHABITABLE BEQUESTS.—These are governed by the principles of the common law. The courts will order them to be executed according to the true intent and will let no trust lapse for want of a trustee (2 N. H., 21-55; N. H., 467-470-39; N. H., 139).

The following is a rough estimate of the nationality of the Catholic population of the diocese:

| French Canadians | 66,200 |
| Irish            | 52,250 |
| Poles           | 5,000  |
| Lithuanians     | 1,500  |
| Ruthenians      | 750    |
| Italian         | 6,000  |

The principal non-Catholic denominations is as follows:

| Congregationalists | 19,070 |
| Methodists         | 12,529 |
| Baptists           | 9,741  |
| Free Baptists      | 6,210  |
| Unitarians         | 3,829  |
| Universalists      | 1,903  |
| Advent Christians  | 1,608  |
| Christians         | 1,303  |
| Presbyterians      | 842    |

CHAB. A. O'CONNOR.

NEWHEBRIDES, VICARIATE APPOSTOLIC OF, in Oceania, comprises the New Hebrides, with Banks and Torres, islands situated between 15° and 21° S. lat. and between 160° and 170° E. long. The total area is about 580 sq. miles. The indigenous population, which has decreased considerably, amounts to about 75,000; they are for the most part of an olive or brown complexion, varying in darkness. Their languages, which are of the Melanesian family, belong to the Huli race and their religious worship has for its object the souls of the dead, but they also recognize a higher Being who is good. The white population is about 1000, nearly 650 of whom are French, and 300 English. The islands belong jointly to France and Great Britain under what is known as the "Condominium of the New Hebrides". They were discovered in 1606 by the Spaniards under Quiros, and were named Tierra Austral del S. Esperitu. In 1768 the French navigator, Bougainville, in sailing round the globe, came upon the same group and named them the Grandes Cyclades. Six years later, Cook discovered the islands and gave them their present name. According to the account of Quiros, the Franciscans, who acted as missionaries to these islands, are said to have held three masses in a chapel built on the shore, and even held a procession of the Blessed Sacrament. Nevertheless, the islands had to wait long for the preaching of Catholic missionaries. Not until January, 1857, did four Marist priests, sent by Mgr Fraysee, Vicar Apostolic of New Caledonia, definitively establish here the first missions. They continued their labors, however, developed rapidly, and in 1900, at the petition of Mgr Fraysee, the New Hebrides were separated from his jurisdiction and made a prefecture Apostolic, under Père Douceré, of the Society of Mary. In 1904 this mission became a vicariate Apostolic, and Père Douceré, as vicar Apostolic, was consecrated titular Bishop of Teneruthis. His residence is at Port-Vila. The staff of the mission now comprises 26 priests and 3 lay brothers of the Lyons Society of Mary. Their labours are seconded by 16 religious women of the regular Third Order of Mary, and a certain number of native catechists. There are 12 missionary residences, besides numerous annexes. Each mission has its schools. Near the episcopal residence is established a training-school for native catechists. Religious instruction and education for white children are secured by two schools at Port-Vila: a school for boys, conducted by the Little Brothers of Mary; one for girls, under the sisters of the mission who also serve the hospital at Port-Vila and conduct at Malico a crèche for little orphans. Conversions from paganism progress slowly, but continuously. The native Catholics, now numbering rather more than one thousand, are well instructed and faithful to their religious duties. There are about 600 white Catholics, and this number is increasing rapidly, both by births and by immigration.

P. DOUCERÉ.

Newhouse, Abbey of, near Brockelsby, Lincoln, the first Premonstratensian abbey in England, was founded in 1143 by Peter de Gousel, with the consent of his lord, Hugh de Bayeux, and the approbation of Bishop Roger, Bishop of Exeter. The Abbey was founded by the Abbey of Ligueus near Caletis, France, then under the rule of Abbot Henry. On their arrival in England the White Canons were hospitably received by William, Earl of Lincoln, who confirmed the donations made to Celro, the first Abbot of Newhouse, by Peter de Gousel the founder, by Ralph de Halton, and Geoffrey de Tours. The abbey was built in honour of Our Lady and St. Martial, Bishop of Limoges. In time Newhouse became the parent house of eleven of the Premonstratensian houses in England. The Abbey of Newhouse represents an abbey at full length, with his crozier and the inscription: Sigill. conventus Sci Marcialis. Ep. Li. de Newhouse. Of this abbey which was granted (9 Henry VIII) to Charles Duke of Suffolk, many of the old foundations still remain. The names of twenty-six abbots are known, the last being Thomas Harpham, who was abbot from 1534 to the suppression of the abbey by Henry VIII. The following list gives in alphabetical order the names and the dates of foundations of the Premonstratensian or Norbertine abbots, made from the time the abbey was first established in England at the time of the Reformation: Alnwick, Northumberland, this was the first foundation made from Newhouse (1147); Barlings, near Lincoln (1154); Bileigh, near Maldon, Essex (1180); Coverham, Yorkshire (originally established at Swanby, 1160); Croxton, near Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire (1162); Dale, Derbyshire (1162); St.
New Jersey, one of the original thirteen states of the American Union. It ratified the Federal Constitution on 18 December, 1787, being preceded only by Delaware and Pennsylvania. The capital of the state is Trenton. The extreme length of New Jersey from north to south is 160 miles, its extreme breadth 70 miles, and its gross area 7815 square miles. It is situated between 38° 55' 39" and 41° 21' 19" N. lat., and between 73° 53' 51" and 75° 33' 3" W. long. It is bounded on the north by New York State, on the east by the Hudson River and the Atlantic Ocean, on the south by Delaware Bay, and on the west by the Delaware River. In 1910 the population was 2,537,167 (1,883,669 in 1900), the state being thus, notwithstanding its large mountainous and forest areas, more densely populated than the most fertile of the prairie states or the great manufacturing States of New York or Pennsylvania. New Jersey has, in proportion to its area, more miles of railway than any other state, the majority of the eastern trunk lines traversing it. Its farms yield a larger income in proportion to the area cultivated than the richest states of the Mississippi valley. In manufactures it ranks sixth in the Union.

Physical Characteristics.—Much of the northern part of New Jersey is mountainous and much of its southern half is covered with forest. The state divides itself naturally into four belts, differing in age, in the nature of the underlying rocks, and in topography. The Appalachian belt, made up of the Kittatinny range and valley, forms the north-western part of the state. This ridge is due to tilted-up layers of hard rock, which have been able to resist the agents of weather, while the softer rocks were being slowly worn away to form the Kittatinny valley. The Kittatinny Mountains constitute the highest land in the state, and are clothed with forests; the valley, which is one of the most fertile parts of the state, is devoted to general farming and grazing. There are no large cities, except Philadelphia, and no manufacturing pursuits. The Highland belt is the oldest part of the state, and is a portion of the very ancient mountain system of which the Blue Ridge Mountains are a worn-down remnant. The Highblands (generally less than 1500 feet high) are a region of lakes, forests, and picturesque valleys, but are not a productive farming section. Here, in ancient crystalline rocks are foundiable beds of iron and of zinc ore, but there are no large cities and no extensive manufacturing. The Piedmont belt is a rolling plain from which rise abrupt ridges of hard trap rock. The Palisades along the Hudson and the Orange or Watchung Mountains are the most prominent of these ridges. While the rocks of the Piedmont plain are mostly sandstone and shale, the trap-rocks are covered in clay sheets. This, the belt of densest population, many cities, great manufacturing activity, and generally productive soil, is by far the most wealthy part of the state. The northern part of New Jersey was covered by the ice sheet of the glacial period. As a result, there are many swamps, lakes, and waterfalls, a glacial sheet with many boulders, and montane mineral deposits formed by glacial action. These hills are composed of till, gravel, boulders, etc., brought together by the advancing ice sheet and piled up along its front. The coastal plain is the youngest, flattest, and largest of the four natural divisions of the state, of which it forms more than one half. It is composed of layer upon layer of sand, clay, gravel, and marl sediments, that were, in past ages, slowly deposited in the ocean waters along the coast, and afterwards into a low, sandy plain. The marl belt and a few other portions are alone fertile. More than half of the coastal plain is covered with pine forests and is thinly peopled. Outside of the larger cities, the raising of fruit and vegetables for the city markets and the manufacture of glass are the chief industries. The sea-coast is fringed with summer resorts.

