



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



MONKS

93

AND THEIR

DECLINE.



By Rev. George Zurcher, Pastor of St. Joseph's Church,
Buffalo, N. Y.

1898.



*Price 25 cents. Ten copies \$1.50. Send to Rev. George Zurcher,
Buffalo, N. Y.; to J. F. Judge of "The Index," Scranton,
Pa.; or to Archie McLean, Silver Creek, N. Y.*

Nothing distinguishes this generation more than its determination to have the truth. Shams and hypocrites are being stripped bare in every land. Individuals no longer deceive by gorgeous attire. Priest or layman must alike to-day be judged by cold actuality. A lens of such power as was not conceived of in olden times is held over every man and every act, in this hour; this lens is the press through which the public gaze is focussed.—*John Brisben Walker to Catholic University Students in 1891.*

EX
2431
.296

Copyright 1898.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.



ORIGINAL MONKS.

The first Christian monks were called Therapeutæ.¹ Their order was founded near Alexandria in Egypt by St. Mark the evangelist. They ate but once a day, and abstained totally from meat and wine.² Nursing the sick may have been one of their principal occupations. The persecutions of the first three centuries made it quite impossible for this order to last. St. Pachomius, the great founder of monasticism, was born in Egypt about 292. One hundred years after his death Egypt alone had 50,000 monks following his rule,³ which has been translated into Latin by St. Jerome.

For centuries total abstinence from intoxicants was one of the fundamental rules for all monks. No. 45 of St. Pachomius's rule says: "Outside of the infirmary no one shall touch wine." No. 42 of the rule would prevent a cunning monk from turning the infirmary into a Raines-law tavern. It says: "Let no

¹ Servants or healers.

² Allardi Gazæi. Commentarius. Migne's Lat. Fathers, vol. 49.

³ It is found entire in the works of St. Jerome and in Migne's Lat. Fathers, vol. 23.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

one enter the infirmary unless he be sick. Whoever shall be taken sick must be conducted to the infirmary by the superior. . . . Neither can one who is convalescing enter the cell of victuals, and eat what he desires unless he be accompanied by the infirmarian."¹ The rule of St. Pachomius spread through Palestine, Greece, Dalmatia, Ireland, France, England, Scotland, and Germany.

The rule of St. Basil, another famous founder of an order of monks, is equally emphatic on the drink question. It says: "The drinking of water, which is natural and answers a necessary want, is promulgated for all."² "A monk must first of all abstain from the company of women and from the use of wine."³

Chapter XIV of the rule ascribed to St. Anthony the hermit says: "Stay not where wine is served; nor ever eat any meat."

Of the monks of the Jordan we are told that "the Word of God was their inexhaustible supply of food;

¹ When a monk obtained permission to visit his family in case of imminent death among his near relatives, he had to be accompanied by another monk, and No. 54 of the rule prescribed that "whilst outside of the monastery they shall not taste wine nor anything else which they are not in the habit of eating in the monastery."

² *Rugula Fus.* cap. 19.—St. Basil was born in Cesarea in 329. The present monks, who in the Catholic and in the Greek churches follow a portion of his rule, are called Basilian monks.

³ St. Basil. *Sermo de Asceti.*—The word asceticism comes from a Greek word which means gladiator.

ORIGINAL MONKS.

and to the body they allowed only what is necessary, bread and water."¹

The first Bishop of Tours, St. Martin, who was a friend of St. Patrick, made rules for thousands of monks in Gaul, of whom it was written: "None knew wine unless he was compelled by infirmity."² St. Leander permitted wine to the infirm only.³

The monks of Bohemia were so abstemious that they did not even drink much water: "It is well known to everybody that the monks use no other drink but water. Water even is given plentifully to the sick only; to others it is measured out."⁴ The Scythian monks "never knew wine, not even when suffering the severest illness."⁵

St. Wunebald refused to build his monastery at Mainz in Germany, because he feared that the wine-drinking custom of that place might relax the strictness of his monastic rule.⁶ The monks of Lerins, founded by St. Honoratus between 400 and 410 in the south of France, followed the Egyptian rule⁷, which was that of St. Pachomius. In 590 St. Columban, accompanied by Gall, Mang, Theodore, Sigbert, and eight other Irish monks and total abstainers, started

¹ *Vita S. Mariæ Ægyptiacæ.* Boll. April 2.

² Severus Sulpicius.

³ *Lib. de Institutione Virginum*, cap. 9.

⁴ *Vita S. Godehardi.* Boll. May.

⁵ Peter Damian in *Vita Romualdi.*

⁶ *Hist. Gallic. Ord. S. B. L.* IV.

⁷ Heimbucher. *Die Orden der Kath. Kirche*, vol. 1, p. 70.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

out from their Irish monastery at Bangor to spread their own strict monastic rule in France, Switzerland, and even on the threshold of Italy.¹

St. Athanasius² writes in his life of St. Anthony the hermit: "Of meat and wine I better make no mention, because nearly all monasteries never have anything of the kind." St. Augustin says of monks: "In order to better subdue the passions, the monks abstain not only from meat and wine, but also from such things as are apt to excite the appetite of the stomach or of the throat."³

In the course of time the Greek monks remained more faithful to total abstinence than their Latin brethren: "Wine is not made for monks who are trying to live for God," said Abbot Xoium.⁴ An old and famous rule of unknown authorship says: "Meat and wine or intoxicating drinks must be rejected by monks, and are not desirable for those to whom the world is crucified for Christ, and who are crucified to the world."⁵

¹ Ibid, p. 79.—Among other monasteries they founded those of Luxeuil in Burgundy, of St. Gall in Switzerland, and of Bobbio between Milan and Germany.

² St. Athanasius formulated the Athanasian creed at the Council of Nice in 325. In the following year he became Bishop of Alexandria; but the most of his 47 years as bishop were spent in exile through Gaul, Italy, and other countries.

³ De Mor. Eccl. cap. 31.—The Augustinian monks, though not much addicted to total abstinence, were called after St. Augustin, who died in 430 as bishop of Hippo in Africa.

⁴ Mon. Eccl. Græc. T. I.

⁵ Regula Cujusdam. Migne's Lat. Fathers, vol. 66.

ST. BENEDICT'S BREAK.

St. Jerome writes: "I will not speak of my food and drink in those days, since even the weak monks are used to cold water, and look upon anything cooked as a luxury."¹ To conclude with St. Augustin concerning total abstinence of monks during the first centuries of christianity: "Anyone who reads the lives of the saints, especially the monks of the desert, cannot fail to see that they observed a perpetual abstinence from meat and wine."²

If St. Augustin and St. Jerome had met our Benedictine monks, who run a brewery near Pittsburg, they would have looked upon them as clowns, or denounced them as frauds.

St. Benedict, an Italian monk who died in 543, dealt a severe blow to total abstinence among monks with his famous rule allowing a hemina³ of wine per

¹ *Epistola de Austeritate sua in Eremo.*—St. Jerome was born in Dalmatia in 331, was commissioned by the Pope to make a translation of the Bible into Latin from the best versions in other languages. After years of toil and travel he brought forth the Latin Vulgate which is the standard version of the Bible in the Catholic church.

² *De Mor. Eccl.*, cap. 31.

³ It is strange that the disciples of St. Benedict cannot accurately describe the size of a hemina. The weight of a hemina of wine varies, according to the interpreters of the Benedictine rule, from seven to thirty-five ounces. Hildemar, one of the best interpreters, writes: "Charlemagne sent to St. Benedict's monastery for the original hemina, which was found, and according to which the wine is now dealt out to the monks here." Two years after the death of Charlemagne, Louis I, at the council of Aix in 816, provided "that each nun should receive in these wine-producing regions three pounds of wine per day."—*Concil. Germ. T. I.*, p. 533. This would indicate that the hem-

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

day to each monk. This rule, which is astonishingly lax when compared with its predecessors, spread to such an extent that in 1203, when the Scotch monastery of Iona submitted to it, the Benedictine rule had become the almost universal rule for monks in the Western church. Chapter 40 of the Benedictine rule is entitled: "The Measure of Drink." It reads thus: "Every one hath his proper gift from God; one after this manner and another after that. And therefore it is with some scrupulosity that we determine the measure of food for others. However, considering the imbecility of the sickly-minded,¹ we believe a hemina of wine per day sufficient for each one. But let those to whom God has given the strength of abstinence know that a special reward awaits them."²

ina contained about three pints. It seems that the bishops at the council of Aix did not agree with the King, because they prescribed to the nuns the following extract from a letter of St. Jerome: "In so far as it is in my power to give you a counsel, if you believe one who is experienced, I advise first of all, and I solemnly declare that a spouse of Christ should shun wine like poison." Ibid, p. 517.

¹ One interpreter translated *infirmorum imbecilitatem* into weakness of the infirm, and claimed that the rule prescribed wine for the sick only; but a host of wine-loving monks quickly overwhelmed him by referring him to that part of the rule which declares that "the monk who arrives late to the meal forfeits his wine." They claimed, with apparent reason, that the rule intended wine for all monks who were prompt at their meals.

² This part of the rule is weak and confusing. Those who have received "from God the strength of abstinence" would deserve a special punishment for not being total abstainers; and those who have not received "from God the strength of abstinence" would be foolhardy in making any attempt at to-

ST. BENEDICT'S BREAK.

However, if on account of the necessity of the place, or labor or heat of summer, a larger measure should be required, let it be determined by the prior¹, who is careful in all, that satiety and inebriety may not glide in. Although we read that wine was not at all made for monks; nevertheless, since in our times it is hard to convince the monks of this, let us at least agree to this, that we shall not drink to the point of satiety, but less; because wine drives even the wise into apostasy. But where the necessity of the locality makes it evident that the above mentioned measure cannot be had, but much less, or even none at all, let those who live there bless God, and not murmur."²

Hildemar, one of the best interpreters of the Benedictine rule, says: "It is good to abstain from wine without the consent of the abbot; however, it is better to drink a little wine in order to avoid human praise."³ It seems that no provision was made for those to whom "God had given the strength of abstinence." Popes or church authorities in Rome have

tal abstinence. The rule has not even a hint as to how a monk might find out whether "God has given him the strength of abstinence."

¹ "The necessity of place, labor, or heat" must have furnished plentiful excuses to the priors for increasing the hemina. Some priors tried to lessen the hemina. Hildemar, for instance, says that "the measure of wine must be lessened for him whom the hemina causes to vacillate in speech or in gait."—Migne's Lat. Fathers, vol. 66, p. 645. Why did not Hildemar make an effort to find out whether "God had given the power of abstinence" to those who were vacillating in speech or in gait?

² Migne's Latin Fathers, vol. 66.

³ Ibid, p. 652.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

almost overwhelmed the Benedictine order with sanctions and privileges. Was it proper that Italians should have contributed so much towards the spreading of wine-drinking habits in countries where intoxicants are about twenty times more injurious to life and morals than in Italy?¹ With the spread of St. Benedict's rule, total abstinence seemed doomed. However, for two centuries after St. Benedict's death the friends of total abstinence kept up a struggle in which the Irish monks took the lead.

In the monasteries of St. Comgall in Ireland "the meal consisted of nothing but bread and water and vegetables; milk and other victuals were unknown to both sight and taste until, upon the advice of St. Finbar, milk was allowed to the aged and the infirm."² The same is related of Abbot Fintan's disciples. The monks of Lindisfarne, England, were total abstainers until they received into their monastery King Ceolwulf, who died in 760. "When the King became a monk he had the rule changed so as to allow the monks of Lindisfarne to drink wine or beer. Up to that time they were in the habit of drinking only milk and water according to the an-

¹ In 1842 Father Mathew wrote to Dr. Cullen in Rome: "If his Holiness was aware of the awful state to which the people of Ireland were reduced by the use of intoxicating liquor, he would not hesitate to renounce it altogether."—*Rec. of Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.* quoted in *Griffin's Journal*, March, 1898.

² *Bollandists*, May 10.—Comgall had 3,000 monks under his guidance in different monasteries, of which Bangor was the principal one.

OPPOSITION TO ST. BENEDICT'S HEMINA.

cient tradition of St. Aidan, the first superior of that church and monastery."¹

St. Columban and his twelve companions had transplanted their total abstinence principles from Ireland into many French monasteries, when another Irishman, St. Boniface, established total abstinence in the land of the Teutons.² In a letter to Pope Zachary St. Boniface said of his monks: "They are men of strict abstinence, without meat and wine, without beer and servants, satisfied with the labor of their own hands."³ If the popes had lived in a colder climate than Italy, the Irish monks might have converted the whole civilized race to total abstinence.

The following total abstinence rule for the German monks would have remained in force much longer if kings in those times had not been self-constituted regulators of church discipline. "In the year after building the church at Fulda,⁴ St. Boniface,

¹ Simon Dunelmensis. *Hist. de Reg. Angl. ad ann. 854.*—Columba, a disciple of St. Fimian of Maghbie, started in 546 the monastery of Tironell. In 563 he founded the Scotch monastery of Hy or Iona which produced such founders of total abstinence monasteries as Finan of Clonenagh, and Aidan of Lindisfarne, England.

² After having started a monastery in Hessa and one in Thuringia, he called to his assistance other Irish monks among whom were Lul, Boniface's successor as archbishop; Burchard, bishop of Wurtzburg; and Wigbert, first abbot of Fritzlar.

³ Migne's *Lat. Fathers*, vol. 66, p. 709.

⁴ Boniface founded the monastery of Fulda in 744, upon land granted to him by Charlemagne, and placed it in charge of his friend and disciple, Sturm.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

bishop, went there again, and stayed several days in the new monastery. He incessantly instructed the new monks on the discipline of the monastic rule according to the tradition of Holy Scripture. After having explained the sacred Scriptures to the brethren, and read to them that wine was not at all for monks, it was decreed, with the consent of all, that among them no kind of strong drink which might inebriate, but soft beer only, would be drunk. After some years, in the time of King Pippin, the family growing, the rule was amended by a Synodal decree, on account of the sick and the feeble. Some of the brethren, however, abstained from wine and other strong drink to the end of their lives."¹

St. Boniface fought the Benedictine hemina with all his might, and it is surprising that historians should describe him and his monks as followers of the Benedictine rule. "In his three trips to Rome St. Boniface gained a thorough knowledge of the Italian Benedictine monasteries which he set before Sturm as patterns of monastic life."² Boniface did all he could to protect the German monks against the ultramontane wine rule of the Benedictine monasteries.