Civil History.—The precise date of the first settlement in New Jersey is not known, though it is believed that the Danes or Norwegians, who crossed the Atlantic with the Dutch colonists, began a settlement at Bergen about 1621. Ten years previously an attempt had been made to form a settlement at Jersey City. In 1623 the Dutch West India Company sent out a ship under the command of Captain Cornelius Jacobse Mey. Entering Delaware Bay, he gave his name to its northern cape, and then, sailing proportionate to its abundance, and masts, built Fort Nassau, which may be considered the first permanent settlement of the state. In 1632 Charles I granted to Sir Edmund Pownen a vast tract of land embracing New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, although he had previously granted Maryland to Lord Baltimore. In 1634 Pownen made a grant of ten thousand acres to Sir Thomas Danby on condition that he would settle one hundred planters on it, and would not permit "any to live thereon not believing or professing the three Christian creeds commonly called the Apostolical, Athanasian, and Nicene." In 1642 Pownen sailed up the Delaware River, which he named "The Charles", and founded at Salem City a settlement of seventy persons. The efforts of Thomas and George Pownen to assert their claims to the lands granted to their grandfather proved futile, the possessions having fallen into other hands after the latter had retired to England. In this section of the commonwealth. In 1664, prior to the grant of Charles I to Pownen, King James had granted a new patent for Virginia (ignoring that of Sir Walter Raleigh, dated 1584), in which was included the territory now known as the New England States, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. The possession of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and adjacent lands was subsequently claimed by the Dutch, and New Sweden, and then by the Swedes. The former built Fort Nassau on the Delaware near Gloucester. Disputes as to the rightful possession of this territory continued until 12 March, 1664, when Charles II royal disregard for previous patents, grants, and charters, deeded to his brother James, Duke of York, a vast tract embracing the whole of New England, New York, and all of what is now New Jersey. This was accompanied by active preparations to drive the Dutch from America, as their possession of New Jersey, if acquiesced in, would practically separate the New England Colonies from Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas. In the summer of 1664 armed vessels appeared in New York harbor, and after negotiations the Dutch surrendered.
upon the west, Delaware bay or river, and extendeth southward to the main ocean as far as Cape May, at the mouth of Delaware bay, and to the northward as far as the East river or river of Delaware, which is forty-one degrees and forty minutes of latitude, and worketh over thence in a straight line to Hudson river, which said tract of land is hereafter to be called by the name or names of Nova Cassarea or New Jersey". This name was given in honour of Carteret's gallant defence of the Island of Jersey (Cassarea), of which his governorship during the parliamentary wars. This grant regarded the Dutch as intruders, and Berkeley and Carteret not only became rulers, but acquired the right to transfer the privilege to others. Measures were speedily devised for populating and governing the country. The proprietors published a constitution, dated 10 February, 1664, by which the government of the province was to be exercised by a governor, a council, and a general assembly. The governor was to receive his appointment from the proprietors. On the same day that the instrument of government was signed, Philip Carteret, a brother of one of the proprietors, received a commission as Governor of New Jersey, and landed at Elizabeth in August, 1666. By granting a liberal form of government, in advance of any other colonies well located for agriculture, commerce, fishing, and mining, Carteret and Berkeley attracted settlers not only from England, but from Scotland, New England, and particularly from Long Island and Connecticut. These planters were largely Calvinists from Presbyterian and Congregational communities, and occupied the main land in New Jersey, in the north shore of Monmouth county. The valley of the Delaware remained unsettled. The Calvinists brought with them into East Jersey their distinctive views upon religious and civil matters.

The first Legislative Assembly met at Elizabeth-town on 26 May, 1665. The session lasted four days, and was brought to a close by harmony and strict attention to the business for which the burgesses and representatives were summoned by Governor Carteret. It may be noticed that this assembly passed laws by which twelve distinct offences were made punishable with death. The assembly adjourned sine die, and seven years elapsed before another conference of the colony. New York by the British was, on 30 July, 1673, was followed by the subjection of the surrounding country, including the province of New Jersey. The whole of the territory, however, was restored to the English Crown by the Anglo-Dutch Treaty of 9 February, 1674. The second General Assembly began its sessions on 5 November, 1674, and met concerned in the proper military defence of the province, the institution of regular courts, and the assessment of taxes. A code of capital laws was adopted, similar to that passed in 1668. On 18 March, 1673, Lord Berkeley disposed of his right and interest in the province to John Fenwick and a representative of the men of the ministry of Quakers, or Friends, for the sum of one thousand pounds. John Fenwick received the conveyance in trust for Edward Bylling, and a dispute as to the terms having arisen, William Penn was called in as arbitrator. He gave one-tenth of the province and a considerable sum of money to Fenwick, the remainder of the territory being adjudged to Bylling. In 1678 a division of the Carteret and Berkeley interests occurred. By the "Indenture Quintipartite", dated 1 July, 1786, the line of division was made to extend across the province from Little Egg Harbor to a point in the Delaware River in forty-one degrees N. lat. These divisions were known respectively as East and West Jersey, and the line then fixed was rendered, and the two portions included together under a royal government. After Berkeley's transfer the dominant influence in West Jersey was that of the Society of Friends. Salem was settled in 1675; Burlington, Gloucester, and Trenton about five years later, while within ten years the "shore" communication of Cape May and Tuckerton came into existence. The Society of Friends established in West Jersey a series of communities in which the life of the people was different from that of East Jersey. As East Jersey resembled New England in civil government, so West Jersey resembled Virginia. The political and social centres of the large plantations were the shire towns; slave-holding was common; a landed aristocracy was established there. It is true that the Indians and, under the advice of William Penn and his friends, good faith was kept with the Indians. Capital punishment was practically unknown, and disputes were frequently settled by arbitration.

Two elements of discord marked the genesis of East Jersey and West Jersey. One was external, and arose from the attitude of the Duke of York. As we have already noted, New Jersey was recaptured in 1673 by the Dutch, who held the colony until the early spring of 1674. A question arose as to the Duke of York's title after 1674; reconveyances were made, but in spite of past assurances the duke claimed the proprietary right of government. To that end Sir Edward Andros was appointed Governor of New Jersey, and a climax was reached in 1680 when the proprietary Governor of East Jersey was carried prisoner to New York. In 1681 the Crown recognized the justice of the proprietors' contention, and local government was re-established, but not before the seeds of disaffection were sown that bore fruit in the Revolution and War of American Independence. The contest between the Board of Proprietors and the small landowners. Both in East and West Jersey, Carteret and Berkeley and their assignees had transferred to wealthy combinations of capitalists (mostly non-resistant) much of the broad acreage of the colonies. With the Union of New Jersey in 1702 their right of selection of governors and members of executive councils, which right Carteret and Carteret derived from the Crown, with "quit-rent" agitation in East Jersey, led to much bitterness. Finally, disgusted with turmoil and recognizing the sentiments of revolt entertained by the people, the Boards of Proprietors surrendered to the Crown in 1702 their right of government, retaining only their interest in the soil. The two New Jerseys were now united and the two provinces became the royal colony of New Jersey. Queen Anne appointed Lord Cornbury, Governor of New York and New Jersey, but each continued to have a separate assembly. In 1738 New Jersey petitioned for a distinct administration, and Lewes was elected governor. The population was then about 40,000. The last royal governor was William Franklin, the natural son of Benjamin Franklin. The opening of the Revolution found New Jersey sentiment unevenly crystallized. Few, if any, favoured absolute independence. There were three elements. One, the Tory and conservative element, led by William Franklin, embraced nearly all the Episcopalians, a vast portion of the non-combatant members of the Society of Friends, and some East Jersey Calvinists. Another element was composed of men of various shades of belief, some in favour of continual protest, others desirous of compromise. This included at the outbreak of the struggle most of the Calvinists, some few Quakers of the younger generation, and the Irish and Scotch. The third party drew its support from a few bold, aggressive spirits of influence, whose following included men who believed that war for independence would benefit their fortunes. The part played in the Revolution by New Jersey has been frequently told. The patriots succeeded in winning over Princeton and Trenton; Monmouth and Red Bank are ever-memorable, while the raids at Salem, Springfield, Elizabeth, in the valley of the Hackensack, and the winter at Morris-
town are a part of national history. Lying between New York and Philadelphia, its soil was a theatre where war was at one time the Tory element suppressed, finding its expression in open hostility, or in the barbaric cruelties of the “Pine Robbers” of Monmouth, Burlington, Gloucester, and Salem counties. Though under suspicion, the Society of Friends was neutral, for conscience’ sake, remaining faithful to the teachings of its creed. The source of the struggle found the people of New Jersey jubilant and not disposed to relinquish their sovereignty. The Articles of Confederation were weak and had become a byword and a jest. There was much state pride and much aristocratic feeling among the old families who continued to dominate state politics.