It seems that much time elapsed before the Benedictine monks made use of the latitude of their rule

¹ Concilia Germania. T. 1, p. 90. Vita S. Sturmi.

² Heimbucher's Orden., vol 1, p. 107—Benedictine writers have been accused of kidnaping strange saints to fill up their Benedictine calendar. Feller's Biographie Universelle. Art. Benoit.

THE HEMINA CONQUERS.

allowing more than a hemina of wine in case of "necessity, work, or heat," or before many of them fell into the habit of drinking wine between meals. Theodemar, one of St. Benedict's successors as abbot of Monte Casino, wrote to Charlemagne: "At four o'clock in haying time we bring water mixed with honey to the brethren at work."¹

After the council of Aix, at which Louis I prescribed three pounds of wine per day for monks and nuns, he compelled monasteries to adopt the Benedictine rule. "All the monks in Southern Normandie and Touraine knew nothing of wine before they accepted the rule of St. Benedict at the time of Louis I."² St. Benedict of Aniane, who died in 821, made a strong effort to gradually lead the Benedictine monks back to total abstinence by allowing them wine on Sundays and solemn feast days; but no reformation of monks which allows intoxicants on any day of the week can last much beyond the life of the reformer.

When it became evident that the Benedictine hemina would play havoc with the total abstinence then practiced by all lay christians on fasting days, an attempt was made to deprive monks of wine during Lent. "In Lent all monks must abstain from wine and oil."³ "In Lent there must be a total abstinence from wine and oil."⁴ It was too late: popes had

¹ Migne's Lat. Fathers, vol. 66, p. 632.

² Vita S. Winwaloei. Bol. 3 March. Migne. Ibid.

³ Rule of St. Isidor of Spain. Cap. 10.

⁴ Rule of St. Fructuosus. Cap. 18.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

sanctioned St. Benedict's rule which allows a hemina of wine or more if the prior sees fit, every day in the year, Good Friday included. At the end of the thirteenth century total abstinence among the Benedictine monks was dwindling to this: "The abstinence on the Fridays in Lent shall be held thus: On three Fridays let us use bread and water. On the other three, let us be satisfied with one kind of food and with the usual drink."¹ The monks of Fleury took the palm for handling St. Benedict's rule with gloves: "In Lent the pound of bread must be larger and more delicate, and the wine better than usual."²

Bishops, however, did not look on silently when monks fell into excess. Egbert, Bishop of York, made the rule that "any cleric or monk who gets drunk must do penance for three months on bread and water."³

A certain number of priests attached to the service of a cathedral, and living in common under monastic rule, were called canons or Augustinian monks. In the tenth year of King Pippin, Chrodegang's rule for canons allowed four pounds of bread

¹ *Capitulum Generale Cisterciencie.*—The Cistercians were then the strictest branch of the Benedictine order.

² *Floriacenses Consuetudines.* Cap. 7.

³ *Concil. Angl., T. I.*—The same rule was adopted by Fructuosus for his monks. It is also in the collection made in 899 by Reginon, called *Reginonis Canones.* *Conc. Germ., T. II.* The church was more lenient to a drunken layman: "If a layman gets drunk, he must do penance for three days on bread and water." *Reginonis Canones.*

THE HEMINA CONQUERS.

per day, five pounds of wine, or, if wine was scarce, six pounds of beer."¹ The council of Aix, in 816, ordered that the bishops should furnish to the canons five pounds of wine or six pounds of beer if wine could not be procured. When this rule was first read at the council, the bishops exclaimed: "That will do for sailors but not for canons."² It seems that after the monks were taken care of, the bishops were allowed to adopt for diocesan priests a total abstinence extract from St. Jerome's letter to Nepotian, which says: "If my youth gets passionate without wine, if I am inflamed by the heat of my blood, if my body is supple and healthy, I gladly deprive myself of this drink in which I suspect poison. Whatever inebriates, shun the same as wine."³

Thomas a Kempis, the author of the "Imitation of Christ," was an Augustinian monk of the reform rule of Windesheim. Most of the Augustinian monasteries were closed by the Reformation, and many of their inmates became Lutheran. Luther had been an Augustinian monk. At this time there are but few Augustinian monasteries.⁴

¹ Conc. Germ. T. I, p. 100.

² Heimbucher's Orden. Vol. I, p. 436.

³ Conc. Germ. T. I, p. 479.

⁴ This order, which has been subdivided into various branches, reached its period of highest usefulness when its monasteries were maintaining many hospitals and schools. The Augustinian library at St. Florian, Austria, has over 70,000 volumes. The monks who, with their St. Bernard dogs, rescue exhausted travelers out of snow drifts on the Alps are Augustinians.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

For centuries the laws of the Catholic church forbade lay Catholics to use intoxicating drinks on fasting days. The Wednesdays and Fridays through the whole year were days of fast. Pope Benedict XIV wrote: "In former centuries the lenten fast allowed but one meal a day, and prescribed abstinence not only from meat and wine, but even from water outside the regular meal time."¹ "St. Callixtus instituted a fast from flour, wine and oil, to be kept four times a year on Saturday."² In 801 Charlemagne sent around a notice of a special fast to avert pestilence, famine and war. This notice says: "Let all abstain on these three days from wine and meat; and fast till three o'clock, except such as are prevented by age or infirmity."³ "The apostles have prescribed that on Wednesday and Friday we must fast till three o'clock."⁴ "Do not neglect to fast on Wednesday and Friday, giving what is thus saved to the poor."⁵

The monks of to-day claim that on fasting days they can eat two ounces of dry food in the morning, eight ounces in the evening, a full meal at noon, and wine or other liquids at any time in the day as long as they do not get drunk. "At the time of St. Aid-

¹ *Institutiones Eccl.* Cap. 3 and 15. Benedict XIV died in 1758.

² *Ibid.* Pope Callixtus died in 223.

³ *Conc. Germ.* T. 1.

⁴ Epiphanius in *Synopsi.*

⁵ St. Ignatius, *Epis. 4 ad Phil.* He was a disciple of the apostles; in 68 he succeeded St. Peter as Bishop of Antioch.

THEY RELAX THE FAST.

an the monks and nuns in England established the custom of fasting till three o'clock on Wednesdays and Fridays through the whole year except in the five weeks following Easter."¹ No. 87 of the rule of St. Pachomius says: "If any one wakes up in the night, and feels thirsty, he shall not drink water if a fasting day is on hand."

The vagueness of St. Benedict's rule paved the way for radical relaxations in the fasting customs. In regard to Lent the rule says: "Monks should all the time keep the observance of Lent; but because few only have this strength, we advise that we add something to our usual routine, particular prayers, abstinence from food and drink, so that each one may of his own will offer to God something above what we are obliged to do." In regard to fasting till three o'clock on Wednesdays and Fridays St. Benedict's rule says: "From Easter to Pentecost let the brethren be fed at noon, and let them have supper in the evening. From Pentecost, through the whole summer, if the monks have no labors, or if the greatness of the heat does not disturb them, let them fast till three o'clock on Wednesday and Friday; but on the remaining days let them dine at noon. Dining at noon, if they shall have worked in the fields, or if they have been weakened by the heat, is to be kept up, and let this be with the providence of the abbot."²

¹ Bede. Lib. III. Hist., cap. 5.

² The providence of the abbot must have been propitious to

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

Chapter 39 of the rule of St. Benedict turned out to be quite a bone of contention. It says: "All must totally abstain from meats of four-footed animals, except those who are entirely weak and the sick." The monks sharpened their wits and discovered that the rule did not forbid the meat of any beast that had less than four feet. Hildemar fought against meat of every kind; but St. Hildegard, Theodemar, and others carried the day in favor of fowl under the plea that "fowl was of the same nature as fish."

Strong efforts were made to check the laxity which the Benedictine rule was spreading.¹ Peter Damian,² St. Bernard³ and Peter of Cluny arrested for a time the downward tendency of monastic discipline. No

the brethren. The *Consuetudines* of Fleury say: "According to the precept of our Father (St. Benedict), we must fast on the first Wednesday after Pentecost. . . . On other Wednesdays instead of fasting we do some manual work, or recite some prayers by command of the prior." In another Benedictine monastery "to be mindful of the Founder, the monks observed silence on Wednesday, or went in procession barefooted." Migne's *Lat. Fathers*, vol. 66. *Commentary on St. Benedict's rule.*

¹ "The monks shall never use any meat in their food; chicken and other fowl is not allowed in the Order."—Rule of Aurelianus. "Healthy monks shall never receive chicken or meat."—Rule of Cæsarius.

² "Those are said to keep the perfect fast who use with bread but salt and water."—Peter Damian. *Opus*. 14, cap. 15.

³ St. Bernard said to his monks at the beginning of a lenten season: "Hitherto we alone have fasted till three o'clock; but from now on, all will fast till Vespers as we do, kings and princes, clergy and people, noble and ignoble, rich and poor." *Serm.* 3.

THEY RELAX THE FAST.

meat was used by the monks of Fulda down to the year 852; and they lived on one meal a day down to the middle of the tenth century.¹ Peter the Venerable or of Cluny wrote of the Carthusians, a branch of the Benedictine order: "The monks always use dark bread. Their wine is watered and ought to be called bad wine."² The sick as well as the healthy always abstain from every kind of meat. They never buy fish; but they use it when it is given to them. On Sundays and Thursdays only, they use cheese and eggs; on Thursdays and Saturdays, cooked vegetables; on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays they are satisfied with bread and water alone."³

In spite of these and other great reformers of monks, "customs" like the following acquired the force of rule in many Benedictine monasteries: "In the summer season when the brethren are fed twice a day, they remain standing in the chapel after three o'clock prayer, and wait in divine fear for the bell of the superior calling them to the refectory where they all meet as soon as the bell is heard. And although some one may not be able to drink, he must present himself nevertheless, so that his place may not appear vacant."⁴ The following rule, made at Oxford

¹ Mabillon. Præf. ad Sæc. III.

² *Villum*. The word *swill* is perhaps derived from *villum*.

³ Lib. II Mirab., cap. 28.—Dark bread containing less starch and a greater variety of nourishing substances than white bread, was very useful to the monks.

⁴ Migne's Lat. Fathers, vol. 66, p. 666.—Total abstinence had become a heroic virtue.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

under Archbishop Stephen in the thirteenth century, would indicate that in England, too, monks were acquiring habits of marching to the refectory between meals for drinking purposes: "Since monks are not a little infested with gluttony, we decree that monks and regular canons shall not presume to give themselves to eating or drinking except at stated hours. If any one thirsts, let him obtain permission to enter the refectory according to order, that he may satisfy a necessity, and not sensuality. From this rule are exempt the sick and those who are in the service of prelates."¹

The laxity of the Benedictine rule was not allowed to invade all monasteries. The Camaldolese² branched off from the Benedictine order in 1012, and followed the reform rule of St. Romuald which prescribed total abstinence. The order contained at one time two thousand monks; now it has scarcely two hundred. Peter Damian has written a *Life of St. Romuald*.³ The Grammontenses of Grand Mount

¹ Constit. Oxon. in Concilia Omnia. T. IV.

² Campo Maldoli or the field donated to these monks by Maldoli.

³ Peter Damian succeeded in introducing total abstinence into a number of monasteries. He says: "Our languishing monk may reply that the apostle prescribed a little wine to his disciple. It would be well, Brother, if we would equally mind all the Scriptural sentences which preach fasting, like the one in question, which relaxes the rigor of abstinence by discretion. Our languishing one may add that his head aches, and that his stomach is weak. This will do as a plaster for the effeminate, and a palliation for such monks as live for the flesh. This excuse is meagre enough, since water is helpful to the

EFFORTS TO REFORM THEM.

in Limoges, also followed the Camaldolese rule; they had at one time sixty monasteries.

The order of Vallombrosians was founded by John Gualbert in 1073. Before that time but few monks were priests; and monks generally used to take part in the manual labors of their communities. In an attempt to reform his monks Gualbert introduced the innovation of dividing them into working and contemplative monks. The working monks did all the manual labor.¹ There are but two Vallombrosian monasteries now, one at Rome, the other at Vallombrosa.

At the end of the 11th century St. Bruno began his reform of Benedictine monks by founding the order of Carthusians at Chartreuse near Grenoble. At first they lived solely on bread, water, and vegetables; now they monopolize the manufacture of one of the deadliest alcoholic brands in existence. They were not suppressed in France with other orders of monks because they swell the internal revenues of the French government. It would seem that these monk distillers do not use much of the nerve-wrecking liquor so much in vogue among the

sick, and wine often kills. Why do we read that James Alphæus sought such physicians as were known never to have used these liquors from birth? Down to the six hundredth year of Noah, the world knew nothing of wine, and we read of people who died during all those ages, but of none who were sick." Lib. VI., Epist. 23.

¹ The same distinction is now kept up in most monasteries in the shape of monk priests and lay brothers.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

squanderers in civilized nations. According to their rule they drink a little wine mixed with water, and at meal time only.¹ It is the only order whose general superior does not reside in Rome.²

The Cistercians were founded by Robert of Citeaux, another reformer of Benedictine monks. In 1112 St. Bernard, with thirty young noblemen, joined the new order which in 1352 had seven hundred monasteries. That of Clairveaux and sixty-five others were started by St. Bernard.³ The Cistercians cleared swamp lands, built cathedrals, furnished the best brains to the Crusades, and organized hospital knights and Lazarus bands to take care

¹ They take the first meal at ten o'clock in the summer, at eleven in winter, and at noon on fasting days. They shave the head every fifty days, and sing the Mass without organ accompaniment.

² In all monastic orders every monastery has its local superior who, in some of the older orders, may be an abbot. All monasteries of the same order within a certain district or province are under the jurisdiction or authority of a higher superior who is usually called provincial. A meeting of all the provincials of an order is termed a chapter meeting, and is presided over by the general superior. As a rule, monks are not under the jurisdiction of bishops; together with their provincials and superiors, they are under the immediate jurisdiction of the Pope. Each order has a cardinal Protector.

³ St. Bernard was a powerful advocate of total abstinence. He wrote: "It is in vain that some flatter themselves with the example of Paul telling his disciple not to drink water, but to use a little wine on account of his many infirmities. Let these remember that the apostle did not advise anything of the kind for himself, nor did the disciple at all ask for it. Furthermore, he did not give the advice to a monk, but to a bishop whose life was highly necessary to the newly born church. Such was Timothy: "Give me another Timothy, and if you will, I will not only feed him on gold, but give him balsam to drink." Regula. Cap. 30.