New Jersey History.—Early Missionary Efforts.—The comparative liberality of the proprietary rule of Berkeley and Carteret, especially in religious matters, attracted some Catholic settlers to New Jersey. As early as 1672 we find Fathers Harvey and Gage visiting both Woodbridge and Elizabethtown (then the capital of New Jersey) for the purpose of ministering to the Catholics in those places. Robert Vanquellen, a native of Caen, France, and a Catholic, lived at Woodbridge, and was surveyor general of that section of New Jersey in 1669 and 1670. Catholics were, however, regarded with some suspicion and considerable bigotry at times manifested itself. A Catholic by the name of William Douglass, when elected a rector in 1678, Father Malou died, and he was elected because of his religious convictions, from the General Assembly of 1668. In 1691 the New York Assembly passed the first anti-Catholic enactment, which was followed by laws strongly opposed to Catholics and their beliefs both in New York and New Jersey. Lord Cornbury, appointed governor in 1701, was instructed by Queen Anne to permit liberty of conscience to all persons except “papists”.

The first Catholics in New Jersey were probably those who availed themselves of the grant made by Charles I in 1632 to Sir Edmund Powel, and of Powel’s conveyance in 1634 to Thomas Danby. In this way a Catholic settlement was founded near Salem. The fine clay found at Woodbridge attracted some Catholics to that place as early as 1672. The ship “Philip”, which is said to have brought Carteret to America, also transported several French Catholics, who were skilled as salt makers, to New Jersey. The records show Hugh Dunn and John and James Hannah coming in 1674. Samuel Hannah, in 1830, was unable to bear the toleration which the Catholics were enjoying in the province, endeavored to arouse ill-feeling against them by accusing them of complicity in the “Negro Plot”. In the persecution thus aroused Father John Ury, a Catholic priest (see Flynn, op. cit. in bibliography, pp. 21–2), who had exercised unostentatiously his sacred ministry in New Jersey, and had been engaged for about twelve months in teaching at Burlington, was put to death in New York City, the real cause being the violent hostility of the rabble towards the Catholic name and priesthood. Father Robert Harding arrived in Philadelphia from England in August, 1740, when the City of Brotherly Love contained only 2000 homes. He laboured in New Jersey from 1762 until his death in 1772, at the age of seventy years. Father Ferdinand Farmer, whose family name was Steenmeyer (q. v.), may be considered the true missionary of New Jersey.

In “First Catholics in New Jersey”, in 1744, Father Theodore Schneider, a distinguished Jesuit, published a history in which he visited New Jersey and celebrated Mass at the iron furnaces there. Having some skill in medicine, he was accustomed to cure the body as well as the soul; and travelling about under the name of Doctor Schneider he obtained access to places whither he could not otherwise have gone without great personal danger. Sometimes, however, his real character and discommodities of his profession were discovered in New Jersey. He used to carry in his missionary excursions a manuscript copy of the Roman Missal, carefully written in his own hand. He died on 11 July, 1764. Patrick Colvin seems to have been the only Catholic resident in Trenton in 1776. He was interested in the cause of the patriots, and helped to furnish the boats used to transport General Washington’s army across the Delaware on 25 December, 1776. Captain Michael Kearney, a Catholic, lived near Whippany in Morris County on his large estate, consisting of about one thousand acres, known as “The Irish Lott”. The inscription on his tomb bears witness to his genial hospitality, and to his having served as a transport General Washington’s army across the Delaware on 5 April, 1777. Molly Pitcher (née McCauley), who acquired fame at the Battle of Monmouth, was a Catholic girl. One Pierre Malou, who had been a general in the Belgian Army, was a resident of Princeton from 1785 to 1799; he purchased five hundred acres of land there. John Henry May, who died in 1807, sailed for Europe in order to bring his wife and two sons to New Jersey. On the return voyage his wife died. He returned to Europe, became a lay brother of the Society of Jesus; afterwards he studied theology, and was later raised to the priesthood, came to America again and was stationed in Madison. Father Malou also made his way to New York, and died in 1827, and is buried under St. Peter’s Church in Barclay Street.

When Bishop John Carroll returned from England he received Father John Rossiter, an Augustinian, into his diocese in 1790. On 27 May, 1799, the Augustinians were given permission to establish colleges of the order in the United States. The establishment of missions in New Jersey at Cape May and at Trenton in 1803 and 1805, and at Paterson a little later. St. John’s parish at Trenton, now the parish of the Sacred Heart, was the first parish established in New Jersey (1799). St. Joseph’s Church in Philadelphia was the first parish church for the Catholics of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. The Father Harding above referred to was pastor of this parish, and is said to have been the first priest to have visited New Jersey prior to 1762. St. John’s Church in Newark was built in 1828, and the first pastor was Rev. Gregory Bryan Pardow. Father Pardow was born in Warren County, New Jersey, and was named coadjutor of the first Catholic parish founded in Newark. During and after the terrible famine in Ireland about 1848 a great number of Irish Catholics came to New Jersey. About this time Father Bernard J. McQuaid (q. v.) began his missionary career in New Jersey. He became pastor at Madison in 1848, and had missions at Morristown, Dover, Mendham, Berkeley, and Springfield. His parish extended from Madison to the banks of the Delaware, including Morris, Somerset, Warren, and Sussex Counties, besides Short Hills in Essex and Springfield in Union. He opened the first Catholic school in New Jersey at Madison; built the Church of the Assumption at Morristown; St. Joseph’s at Mendham; and St. Rose’s at Springfield, now removed to Short Hills. He became rector of St. Patrick’s pro-cathedral at Newark in 1855, upon the arrival of the Bulls from Rome appointing James Roosevelt Bayley, first Bishop of Newark; he built Seton Hall College and was its first president, and brought the Sisters of Charity into the Diocese of Newark.

DIOCESES AND CATHOLIC POPULATION.—The State of New Jersey is divided ecclesiastically into the Dioceses of Newark and Trenton, which are treated in separate articles. The total Catholic population of the state is about 500,000.
Legislation on Matters Directly Affecting Religion.—The First Constitution of the State of New Jersey, adopted at the Provincial Congress held at Burlington on 2 July, 1776, was a declaration that no resident inhabitant of this colony shall be denied the enjoyment of any civil right merely on account of his religious principles, but that all persons professing a belief in the faith of any Protestant sect, who shall demean themselves peaceably under the government, as hereby established, shall be capable of being elected into the civil and military stations of the public service, or to sit in either branch of the Legislature, and shall fully and freely enjoy every privilege and immunity enjoyed by others their fellow-subjects. The Constitution agreed upon in convention at Trenton in 1844, and ratified by the people at an election held on 13 August, 1844, guarantees the free exercise of worship, and further provides that "no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust; and no person shall be denied the enjoyment of any civil right merely on account of his religious principles." In it there is no discrimination in favour of Protestants as in the earlier instrument.

The law states that the state preserves the rights of worldly employment or business, except works of necessity or charity, on Sunday. Oaths are administered to all witnesses in courts of justice either by the ceremony of the uplifted hand or on the Bible, except where one declares himself, for conscientious reasons, to be scrupulous concerning the taking of an oath, in which case his solemn affirmation or declaration is accepted. Blasphemy and profanity are prohibited by statute and punishable by fine, while perjury is punished by fine and imprisonment, besides disqualification afterwards on the part of the person convicted to give evidence in any court of justice. The sessions of the Legislature are, through custom, opened by prayer. Caution is required by or before any judge, justice of the peace, or other magistrate administering any oath or legislature. The judge shall be delivered to the said religious society, institution, or organization, or any officer thereof. In Chapter 274 of the Laws of 1910, which makes such licences necessary, it is provided that "nothing in this act contained shall be deemed or taken to render any common law or other marriage, otherwise lawful, invalid by reason of the failure to take out a licence as is herein provided."