EFFORTS TO REFORM THEM.

of the sick in time of peace, and of the wounded on battle fields. They also conducted a good number of public schools.

A later abbot of Clairveaux, Dennis L'Argentier, undertook a great reform of monks. Louis XIII asked the help of Pope Gregory XV who, in 1621, ordered Cardinal Rochefoucauld to call a convention of superiors from the Benedictine, Jesuit, Capuchin, Feuillant and Cistercian orders. The reforms proposed by Rochefoucauld were adopted; but a multitude of lax monasteries appealed to the Pope and to the King of France, and placed themselves under the protectorate of Cardinal Richelieu, who, contrary to expectations, favored the reform and helped to introduce it in forty monasteries. At the death of Richelieu, the monks began the controversy anew. Pope Alexander VI annulled what Rochefoucauld had done, and pacified the monks by ordering that those who wished the stricter rule should form a separate order. The Cistercian monasteries were closed in France by the revolution of 1789; in Bavaria, in 1803; in Spain, in 1835; and partly in Switzerland in 1848. To-day Clairveaux is a penitentiary with about one thousand five hundred prisoners.

The Barnabites were founded in 1530 for the purpose of reforming the morals of the people. On account of their austerity, which approached that of the primitive monks, they were accused before the Inquisition. They managed to clear themselves.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

At the present time the few monasteries of this order are mostly in Italy.¹

John de la Barriere instituted a reform in the monastery of Feuillans (Lat. Fulium) by adding to the Benedictine rule some restrictions, one of which was total abstinence from wine even in sickness. The reform rule was approved by the Pope in 1589 and was adopted by several monasteries. Whilst the founder was accused and deposed, a chapter meeting was held at which the rule was relaxed so as to allow wine. Barriere died in 1600 shortly after his innocence had been declared by Cardinal Baronius, to whom the Pope had referred the accusations.

The order of Trappists, who are reformed Cistercians, was founded in 1663 by Armand de Rance at the monastery of La Trappe. The rule of this reformer would come very close to the primitive monastic discipline if it prescribed total abstinence. The Trappists sleep on a four-inch straw mattress, rise at two o'clock in the morning, abstain from meat and fish, except when Christmas day falls on a Friday. The sick only receive white bread. All do a share of the washing and other house work. At present there are about fifty-six Trappist monasteries.

¹ The apostate priest Gavazzi, who with the scum of Italian and German revolutionaries, roused so much prejudice throughout America in 1853 against the papal legate Bedini, had been a Barnabite monk. J. Gilmary Shea's *History*. Vol. 4., p. 360.—That wave of prejudice culminated in Know-nothingism.

THEY STILL RELAX.

The general discipline of the Catholic church is now somewhat imbued with monastic laxity. Benedict XIV, who became Pope in 1740, writes thus of the Lenten fast: "In former centuries food was taken but once a day in Lent which prescribed total abstinence from meat and wine; even a drink of water was not allowed outside of meal time. . . . But from the example of the monks who were allowed a drink of water after their day's work, and later on, a bit of bread with the water, from the example of the monks, I say, without canonical sanction, the evening meal, called collation, has been added to the day of fast. Our theologians even declare that one may drink wine or water every hour of the day without doing injury to the fast. . . . Whilst we remind the faithful of the ancient discipline, we do not wish to abolish a general custom; we only ask that they should not be carried away by the theology of some, and establish evil customs which are enough to move the ire and the stomach of any pious man. Who shall excuse from sin him who drinks repeatedly whilst he fasts?"¹

Jesuits have been particularly active in lessening self-denial among Catholics in regard to eating and drinking. The famous Jesuit theologian Bellarmin, says: "In the colder regions the church did not wish to impose total abstinence from wine on the people, because many could not practice it without

¹ *Institutiones Eccles.*, cap. XV.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

great danger to the health.”¹ Even our cardinals of to-day who are not allowed to walk in the streets of Rome, which has no cold climate, may feel cold enough to believe with Cardinal Bellarmin that total abstinence from wine would be “a great danger to the health.” The Jesuit theologians, Zaccaria and Sanchez, teach that wine cools the blood, contains no food, and can therefore be taken during the fast : “Wine, beer, and other liquors distilled from herbs do not nourish the solid parts of the body ; St. Thomas absolutely denies that they break the fast.² Others generally teach with Sanchez, that they do not break the fast even when they are taken to satisfy hunger ; because they only cool the blood, and help to move and digest the victuals.”³

After having introduced the evening meal, monks are trying to introduce a morning meal on fasting days : “It is commonly held by theologians that

¹ Ibid.

² Benedict XIV rightly observes that St. Thomas is not opposed to drinks on a fasting day, provided that they are taken after the meal. Const. Eccl., cap. XV.—Summa of St. Thomas. Quæst. 147. Prop. V ; oby. 3. In the same Proposition St. Thomas speaks of drinks made from syrups (electuaria), and used after the meal, and not of wine, beer or Chartreuse. He also explicitly says that the one meal allowed on a fasting day must not be taken before three o'clock. But our theological monk jugglers are allowed to teach every candidate for the priesthood that “St. Thomas absolutely denies that wine, beer and other liquors distilled from herbs break the fast.”

³ Theologia. Quæst. 250.—The French theologian Gousset says on the subject of using drinks on fasting days : “Other nations go further than we do on this point.” Theologie Morale. Vol. I, p. 116.

THEY STILL RELAX.

not more than half an ounce of bread or food is allowed to be taken with a drink so that the drink may not be harmful. . . . It is held that a chocolate drink does not break the fast, if it does not contain over two ounces of chocolate.”¹ Speaking of the poor who are not obliged to fast when their poverty hinders them from getting one full meal, the same theologian quotes the theological opinion that “a meal is not full without wine or beer.”²

The “Moral Theology” of the Jesuit Gury is now largely used as one of the text books in Catholic theological schools. This is what Gury says on what is allowed on a fasting day outside of the full meal at noon, and the evening meal: “The fast is not broken by a drink of water, wine or other drinks calculated and used to quench the thirst. Hence the axiom: What is liquid does not break the fast. . . . Chocolate does not break the fast if it is taken only once a day. Many take less chocolate, and substitute bread, but so as not to take over two ounces of food after the weight of water is subtracted. . . . At the evening collation about eight ounces of food are allowed, not weighing water, wine or other drink.”³ He quotes St. Liguori, the founder of the Redemptorist order, in favor of the above opinions.

¹ Zaccaria. *Theologia. Quæst.* 250.

² *Ibid.* *Quæst.* 258.

³ *Compendium Theologiæ Moralis. Pars I; N. 490, 492, 497 and 498.*

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

At the time of the Protestant Reformation most monastic orders possessed special privileges to preach indulgences, and to collect indulgence alms for their own use. Every year on All Saints Day the Augustinians at Wittemberg preached their indulgences which were quite a source of revenue. When Leo X ordered that a special indulgence should be preached, and that the indulgence alms would be used to build St. Peter's basilica, he added the provision that all other indulgences were suspended for the time being. In the province of Maintz Archbishop Albrecht promulgated the following rule for the indulgence preachers: "In every sermon the people must be given to understand that all previous indulgences are suspended for eight years, so that they may not neglect or despise our present indulgences."¹ The Dominicans alone had the privilege of preaching the great indulgence; and when Luther, on All Saints Day in 1517, checked the eagerness of the people to assist at Tetzels indulgence sermons by posting on the Augustine church door at Wittemberg, 95 theses against the preaching of indulgences, he was endorsed by the monastic orders outside of the Dominicans; and for a considerable time the Pope refused to see anything else in the Reformation but a monks' quarrel.¹

¹ Groene's Tetzels and Luther, p. 21 to 51.—Albrecht had reason to be zealous for the new indulgence, because he had obtained permission to apply one-half of the indulgence alms to the paying of debts which he had incurred in Rome.

¹ Ibid.

THEY HELP LUTHER.

When the Reformation was fairly under way, it received a powerful impetus from a large number of ex-monks among whom the following may be mentioned :

Bucer was an ex-Dominican, Luther an ex-Augustinian, Bellando an ex-Franciscan. Ochini, or Occhini, resigned as superior general of the Capuchins, married and preached Lutheranism. In 1546 he took part in a meeting of atheists. His advocacy of polygamy and atheism made him equally odious to Catholics and Protestants. The Augustinian Marlorat became a Calvinist minister. The ex-Dominican Montluc, published two volumes of Protestant sermons; his son, as governor of Cambrai, pillaged churches and convents. The ex-Augustinian, Spina (Jean de L'Epine) wrote several books in defense of Calvinism. The ex-Jesuit Reihing married and became director of the Lutheran college of Tubingen where he died in 1628. The Servite monk, Sarpi, kept up a correspondence with those rulers who were eager to go to war against Catholics. The Augustinian Courayer, wrote in favor of Sarpi and Anglicanism. The ex-Minorite monk, Lambert, was the first one to propose the abolishing of the Mass. When a citizen of Maintz had his child baptized by a Catholic priest, the ex-monk Limberger, claimed that the father of the child "was guilty of blasphemy and crime, and should be expelled from the city." The ex-Augustinian, Vermigli, or Peter Martyr, married and preached Calvinism in Italy, France,

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

England and Germany. At the beginning of the seventeenth century the ex-Jesuit, Perkins, was the ablest defender of the church of England. Canon Carlostadt was the first priest who married under the Lutheran dispensation. Zwinglius had been an Augustinian canon. Œcolumpadius was an ex-member of the order of St. Bridget. Feuardent, one of the best Calvinist theologians, was an ex-Franciscan. Beze was an ex-prior.¹

The laxity of monks was one of the causes of the Protestant Reformation. The Statutes for monks, made in Cologne in 1452, say: "It is known that in most monasteries the monastic life and the knowledge of the rule are gone."² One century later, a Mandment of the Archbishop of Cologne said: "The present tempest brings us uncowed and vow-breaking monks, vagrants erring miserably, pushing others into error, and filling the people with dissension and rebellion."³ Geiler, of Kaisersberg, defined the monks of that time as "bad and unregulated boys."⁴

After the Protestant Reformation had spread over whole countries, Pope Paul III decided to reform what was left of the Catholic church. He appointed a commission to propose reforms. Under the head

¹ Feller, *Biographie Universelle*.—Cretineau-Joly, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus*; vol. 2.—Janssen, *History of the German People*, vol. 3.—*Conc. Germ.* T. 8, præf.

² *Concil. Germ.*, T. V. p. 419.

³ *Ibid.* T. VI., p. 773.

⁴ Janssen's *History of German People*, vol. I, p. 605. *Germ.*

SHOULD ALL BE ABOLISHED?

of monastic reforms, the commission¹ reported as follows: "Another abuse to be corrected is found in the religious² orders, which are so corrupt as to be a great scandal to the seculars. We believe it urgent that they all be abolished, not by doing injustice to any of them, but by forbidding them to receive novices. We believe it best to send away from monasteries all young people who have not yet bound themselves by vows."³

In a meeting of cardinals, Paul III spoke of abolishing the order of Capuchins, because the general superior of that order had become Lutheran. No action was taken. The Council of Trent, which accomplished great reforms, did not publicly discuss the suppression of monastic orders. In session XXV it decreed: "All monks must conform their lives to the rule which they have professed. Let their superiors use diligent care that the rule be kept." The first session in 1545 was attended by 80 archbishops and bishops, many of whom had been monks, 13 abbots and generals of monastic orders,

¹ The commission was composed of Cardinal Contarini, formerly ambassador of the republic of Venice to Charles V; Sadolet, whose death in 1547 was as much regretted by Protestants as by Catholics on account of his humility and kindness; Pole of Canterbury, whose moderation, charity and learning were recognized by his contemporaries; Caraffa; Fregosi, Archbishop of Salerno, and a famous scholar in Greek and Hebrew; Archbishop Alexander; Bishop Gilbert; Cortesi; and the Dominican monk, Badia.

² Monastic.

³ Hist. de la Comp. de Jesus. Cretineau-Joly. vol. I, p. 36.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

and 60 theologians representing the monks.¹ As theologians of the Pope at the council, the Jesuits, Salmeron, who was thirty-one years old, and Laynez, who was thirty-four, had much to do with the framing of the decrees. The young Jesuits were well qualified to take a leading part in that council which lasted eighteen years.

The generality of monks were then as now, under the direct jurisdiction of the Pope, and not under that of any bishop. The bishops have found it extremely difficult to use any of their authority over refractory monks. In 1570, or eight years after the Council of Trent, Bishop Lindan complained thus in one of his diocesan synods: "No one can convince me that our Belgium will ever be freed from the almost universal prevalence of intemperance, unless we have priests who abstain from those things which are noxious to soul and body. . . . It is to be deplored that not a few of our monasteries have been converted into wine funnels and beer sewers. O, immortal God! have those nurseries of all virtues, and especially of sobriety and abstinence, been really turned into taverns and abominable holes? When such monks chant the office, their minds wander towards drink, and their function is reduced to mere guttural bellowing and thundering sound."¹

From the Apostolical Constitutions down to the

¹ Hist. de la Compagnie de Jesus; vol. I, p. 205.

¹ Concil. Germ. T. VII, p. 656.

SHOULD ALL BE ABOLISHED?

councils of our time, priests have always been "forbidden to enter taverns, except when compelled by travel." In some places a violation of this law meant withdrawal of all faculties to perform priestly functions, or suspension: "Whenever," said a council of Besancon, "a priest shall enter a tavern or hotel to drink, he incurs by the fact itself, a suspension, the absolution from which is reserved to the bishop. We command that this be immediately published in all churches, and posted on the church doors."¹ The same penalty was imposed by the synods of Namur in 1737, and of Ypre in 1768.² The council of St. Omer forbade priests to enter taverns under pain of imprisonment.³

The most lax law on this subject was made by the diocesan synod of Constance, which was attended by twenty-five abbots and thirty-eight other officials of monks. After repeating the old law forbidding priests to drink in taverns, the synod adds: "We except the case of travel and propriety, when, for instance, one is called by a traveling friend, or attends honorable nuptials or other convivialities usually held in public resorts."⁴

¹ Conc. Germ. T. X. p. 283.