With certain limitations, decrees of nullity of marriage may be rendered in all cases, when (1) either of the parties has another wife or husband living at the time of a second or other marriage, (2) the parties are within the degrees prohibited by law, (3) the parties, or either of them, are at the time of marriage physically and incurably impotent, (4) the parties, or either of them, were, at the time of the marriage incapable of consenting thereto, and the marriage has not been subsequently ratified, (5) at the suit of the man, when she was under the age of sixteen years at the time of the marriage, unless such marriage be confirmed by the suit arriving at the marriage, (6) (a) after arriving at the marriage, when she was under the age of eighteen at the time of the marriage, unless such marriage be confirmed by the suit arriving at such age. The decree of nullity of marriage does not render illegal the

Chase, and hold lands, legacies, donations, and other personal property to an amount not exceeding $3000 a year (exclusive of the church edifices, school-houses, parsonages, and lands or other property belonging to the church or erected), and burying-places. The religious corporation may grant and dispose of its real and personal property; but all proceedings, orders, and acts must be those of a majority of the corporation, and not of a less number, and to be valid must receive the sanction of the bishop. Under an Act of the Legislature approved on 11 April, 1908, any Roman Catholic diocese may become a corporation, and be able unlimitedly to acquire and hold real and personal property. The legal corporate title of the Newark diocese is "The Roman Catholic Diocese of Newark"; that of the Trenton Diocese is "The Diocese of Trenton." Church property is exempt from taxation; parsonages and other lands, where the clergymen live, are exempt from taxation; and the lands wherein they stand, are exempt from an amount not exceeding $5000.

Marriage and Divorce.—A revision of the statutes relating to marriage, enacted in 1910, empowers the following officers to perform marriages between such persons as may lawfully enter into the matrimonial relation: the mayor, or his deputy, the pastor of the church, the president of the supreme court, the chancellor and each vice-chancellor, and each judge of the court of common pleas and justice of the peace, recorder and police justice, and mayor of a city, and every "stated and ordained minister of the gospel"; and "every religious society, institution or organization in this State may join together in marriage the person in said society, or when one of such persons is a member of such society, according to the rules and customs of the society, institution or organization to which they or either of them belong." The same act renders absolutely void any marriage within the following prohibited degrees of relationship: "A man shall not marry any of his ancestors or descendants, or of his sister, or the daughter of his brother or sister, or the sister of his father or mother, whether such collateral kindred be of the whole or half blood. A woman shall not marry any of her ancestors or descendants, or her brother, or the son of her brother or sister, or the brother of her father or mother, whether such collateral kindred be of the whole or half blood." Since 1 July, 1910, it is necessary for persons intending to be married to obtain first a marriage licence and deliver the same to the clergyman, magistrate, or person who is to officiate, before the proposed marriage can be lawfully performed; but, if the marriage is to be performed by a priest or minister of the gospel, or clergyman, or organization, the licence shall be delivered to the said religious society, institution, or organization, or any officer thereof. In Chapter 274 of the Laws of 1910, which makes such licences necessary, it is provided that "nothing in this act contained shall be deemed or taken to render any common law or other marriage, otherwise lawful, invalid by reason of the failure to take out a licence as is herein provided."
issue of any marriage so dissolved, except where the marriage is dissolved because either of the parties had another wife or husband living at the time of a second or other marriage. Such marriage shall be deemed void from the beginning, and the issue thereof shall be illegitimate. The grounds for absolute divorce are: (1) adultery; (2) wilful, continued, and obstinate desertion for a term of two years; (3) desertion et thoro may be decreed for (1) adultery; (2) wilful, continued, and obstinate desertion for the term of two years; (3) extreme cruelty in either of the parties. In all cases of divorce a mensa et thoro, the court may decree a separation for ever thereafter, or for a limited time, with a provision that, in case of a reconciliation at any time thereafter, the parties may apply for a restoration of the decree, and upon such application the Court shall make such order.

Wills.—All persons of sound mind and of the age of twenty-one years are legally competent to dispose of property by will. No specific form of words is necessary in a will, but the testator must state in the document that it is his will; and it must be signed, and declared or published, by the testator as his will in the presence of at least two subscribing witnesses. The witnesses must sign in the presence of the testator, and in the presence of each other. A codicil to a will must be made and executed with the same requirements as a will, regarding declaration of its character, signature of witnesses. Wills are legal under some rare circumstances, as in cases of sudden dangerous sickness or accident, in the presence of at least three competent witnesses, and at the request of the person about to die. Devises and bequests may be validly made for charitable and religious purposes and to religious societies.

The parochial corporation statute enables church corporations to hold title to "burying places," and the Diocesan Corporation Act of 1908 makes the diocesan corporation "capable unlimitedly" of acquiring and holding "leases, legacies, devises, moneys, donations, goods and chattels of all kinds, church edifices, school houses, college buildings, seminaries, parsonages, Sisters' houses, hospital, or phan asylum, reformatories and all other kinds of religious, ecclesiastical, educational and charitable institutions, and the lands whereon the same are, or may be erected, and cemeteries or burying places and any lands, tenements and hereditaments suitable for any or all of said purposes, in any place or places in any state or the several parts thereof, to lease, sell, grant, demise, alien and dispose of; . . . to exercise any corporate powers necessary and proper to the carrying out of the above enumerated powers, and to the carrying out of the purposes of such corporation and its institutions."

Education.—A single little Dutch school in Bergen (now Jersey City) in 1662 marked the beginning of the free public school system in New Jersey. That was almost two hundred and fifty years ago and since that time the schools have increased gradually in number and size until, according to the New Jersey School Report of 1909, there are now 2,052 public schools in New Jersey, with a total school capacity of 626,719. The total value of the school property is estimated at $33,900,466.00. There are 11,235 teachers employed, of which 1250 are men and 9985 are women. These receive an average yearly salary of $718.40. For the school year 1908-9 the current expenses of the schools amounted to $11,593,201; the cost of permanent improvement was $986,597, and some 5,221,122.10.

The total appropriation of $17,227,331. The total enrollment of pupils for the same year was 424,534. The state superintendent, at the head of the state department of public instruction, exercises a general supervision over the public school system of the state. He is appointed by the governor, as also is the state board of education, which consists of two members from each congressional district. The county superintendents of schools are appointed by the state board of education. This board also exercises supervision over the different state educational institutions, such for example as the normal schools. Each of the many school districts, into which the state is divided, has its own school or schools, controlled by officers, who are the voters of the district elect. In the larger towns there are superintendents or supervising principals and school-boards, appointed by the mayor.

New Jersey has two state normal schools—one at Trenton and one at Montclair. The school at Trenton was established in 1855 by an Act of the Legislature, and has in connexion with it the State Model School. The Montclair State Normal School was formally opened on 28 September, 1908. The increasing demand for professionally trained teachers, and the inability of the State Normal School at Trenton to meet it, had made another normal school necessary. At Beverly is the Farnum School, a preparatory school associated with the Newport School; at Trenton is the State School for Deaf Mutes; at Bordentown the Manual Training and Industrial School for Colored Youths; and connected with Rutgers College is the State Agricultural College. The principal institutions for higher education in New Jersey are Princeton University at Princeton (founded 1746); Stevens Institute of Technology at Hoboken; Rutgers College at New Brunswick (founded 1766); Queens College, 1766; Bordentown Female College at Bordentown; Saint Peter's College, Jersey City; Saint Benedict's College, Newark; Seton Hall College, South Orange (founded 1856). The three last-mentioned are Catholic institutions. (For full statistics concerning the Catholic schools, see the articles on the Dioceses of Newark and Trenton.)