² "In order to suppress forever the scandal of priests entering taverns, we insist on the acts of our predecessors, and we moreover forbid all priests, secular and regular, under pain of suspension to be incurred by the act itself, to enter for eating or drinking purposes, a tavern or hotel where drinks (what is now called *café huysen* not excepted) are for sale." *Ib.* T. X. p. 598.

³ *Ibid.* T. X, p. 801.

⁴ *Ibid.* T. VIII, p. 891.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

The council of Arras, held in 1585, found it necessary to forbid monks to run taverns: "Since ruination comes to monasteries of mendicant and other monks, from the sale of wine to clerical or lay outsiders drinking inebriously, we order under severe penalties, that one and all abstain completely from such a shameful traffic. If any of the mendicant monks, who (shame upon them!) are mostly given to this abuse, shall be caught despising this decree, aside from the canonical punishment to be meted out by their superiors, we shall deprive them for one year of the faculty to preach and hear confessions in this diocese."¹

The same synod of Constance, which was attended by twenty-five abbots and thirty-eight other officials of monks, was as lenient to the monks who were running taverns as to those who frequented them. After decreeing that clerics should not run taverns, it adds: "However, we do not forbid that those who receive not the smallest portion of their income in wine, and who have a right to sell it publicly by the measure, should use this right, provided that they do not dispense it themselves, but through respectable secular persons."²

¹ Conc. Germ. T. X, p. 761.

² Ibid. T. VIII, p. 892.—The same synod decreed: "Let prelates and canons who are priests, and who are not bound to say mass, celebrate mass at least once a month, and on the principal festival days, after having been to confession." No wonder that the large Carthusian monastery of Constance is now the "Merchants' Hall." Something else besides the Protestant Reformation should be blamed for such monastic decay.

CAN THE POPE REFORM THEM ?

The following looks like another lame effort of a bishop urging monks to observe the rule: "Monks are not allowed to drink among themselves or with outsiders in houses or in gardens. Neither are they allowed to have festive eating or drinking outside of monasteries. To do the contrary is the breaking down of all regular discipline."¹

A few glaring instances may suffice to point out the awry relation of many of the monks of to-day to the temperance laws of the Catholic church in America. The brewery which is run in connection with the Benedictine monastery at Beatty, near Pittsburg, is a National scandal. "Bishop O'Connor tried to stop it, but could not. The present bishop (of Pittsburg) is equally powerless. The matter was brought up in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, but the bishops dropped it when they heard that the Holy See permitted it."²

The following is part of a petition signed by Rev. F. Kittell and other Pittsburg priests asking the Apostolic Delegate, now Cardinal Satolli, to stop the scandal: "The Benedictine monks who make and sell intoxicating liquors in this diocese, instead of laboring for the cause of sobriety, on which the welfare of the church in this country so greatly depends, are actually gaining revenue from the spread of intemperance. Since the aforesaid Benedictine Abbey of St. Vincent is not subject to the jurisdiction

¹ Ibid. Synod of St. Omer. T. X, p. 805.

² Griffin's Journal, Oct., 1895.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

of the bishop of the diocese, who would gladly, if he could, put a stop to the evils indicated above, the undersigned beseech your Excellency, in the plenitude of the power with which you are vested, to strictly enjoin the Right Rev. Abbot from hereafter allowing any of the beer made in the abbatial brewery, to be sold to externs." ¹ Cardinal Satolli made an unsuccessful attempt to stop the evil. It seems that the monks, being under the direct jurisdiction of the Pope, are not under the jurisdiction of even an Apostolic Delegate. If the Pope cannot personally regulate the monks of five continents, he might delegate some of his jurisdiction to some one outside of abbots or superiors of monks to regulate them.

The monk priests are largely to blame that the temperance laws of the Catholic church in America are not observed in so many sections of the country: The last Plenary Council of Baltimore uttered a "special condemnation of the practice of selling beer or other liquors on Sunday, or of frequenting places where they are sold." It called upon "all pastors to induce all of their flocks who may be engaged in the sale of liquors to abandon as soon as they can the dangerous traffic, and embrace a more becoming way of making a living." ² "This is the doctrine of the church, but that is about all that can be said for it. It is practically a dead letter, at least it is dead

¹ The Index, Scranton, Oct. 26, 1895.

² Pastoral Letter, and Decree 263.

CAN THE POPE REFORM THEM ?

in the sense that it is seldom or never preached from Catholic pulpits.”¹ Not to preach this part of Catholic doctrine is somewhat consistent with the brewery business of monks who are under the direct jurisdiction of the Pope. Does the Holy Father know that he is approving both the council of Baltimore and his beer monks ?²

Decree 290 of the same council forbids “the use of intoxicating drinks at picnics and fairs held for charitable purposes.” So many parishes in charge of Redemptorists, Jesuits, Franciscans and other monk priests under the direct jurisdiction of the Pope, have used intoxicating liquors at their church festivals that it would be unfair to the many to mention a few.

It is difficult to say to what extent monk priests are bound to observe laws made by bishops. The *Theologia Moralis* of the Redemptorist, Konings, which is one of our standard text books on moral theology, says of monk superiors: “The Generals and Provincials enjoy quasi-episcopal jurisdiction; they have the same power over their inferiors as a Bishop has over his diocesan subjects. The local Superiors, when not limited by the General or the Provincial, have the same jurisdiction.”³ “In virtue of this jurisdiction the General or his Visitors visit

¹ Colorado Catholic, Feb. 1, 1896.

² Is it possible that the higher church authorities might receive revenues from monks manufacturing alcoholic beverages ?

³ No. 1194.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

all the houses under their authority ; the Bishops are allowed to visit only such monastic churches as are used for parish purposes, or such monasteries as contain less than twelve monks. The Superiors can dispense their inferiors in the same manner as a Bishop dispenses his diocesans ; for instance, in the matter of fasting.”¹ In 1881 Pope Leo XIII declared that “all houses of religious² clergy, no matter how small the number of inmates, are included in the privilege of exemption from episcopal jurisdiction.”³

Konings teaches that bishops “have a directive power over the regulars in regard to diocesan and provincial statutes, when their observance is necessary to avoid scandal.”⁴ When scandal can be avoided without observing diocesan or provincial statutes, what then ? Who is to decide in case of doubt ?⁵ Do the Benedictine brewers believe that they avoid scandal in not heeding the words of the Council of Baltimore to make their living in a more

¹ Ibid. No. 1195.

² Monk priests are not attached to any diocese ; they are often termed regulars or religious. The priests who are not members of any monastic order, are termed seculars or diocesan priests.

³ Constitution defining controversies between the bishops and the regular missionaries in England and Scotland. Lat. In Conc. Balt. III. Appendix, p. 216.

⁴ Theol. Mor. No. 1202, N.

⁵ When a bishop wants to “divide a parish administered by members of a religious order, the Prefect of the order must be heard ; saving the right to appeal, when there is ground, from the episcopal decree to the Holy See.” Const. of Leo XIII in Conc. Balt.

CAN THE POPE REFORM THEM ?

honorable way ? What is the difference, in the eyes of a monk, between the Council of Baltimore and a provincial council ?