Newman, John Henry (1801-1890), Cardinal—Deacon of St. George in Velabro, divine, philosopher, man of letters, leader of a Hungarian movement, and the most illustrious of English converts to the Church. b. in the City of London, 21 Feb., 1801, the eldest of six children, three boys and three girls; d. at Edgbaston, Birmingham, 11 Aug., 1890. Over his descent there has been some discussion as regards the paternal side. His father was John Newman, a banker, his mother Eugenia Augusta Founder, of London as engravers and paper-makers. It is stated that the name was at one time spelt Neumann; it is certain that many Jews, English or foreign, have borne it; and the suggestion has been thrown out that to his Hebrew affinities the cardinal owed, not only his cast of features, but some of his decided characteristics, especially in music, mathematics, his dislike of metaphysical speculations, his grasp of the concrete, and his nervous temperament. But no documentary evidence has been found to confirm the suggestion. His French pedigree is undoubtedly. It accounts for the religious training, a modified Calvinism, which he received at his mother's knees; and perhaps it helped towards the
"Lucid concision" of his phrase when dealing with abstruse subjects. His brother Francis William, also a writer, but wanting in literary charm, turned from the English Church to Deism; Charles Robert, the second son, was very erratic, and professed Atheism; one sister was the chief author, for Newman's early thoughts, and for his judgment on the great religious revival known as the Oxford Movement, of which he was the guide, the philosopher, and the martyr. His immense correspondence, the larger portion of which still awaits publication, cannot essentially change our estimate of one who, though subtle to a degree bordering on refinement, was also impulsive and open with his friends, as well as bold in his confidences to the public. From all that is thus known of him we may infer that Newman's greatness consisted in the union of originality, amounting to genius of the first rank, with a deep spiritual temper, the whole manifesting itself in language of perfect purity and unadulterated humanism. His system has a wide range of interest, and in a personality no less winning than sensitive. Among the literary stars of his time Newman is distinguished by the pure Christian radiance that shines in his life and writings. He is the one Englishman of that era who upheld the ancient creed with a knowledge that only theologians possessed in England, and a fervour akin to that of the saints. It is this unique combination that raises him above lay preachers de sanctitate mundi like Thackeray, and which gives him a place apart from Tennyson and Browning. In comparison with him Keble is a light of the sixth magnitude, Pusey but a devout professor, Liddon a less eloquent Laocordaire. Newman occupied in the nineteenth century a position recalling that of Bishop Butler in the eighteenth. As Butler was the Christian champion against Deism, so Newman is the Catholic apologist in an epoch of Agnosticism, and amid theories of evolution. He is, moreover, a poet, and his "Dream of Gerontius" far excels the meditative verse of modern singers by its happy combination of calm and dramatic scenes of the world behind the veil. He was brought up from a child to take great delight in reading the Bible; but he had no formed religious convictions until he was fifteen. He used to wish the Arabic tales were true; his mind ran on unknown influences; he thought life possibly a dream, himself an angel, and that his fellow-angels might be deceiving him with the semblance of a material world. He was "very superstitious", and would cross himself on going into the dark. At fifteen he underwent "conversion", though not quite as Evangelicals practise it; from works of the school of Calvin he gained definite dogmatic ideas; and he rested "in the thought that both the Fancy and the Reason are self-evident beings, myself and my Creator". In other words, personality became the primal truth in his philosophy; not matter, law, reason, or the experience of the senses. Henceforth, Newman was a Christian mystic, and such he remained. From the writings of Thomas Scott of Aston Sandford, to whom he owed much, he learned the doctrine of the Trinity, supporting each verse of the Athanasian Creed with texts from Scripture. Scott's aphorisms were constantly on his lips for years, "Holiness rather than peace", and "Growth only evidence of life". Law's "Serious Call" had on the youth a Catholic or ascetic influence; he was born to be a missionary; thought it God's will that he should lead a single life; was enamoured of quotations from the Fathers given in Milner's "Church History", and, reading Newton on the Prophecies, felt convinced that the pope was Antichrist. He had been at school at Ealing near London from the age of seven. Always thoughtful, shy, and affectionate, he took no part in games, and was the first of his set to rise early, read the Waverley Novels, imitated Gibbon and Johnson, matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, Dec., 1816, and in 1818 won a scholarship of £50 tenable for nine years. In 1819 his father's bank suspended payment, but soon discharged its liabilities in full. Working too hard for his degree, Newman broke down, and gained in 1821 only third-class honours. But his powers could not be hidden. Oriel was then first in reputation and intellect among the Oxford Colleges, and of Oriel he was elected a fellow, 12 April, 1822. He ever felt this to be "the turning point in his life, and of all days most memorable".

In 1821 he had given up the intention of studying for the Bar, and resolved to take orders. As tutor of Oriel, he considered that he had a cure of souls; he was ordained on 13 June, 1824; and at Pusey's suggestion became curate of St. Clement's, Oxford, where he spent two years in parochial activity. And here the views in which he had been brought up disappointed him; "Calvinism was not a key to the phenomina of human nature; it had no effects on the human heart. It would not work. He wrote articles on Cicero, etc., and his first "Essay on Miracles", which takes a strictly Protestant attitude, to the prejudice of those alleged outside Scripture. But he also fell under the influence of Whately, afterwards Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, who, in 1826, made him his vice-president. In 1830, at a meeting of the Congregationalists, he was shot in the leg by a demagogue; at a meeting of the Whig Club, in 1832, he was struck by a whisk, but the man fled. He was then after his own ideas, taught him the notion of Christianitas as a social and sovereign organism distinct from the State, but led him in the direction of "liberal" ideas and nominalistic logic. To Whately's once famous book on that subject Newman contributed. From Hawkins, whom his casting vote made Provost of Oriel, he gained the Catholic doctrine of tradition and baptismal regeneration, as well as a certain precision of terms which, long afterwards, gave rise to Kingsley's misunderstanding of Newman's methods in writing. By another Oxford clergyman he was taught to believe in the Apostolic succession. And Butler's "Analogy", read in 1833, made an era in his religious opinions. A school of men is to say that this deep and searching book became Newman's guide in life, and gave rise not only to the "Essay on Development" but to the "Grammar of Assent". In particular it offered a reflective account of ethics and conscience which confirmed his earliest beliefs in a lawgiver and judge intimately present to the soul. On another line it suggested the sacramental system, or the "Economy", of which the Alexandrians Clement and St. Athanasius are exponents. To sum up, at this formative period the sources whence Newman derived his principles as well as his doctrines were Anglican and Greek, not Roman or German. His Calvinism dropped away; in time he drew from the Roman and Eastern Church, fiercely anti-Arian; and Whately saw the elements of a fresh party in the Church gathering round one whom Oriel had chosen for his intellectual promise, but whom Oxford was to know as a critic and antagonist of the "March of Mind".

His college in 1828 made him Vicar of St. Mary's (the college church), and in its pulpit he delivered the "Parochial Sermons", without eloquence or gesture, for he had no popular gifts, but with a thrilling earnestness and a knowledge of human nature seldom equalled. When published, it was said of them that they "beat all other sermons out of the market as Scott's tales beat all other stories". They were not controversial; and there is little in them to which Catholic theology would object. Their chara
tended style, fertility of illustration, and short sharp energy, have lost nothing by age. In tone they are severe and often melancholy, as if the utterance of an isolated spirit. Though grave and even tender-hearted, Newman's peculiar temper included deep reverence, but the least of his own possessions, as he was a man of impetuous thought and self-denying practice. In 1832 he quarrelled with Dr. Hawkins, who would not endure the pastoral idea which Newman cherished of his college work. He resigned his tutorship, went on a long voyage round the Mediterranean with Froude, and came back to Oxford, where on 14 July, 1833, Keble preached the Assize sermon on "National Apostasy." That day, the anniversary of the French Revolution, gave birth to the Oxford Movement.

Newman's voyage to the coasts of North Africa, Italy, Western Greece, and Sicily (Dec., 1832-July, 1833) was a romantic episode, of which his diaries have preserved the incidents and the colour. In Rome, Newman at the time of the papal catena, as mother of religion to his native land, laid a spell on him never more to be undone. He felt called to some high mission; and when fever took him at Leonforte in Sicily (where he was wandering alone) he cried out, "I shall not die, I have not sinned against the light." Off Cape Ortegal, 11 Dec., 1832, he composed one of the most passionate and original of his poems, which prophesied that the Church would yet reign as in her youth. Recalled in the Straits of Bonifacio, he sought guidance through the tender verses, "Lead, Kindly Light," deservedly treasured by all the English-speaking races. They have been called the marching song of the Tractarian host. But during the earlier stages of that journey it was not clear, even to the leader himself, in what direction they were moving—away from the Revolution, certainly. Reform was in the air: ten Irish bishops had been suppressed; disestablishment might not be far off. There was need of resistance to the enemies without, and of a second, but a Catholic, reformation within. The passive Church must somehow be restored in England.

Others met in committee and sent up an address to Canterbury; Newman began the "Tracts for the Times," as he tells us with a smile, "out of his own head." To him Achilles always seemed more than the host of the Achæans. He took his motto from the Iliad: "They shall know the difference now." Achil-les went down into battle, fought for eight years, won victory upon victory, but was defeated by his own weapons when "Tract 90" appeared, and retired to his tent at Littlemore, a broken champion. Nevertheless, he had done a lasting work, greater than Laud's and Cowley's. If what Newman had resuscitated the Fathers, brought into relief the sacramental system, paved the way for an astonishing revival of long-forgotten ritual, and given the clergy a hold upon thousands at the moment when Erastian principles were on the eve of triumph. "It was so soon after 1830," says Pattison grimly, "that the Tracts desolated Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the Via Media. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the Via Media. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the Via Media. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the Via Media. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the Via Media. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the Via Media. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the Via Media. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the Via Media. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the Via Media. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the Via Media. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the Via Media. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions," which were recurrences on primitive Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the ViaMedia. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets
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PAINTING BY W. W. OULESS—ETCHING BY P.-A. RASON
Two names are associated with a change so momentous—Wiseman and Ward. The "Apologia" does full justice to Wiseman; it scarcely mentions Ward (see Oxford Movement). Those who were looking on might have predicted a collision between the Tractarians and Protestant England, which had forgotten the Caroline divines. This came about on occasion of the Tract 90. It was the least interesting of all Newman's publications. The tract was interdicted to keep stragglers from Rome by distinguishing the corruptions against which the Thirty-Nine Articles were directed, from the doctrines of Trent which they did not assail. A furious and universal agitation broke out in consequence (Feb., 1841). Newman was denounced as a traitor, a Guy Fawkes at Oxford; the University authorities made a mistake in the case and called the tract "an evasion," Dr. Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, mildly censured it, but required that the tracts should cease. For three years condemnations from the bench of bishops were scattered broadcast. To a mind constituted like Newman's, imbued with Ignatian ideas of episcopacy, and unwilling to perceive that they did not avail in the English Establishment, this was an ex cathedra judgment against him. He stopped the tracts, resigned his editorship of "The British Critic," by and by gave up St. Mary's, and retired at Littlemore into lay communion. Nothing is clearer than that, if he had held on quietly, he would have had a wider day. "Tract 90" did go so far as many Anglicans attempt at reconciliation since. The bishops did not dream of coercing him into submission. But he had lost faith in himself. Reading church history, he saw that the Via Media was no new thing. It had been the refuge of the Semarians, without whom Arias could never have flourished. It made the fortune of the Monophysites; it preserved the Church of Alexandria out of the snare and fallen a prey to Mohammed's legions. The analogy which Newman had observed with Dispensary being enforced from another side by Wiseman, writing on the Donatists in "The Dublin Review." Wiseman quoted St. Augustine, "Securus judicat orbis terrarum," which may be interpreted "catholic consent is the judge of controversy." Not antiquity studied in books, not the bare succession of bishops, but the living Church now broke upon him as alone peremptory and infallible. It ever had been so; it must be so still. Nicea, Ephesus, and Chalcedon thus bore witness to Rome. Add to this the grotesque story of the bishops' largesse to the fruit of an alliance with Lutheran Prussia, and the Anglican theory was disproved by facts.

From 1841 Newman was on his death-bed as regarded the Anglican Church. He and some friends lived together at Littlemore in monastic seclusion, under a hard rule which did not improve his delicate health. In February, 1843, he extracted in a local newspaper his severe language towards Rome; in September he resigned his living. With immense labour he composed the "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," in which the apparent variations of dogma, formerly objected by him against the Catholic Church, were explained on a theory of evolution, curiously anticipating on certain points the great work of Darwin. It has many original passages, but remains a fragment. On 9 Oct., 1845, during a period of excited action at Oxford, Newman was received into the Church by Father Dominic, an Italian Passionist, three days after Renan had broken with Saint-Sulpice and Catholicism. The event, although long foretold, found the world and the Church by. Its importance was felt; its causes were not known. Hence an estrangement which only the exquisite candour of Newman's self-delineation in the "Apologia" could entirely heal.

His conversion divides a life of almost ninety years into equal parts—the first more dramatic and its perspective ascertained; the second as yet imperfectly told, but spent for a quarter of a century sub luce magnam, under suspicion from one side or another, his plans thwarted, his motives misconstrued. Called by Wiseman to Oscott, near Birmingham, in 1846, he proceeded in October to Rome, and was there ordained by Cardinal Fransoni. The Pope approved of his scheme for establishing in England the Oratory of St. Philip Neri; in 1847 he came back, and, besides setting up the London house, took mission work in Birmingham. Thence he moved out to Edgbaston, where the community still resides. A large school was added in 1858. The spacious Renaissance church, consecrated in 1858, is a memorial of the forty years during which he made his home in that place. After his "Sermons to Mixed Congregations," which exceed in vigour and irony all others published by him, the Oratorian recluse did not strive to gain a footing in the capital of the Midlands. He always felt "paucorum honorum sum"; his charm was not for the multitude. As a Catholic he began enthusiastically. His "Lectures on Anglican Difficulties" were heard in London by large audiences; "Loss and Gain," though not much of a story, abounds in happy strokes and personal touches; "Callista" recalls his voyage in the Mediterranean by many delightful pages; the sermon at the Synod of Oscott entitled "The second Spring" has care and delicate touches which any reader may know it by heart. "When Newman made up his mind to join the Church of Rome," observes R. H. Hutton, "his genius bloomed out with a force and freedom such as it never displayed in the Anglican communion." And again, "In irony, in humour, in eloquence, in imaginative force, the writings of the later years, as we may call them, by far surpass the writings of his theological apprenticeship." But English Catholic literature also gained a persuasive voice and a classic dignity of which hitherto there had been no example.

His own secession, preceded by that of Ward (amicable conflicts of the angriest kind at Oxford), and followed by many others, had alarmed Englishmen. In 1850 came the "Papal Aggression," by which the country was divided into Catholic sees, and a Roman cardinal announced from the Flaminian Gate his commission to "govern" Westminster. The nation went mad with excitement. Newman delivered in the Corn Exchange, Birmingham, his "Lectures on the Position of England in the Universal Church" (he wrote them from start to finish and, to George Eliot's amazement, they revealed him as a master of humorous, almost too lively sketches, witty and scornful of the great Protestant tradition. An apostate Italian priest, Achilli, was haranguing against the Church. Prompted by Wiseman, the Oratorian gave particulars of this man's infamous career, and Achilli brooded over the charge of libel. Newman, at enormous expense, collected evidence which fully justified the accusations he had made. But a no-papery jury convicted him. He was fined £100; on appeal, the verdict was quashed; and "The Times" admitted that a miscarriage of justice had taken place when Newman was declared guilty. Catholics all the world over came to his relief. His thanks are on record in the dedication of his Dublin "Lectures." But he always remembered that to Wiseman's haste and carelessness he owed this trial.

There was much more trouble awaiting him. The years from 1851 to 1870 brought disaster to a series of noble projects in which he aimed at serving religion and the Church. He was expelled from the Congregation of the "Godless" colleges in 1847, to undertake a university of their own. Neither men nor ideas were forthcoming; the State would not sanction degrees conferred by a private body; nevertheless, an attempt could be made; and Newman was appointed rector, November, 1851. Three years passed...
as in a dream; in 1854 he took the oath. But he had, in 1852, addressed Ireland on the "Idea of a University" with such a largeness and liberality of view as Oxford, if we may believe Pattison, had never taught him. The "Lectures" end abruptly; they gave him less satisfaction than any other of his works; yet, in conjunction with his brilliant short papers in the "University Magazine", and academic dissertations to the various "Schools" they exhibit a range of thought, an urbanity of style, and a pregnant wit, such as no living professor could have rivalled. They are the best defence of Catholic educational theories in any language; a critic perhaps would describe them as the Via Media between an obscurantism which tramples on the rights of knowledge and a Free-Thought which will not hear of any limitation. He died in 1854, in poverty and melancholy; they defended the teaching of the classics against a French Puritan clique led by the Abbé Gaume. This was pretty much all that Newman achieved during the seven years of his "Campaign in Ireland". Only a few native or English students attended the house in St. Stephen's Green. The bishops were divided, and Archbishop MacHale opposed a severe non possumus to the rector's plans. In administration difficulties sprang up; and though Newman won the friendship of Archbishop Cullen and Bishop Moriarty, he was not always treated with due regard. The status of titular bishop had been promised him; for reasons which he never learnt, the promise fell through. His feeling toward the Church and the world became more and more acute; but at 1858, he retired from the rectorship. Its labours and anxieties had told upon him. Another large enterprise, to which Cardinal Wiseman invited him only to balk his efforts, was likewise a failure—the revision of the English Catholic Bible. Newman had selected a company of revisors and had begun to accumulate material when a small publishing house pleaded on the other side, and Wiseman, whose intentions were good, but evanescent, allowed them to wreck this unique opportunity.

During the interval between 1854 and 1860 Newman had passed from the convert's golden favours into a state which resembled criticism of prevailing methods in church government and education. His friends included some of a type known to history as "Liberal Catholics". Of Montalembert and Lacordaire he wrote in 1864: "In their general line of thought and conduct I enthusiastically concur and consider them to be before their age." He speaks of "the unchildish aims, the thwarted projects, the unquenchable manly aspiration found in their "Lettres"...". That moving description might be applied to Newman himself. He was intent on the problems of the time and not alarmed at Darwin's "Origin of Species". He had been made aware by German scholars, like Acton, of the views entertained at Munich; and he was keenly sensitive to the difference between North and South and the delicate questions of policy or discipline. He looked beyond the immediate future; in a lecture at Dublin on "A Form of Infidelity of the Day" he seems to have anticipated what is now termed "Modernism", condemning it as the ruin of dogma. It is distressing to imagine what Newman's horror would have been, had his intuition availed to tell him that, in little more than half a century, a "form of infidelity" so much like what he predicted would claim him as its originator; on the other hand, he would surely have taken comfort, could he also have foreseen that the soundness of his faith was to be so vindicated as it has been by Bishop O'Dwyer, of Limerick, and above all, the vindication so approved of by his apostolic successors. In March, 1908, to that bishop. In another lecture, on "Christianity and Scientific Investigation", he provides for a concordat which would spare the world a second case of Galileo. He held that Christian theology was a deductive science, but physics and the like were inductive; therefore collision between them need not, and in fact did not really occur. He resisted in principle the notion that historical evidence could do away with the necessity of faith as regards creeds and definitions. He deprecated the intrusion of amateurs into divinity; but he was anxious that laymen should take their part in the movement of intellect. This led him to encourage J. M. Capes in founding the "Rambler" and H. Wilberforce in editing the "Westminster Review". But likewise it brought him face to face with a strong reaction from the earlier liberal policy of Pius IX. This new movement, powerful especially in France, was eagerly taken up by Ward and Manning, who now influenced Wiseman as he sank under a fatal disease. Their quarrel with J. H. N. (as he was then generally called) was not quite ended, but it was bated; but much embittered correspondence is left which proves that, while no point of faith divided the parties, their dissensions threw back English Catholic education for thirty years.

These misunderstandings turned on three topics:—the "scientific" history which was cultivated by the "Rambler", with Newman's partial concurrence; the proposed oratory at Oxford; and the temporal power, then at the crisis of its fate. Newman's editorship of the "Rambler", accepted, on request of Wiseman, by way of compromise, lasted only two months (May—July, 1859). His article, "On Consulting the Laity in Matters of Doctrine", was denounced with horror at Rome, but nothing was done. Wiseman's residence in Menevia. Leave was given for an Oratorian house at Oxford, provided Newman did not go thither himself, which defeated the whole plan. A sharp review of Manning's "Lectures on the Temporal Power" was attributed to Newman, who neither wrote nor inspired it; and these two illustrious Catholics were never again clearly to their interest; but they were not temporally powerful; his fears were justified; but prevision and the politics of the day could not well be united. Of all Christians then living this great genius had the deepest insight into the future; but to his own generation he became as Jeremiah announcing the fall of Jerusalem. Despondency was his prevailing mood when, in January, 1864, from an unexpected quarter, the chance of his life was given him. Charles Kingsley, a bold, picturesque, but fiercely anti-Catholic writer, dealing, in"Macmillan's Magazine", with J. A. Froude's "History of England", let fall the remark that "Truth, for its own sake, had never been a virtue with the Roman clergy. Father Newman sometimes suggests that it is God's will that involves not to be; that cunning is the weapon which heaven has given to the Saints wherein to withstand the brute male force of the wicked world which marries and is given in marriage. Whether his notion be doctrinally correct or not, it is at least historically so." These assertions had no foundation whatever in fact. Newman demanded formal acknowledgment of the Oxford sermons generally; he withdrew his charge in terms that left its injustice unreproved; and thus he brought on himself, in the pamphlet which his adversary published, one of the most cutting replies, ironical and pitiless, known to literature. He returned to the assault. "What then does Dr. Newman mean?" was his question. The answer came in the shape of an "Apologia pro Vita sua", which, while pulverizing enemies of the Kingsley stamp, lifted Newman to a height above all his detractors, and added a unique specimen of religious autobiography to our language. Issued in seven parts, between 21 April and 2 June, 1864, the book was worked at as of old in the Abbey of St. Mary de Moot, in London, under the direction of Father Lane, who was its editor. Materials in expectation of some such opportunity had been collecting since 1862. But the duel which led up to an account of Newman's most intimate feelings exhibited sword-play the like of which can be scarcely found outside Pascal's "Provincial
Letters" and Lessing's "Anti-Goeze". It annihilated the opponent and his charge. Not that Newman cherished a personal animosity against Kingstaley, whom he had never met. His tone was determined by a sense of what he owed to his own honour and the Catholic priesthood. "Away with you, Mr. Kingstaley, and fly into space!", were his parting words to a man who was not the more conciliary thing in the world to encounter. Then the old Tractarian hero told the story of his life. He looked upon it with the eye of an artist, with self-knowledge like that of Hamlet, with candour, and pathos, and awe; for he felt a guiding power throughout which had brought him home. The handling was unaffected, the portraits of Oxford celebrities true and lusty, the line sharp and dry. In 1848, "it is interesting to see and to ponder on the conquering of place and power at St. Mary's moved on with a tragic interest. His brief prologues are among the jewels of English prose. A word from St. Augustine converted him, and its poignant effects could not be surpassed in the "Confessions" of the saint himself. The soliloquy, as we may term it, which describes Newman's attitude since 1845, presents in a lofty view his apology, which is not a surrender, to those Catholics who mistrusted him. Though he never would discuss the primary problems of Theism ex professo, he has dwelt on the apparent chaos of history, goodness defeated and mortal efforts futile, with a piercing eloquence which reminds us of some lament in Shakespeare. Newman teaches that in the struggle of the ages, the victors are not the men who are to be dealt with the greatest, but that there is a principle and power with a will, a resolve to stand by experience; and a subtlety of expression corresponding to his fine analysis. He believed in "implicit" logic, varied and converging proofs, indirect demonstration (ex impossibili or ex absurdo) a assent, in short, in not a mechanical echo of the age but an echo of a new world, which his faith had revealed in its journey towards the old faith wherein lay the charm that drew it on. Reality became more fascinating than romance, the problem which staggered Protestants and modern minds—how to reconcile individual genius with tradition, private judgment with authority—was resolved in Newman's great example.

Amid acclamation from Catholics, echoing the "aves vehement" of the world outside, he turned to the philosophy which would justify his action. He began the "Grammar of Assent". Still, Manning, now archbishop, Talbot, chamberlain of Pius IX, W. E. Gladstone, dispassionate, polemics and technical arguments, a living soul had revealed in its journey towards the old faith wherein lay the charm that drew it on. Reality became more fascinating than romance, the problem which staggered Protestants and modern minds—how to reconcile individual genius with tradition, private judgment with authority—was resolved in Newman's great example.

Under these impressions he sent to his bishop, W. B. Ullathorne, a confidential letter in which he branded, not the Fathers of the Council, but the journalists and other partisans outside who were abounding in violent language, as "an insolent and aggressive faction". The letter was surreptitiously made public; a heated controversy ensued; but Newman took no further part in it. That was one of the most difficult matters of the dogmatic definitions; and in 1874 he defended the Church against Gladstone's charge that "Vaticanism" was equivalent to the latest fashions in religion (see his "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk"). Newman's demeasure towards authority was ever one of submission; but, as he wrote to Phillips de Gray the Queen's Serjeant, he "defended the Church, with sympathy with parties, or extreme opinions of any kind. In recommending the Creed he would employ "a wise and gentle minimisation", not extenuating what was true but setting down nought in malice. The "Grammar of Assent" illustrates and defends this method, in which human nature is not left out of account. It is curiously Baconian, for it eschews abstractions and metaphysics, being directed to the problem of concrete affirmation, its motives in fact, and its relation to the personality of the individual. This hitherto unexplored province of apologetics lay dark, while the objective reasons for assent had engaged attention; we might term it the casuistry of the future. Newman wrote that it "is in all acquaintance with the human heart, which has its own; a resolve to stand by experience; and a subtlety of expression corresponding to his fine analysis. He believed in "implicit" logic, varied and converging proofs, indirect demonstration (ex impossibili or ex absurdo) a assent, in short, in not a mechanical echo of the age but an echo of a new world, which his faith had revealed in its journey towards the old faith wherein lay the charm that drew it on. Reality became more fascinating than romance, the problem which staggered Protestant and modern minds—how to reconcile individual genius with tradition, private judgment with authority—was resolved in Newman's great example.

As a sequel and crown to the "Development" this often touching volume (which reminds us of Pascal) completes the author's philosophy. Some portions of it he is said to have written ten times, the last chapter many times more. Yet that chapter is already in part antiquated. The general description, the history of, for instance, several centuries, is not all objections. How far it bears on Kant's "Practical Reason" or the philosophy of the will as developed by Schopenhauer, has yet to be considered. But we must not torture it into the "pragmatism" of a later day. As Newman held by dogma in revelation, so he would never have denied that the mind enjoys a vision of truth founded on reason. He was a mystic, not a sceptic. To him the reason by which he judged himself was "implicit" rather than "explicit", but reason nevertheless. Abstractions do not exist; but the world is a fact; our own personality cannot be called in question; the will is a true cause; and God reveals Himself in conscience. Apologetics, to be persuasive, should address the individual; for real assents, however multiplied, are each single existences. Even a universal creed becomes in this way a private acquisition. As the "Development" affords a counterpart to Bossuet's "Variations", so the "Grammar" may be said to have reduced the "personal equation" in controversy to a working hypothesis, whereas in Protestant hands it had served the purposes of anarchy.

For twenty years Newman lay under imputations at Rome, which misconstrued his teaching and his character. This, which has been called the ostracism of a saintly genius, undoubtedly was due to his former friends, Ward and Manning. In February, 1878,
Plutarch died; and, by a strange conjunction, in that same month Newman returned to Oxford as Honorary Fellow of Trinity College, "dear to him from undergraduate days". The event provoked Catholics to emulation. Moreover, the new pope, Leo XIII, had also lived in exile from the Curia since 1846, and the Virgilian sentiment "Haud ignara malo" would come home to him. The Duke of Norfolk and other English peers approached Cardinal Manning, who submitted their strong representation to the Holy See. Pope Leo, it is alleged, was already considering how he might distinguish the aged Oratorian. He intimated, accordingly, in February, 1879, his intention of bestowing on Newman the cardinal's hat. The message affected him to tears, and he exclaimed that the cloud was lifted from him forever. By singular ill-fortune, Manning understood certain delicate phrases in Newman's reply as declining the purple; he allowed that statement to appear in "The Times", much to everyone's confusion. However, the end was come. After a hazardous journey, and in broken health, Newman arrived in Rome. He was created Cardinal-Deacon of the Title of St. George, on 12 May, 1879. His higher speech, equal to the occasion in grace and wisdom, declared that he had been the life-long enemy of Liberalism, or "the doctrine that there is no truth in religion, but that one creed is as good as another", and that Christianity is "but a sentiment and a taste, not an objective fact, not miraculous".

Hitherto, in modern times, no simple priest, without duties in the Roman Curia, had been raised to the Sacred College. Newman's elevation, hailed by the English nation and by Catholics everywhere with unexampled enthusiasm, was rightly compared to that of Beatrizar after the Council of Florence. It broke down the wall of partition between Rome and England. To the many addresses which poured in upon him the cardinal replied with such point and felicity as often made his words gems of literature. He had revised all his writings, the last of which dealt somewhat tentatively with Scripture problems. Now his hand would serve him no more, but his mind kept its clearness always. In "The Dream of Gerontius" (1865), which had been nearly a lost masterpiece, he anticipated his dying hours, threw into concentrated, almost Dantean, verse and imagery his own beliefs as suggested by the Offices of Requiem, and looked forward to his final pilgrimage, "alone to the Alone". Death came with little suffering, on 11 Aug., 1890. His funeral was a great public event. He lies in the same grave with Ambrose St. John, whom he called his "life under God for thirty-two years". His device as cardinal, taken from St. Francis de Sales, was Cor ad cor loquitur (Heart speaketh to heart); it reveals the secret of his eloquence, unaffected, graceful, tender, and penetrating. On his epitaph we read: Ecce umbrae et imaginibus invisibilis (From shadows and symbols into the truth); it is the doctrine of the Economy, which goes back to Plato's "Republic" (bk. VII), and which passed thence by way of Christian Alexandria into the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas, the poetry of the Florentine, and the schools of Oxford. John Henry Newman thus continues in modern literature the Catholic tradition of East and West, sealing it with a martyr's faith and suffering, steadfast in loyalty to the truth, while discerning with a prophet's vision the task of the future.

As a writer of English prose Newman stands for the perfect embodiment of Oxford, deriving from Cicero the lucid and leisurely art of exposition, from the Greek tragedians a thoughtful refinement, from the Fathers a preference for personal above scientific teaching, from Shakespeare, Hooker, and that older school the use of idiom at its best. He refused to acquire German; he was unacquainted with Goethe as with Hegel; he took some principles from Coleridge, perhaps indirectly; and, on the whole, he never went beyond Aristotle in his general views of education. From the Puritan narrowness of his first twenty years he was delivered when he came to know the Church as essential to Christianity. Then he enlarged that conception till it became Catholic and Roman, an historical idea realised. He made no attempt, however, to widen the Oxford basis of learning, dated 1830, which remained his position, despite continual reading and study. The Scholastic theology, except on its Alexandrian side, he left untouched; there is none of it in his "Lectures", none in the "Grammar of Assent". He wrote forcibly against the shallow enlightenment of Brougham; he printed no word concerning Darwin, or Huxley, or even Celsus. He lamented the fall of Dollinger; but he could not acquiesce in the German idea by which, as it was in fact applied, the private judgment of historians overruled the Church's dogmas. Conscience to him was the inward revelation of God, Catholicism the outward and objective. This twofold force he opposed to the agnostic, the rationalist, the mere worshipping. But he seems to have thought men premature who undertook a positive reconciliation between faith and science, or who attempted by a vaster synthesis to heal the modern conflicts with Rome. He left that duty to a later generation; and, though by the principle of development and the philosophy of concrete assent providing room for it, he did not contribute towards its fulfilment in detail. He will perhaps be known hereafter as the Catholic Bishop Butler, who extended the "Analogy" drawn from experience to the historical Church, proving it thus to be in agreement with the nature of things, however greatly transcending the visible scheme by its message, institutions, and purpose, which are alike supernatural.

The best authorities on Newman are his own writings: Collected Works (36 vols., popular ed., London, 1885); My Campus in Ireland (London, 1858); Meditations and Devotions (London, 1885); Addresses and Replies (London, 1906) (the last three posthumous, ed. by Neville); Letters and Correspondence (1855). E.g. ANNE MOSLEY (London, 1891). See also monographs by Hutton (London, 1891); BARRY (London, 1904); Baxendall (Paris, 1907); Lilly in Dict. of Nat. Biography, s. v.; and useful: Wilphord Ward, W. H. Ward and the Oxford Movement (London, 1889); IORM, Life and Times of Cardinal Newman (London, 1897); Purcell, Life and Writings of Newman (London, 1895); DE Lisle and Purcell, Life and Times of Ambrose Philipps de Lisle (London, 1900); Garskett, Lord Adon and his Order (London, 1898); with caution T. MOSLEY, Reminiscences of Newman (London, 1892). See also bibliography under Oxford Movement.
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