The Benedictines are not the only ones who are opposed to temperance statutes. A layman writes thus: "It was with no small amount of surprise that I learned that the Jesuit Father who conducted the spiritual exercises of a retreat¹ of priests assured the assembled priests that 'Christ did not preach total abstinence'; and that 'the priest who preaches his all-saving teetotalism, the American flag and patriotism, generally ignores the sin of irreligion, indifferentism and the sin which is killing the infants.' I am informed that more priests' retreats are conducted by Jesuits than by members of any other religious order. Catholic laymen who see the appalling effects of drink all around them, have a right to complain if a great religious order should discourage what little efforts are being made to free our Catholic people from the ravages of drink."²

The Catholic wreckage from drink is no worse in Buffalo than in Chicago and other large cities. The following is from a report of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of Buffalo: "The Catholic losses from drink are so shameful that we would not publicly mention the hideous details if the Catholic Union and Times had not called our recent appeal a

¹ The diocesan priests usually assemble once a year for a week's retreat.

² The Index, Scranton, Sept. 18, 1897.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

'tissue of infamous falsehood,' and if the German Catholic daily paper of this city had not fairly shrieked for proofs of our 'infamous assertions.' In counting the committals to the Buffalo Penitentiary during the 41 days from Dec. 1, 1896, to Jan. 10, 1897, our committee found an average of 28 committals per day. The average Catholic committals per day were 18. Out of these 18 Catholics, 11 per day were committed for drunkenness and disorderly conduct. Only one in 24 committed was over 48 years old. If our Catholic accusers will multiply these numbers by 365, they will find that Catholic committals to the penitentiary for drunkenness average in one year, 4,015; total Catholic committals in one year, 6,595; total committals of Catholics and non-Catholics in one year, 10,263. Is the Catholic population of Erie County not less than one-third of the whole? And why should the Catholic church be entitled to nearly two-thirds in the penal house?"

"It is true that many are committed repeatedly; but many are never committed because they have friends or money to pay their fines, and many who have never been convicted die young from drink. We can hardly exaggerate when we say that 7,000 young Catholics in this diocese are annually ruined by drink. Our annual number of baptisms is about 7,000. We seem to be turning out drunken wrecks as fast as we baptize. The Volksfreund may quit praying for the speedy consecration of the new Bishop 'to peremptorily call to order certain dis-

CAN THE POPE REFORM THEM ?

turbers of the peace,' if we douse it with a large enough measure of those proofs it shrieked for. In 1885 there were in this diocese 3,182 more baptisms than funerals; in 1886, 3,377 more; in 1887, 3,631 more; in 1889, 3,782 more. An average of 3,000 more baptisms a year than funerals should give in the last twenty years an increase of 60,000. An average of 3,000 Catholic immigrant arrivals a year to the diocese should make another increase of 60,000. Total increase in twenty years, 120,000. The Catholic Directory gave the Catholic population of this diocese twenty years ago as 110,000, which added to the increase should give now 230,000, instead of 160,000."

"According to the United States census reports, out of one million Irish emigrants settled in America in 1890, 7,550 were in American almshouses; one million Englishmen had 2,163 in our almshouses; one million Scotchmen, 2,374; one million Frenchmen would have had 3,636; one million Poles, 1,486; one million Italians, 817. So much on foreign paupers. The census has something on native (not A. P. A.) paupers. Out of the 63,586 foreign parents of native paupers, 32,419 were from Ireland; 4,688 from England, 15,629 from Germany. Out of the fathers of 12,903 inmates of our juvenile reformatories in 1890, 2,449 were from Ireland, 401 from England, 1,277 from Germany, 115 from France, 111 from Scotland, 74 from Poland."¹

¹ Buffalo Daily Courier, Feb. 1, 1897.—The same pious folks

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

Drink breeds nearly all the filth and bottomless degradation with which the slums of America are reeking. The majority of the people of the slums are Catholic by birth. In past times the monks were self-sacrificing enough to work so well among the most forsaken specimens of humanity that there was no need of poorhouses in Europe. Our monks could, if they wished, grapple with the cancer-like slum evil which is eating into the hearts of large cities. Non-Catholic and individual efforts to check this monstrous evil do not now appear very promising.¹ What would become of America if it should

who claim that the mantle of charity ought to cover up all the drunken iniquity, unconsciously at times bewail the frightful losses from drink. The Catholics of Lockport have two English-speaking parishes and a small German parish. The Buffalo Catholic Union of Feb. 3, 1898, has the following in its Lockport items: "There is an abundance of good Catholic societies in this city, but unfortunately one society has been sadly neglected in Catholic circles for years, and that is a good Catholic temperance organization. There are hundreds of young men already mired in the path of dissipation, with an early grave before them, who might be reclaimed from a life of misery and shame if there were such an organization here." Hundreds of young Catholic men mired in the path of dissipation in two parishes and a half! Where is the mantle of charity big enough to cover up any longer the ravages of drink, and how long will monks under the direct jurisdiction of the Pope, rant against "fanatics and their all-saving teetotalism?"

¹ Under the guidance of Bishop Quigley, a mission house under the patronage of St. Columba's parish, has been started in the slums of Buffalo. If the Holy Father knew the pressing need of such shelter houses for swarms of ill-fed and half-clothed Catholic children in the slums, he might ask the monks who are under his immediate jurisdiction, and who control most of the rich parishes in Buffalo, to go and do likewise.

CAN THE POPE REFORM THEM?

ever be governed by the power emanating from the masses in the slums? "In New York city 62 per cent. of the voters come from the slum districts. In Chicago the percentage of voters from the slums is 61. In the slums of New York there is a saloon to every 129 persons, and one arrest in a year to every six persons."¹ What is the Catholic church doing in New York and Chicago where the slum evil has reached a depth of degradation that has never been seen in any civilized country?² What are the Roman authorities going to do about it? To hasten to the rescue they may find it expedient to abolish the rule which forbids cardinals to walk in the streets of Rome (they must be conveyed in carriages).

Speaking of the Irish, whom the American Catholic church has allowed to drift into the maelstrom of drink, J. W. O'Ryan writes: "The use of intoxicating stimulants, though not in harmony with the highest type of christian perfection, is far less mischievous in Ireland than in this country. When the Irish in such large numbers were forced to emigrate

¹ Cath. T. A. U. of Buffalo, Feb., 1897.

² Nearly every door in the neighborhood of St. Peter's church on Clark street in Chicago, leads to a lurid slum saloon. In 1894 the Franciscan monks who have charge of the large and beautiful church, and who are under the immediate jurisdiction of the Pope, planned to abandon it because it was mostly attended by children only. In 1896 St. Peter's church had three monks and 115 children. According to the Directory for 1898, it has five monks and 86 children. If these monks practice total abstinence, and preach it with all their might, they will be most useful to the vineyard of the Lord by staying where they are, though they should not make an adult convert for a generation.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

to America, they had a special claim to wise and true leading from the Catholic church. They who had seen their own immortal green dyed red in the blood of their martyr kinsmen, would have cheerfully obeyed if the church had appealed to them to forswear the idle habits of intoxicants. The appeal was not made. The Murphys and McCarthys, miserable, ragged, poor and unkempt slum dwellers as they are, were created for higher things. Drinking and thinking beer, they were put to work in the sewers, and kept there as convenient political chattel by Catholic traitors, brewers and idlers in the purlieux of city halls. Catholic laboring men in America have been remorsefully betrayed. Our neglected people did not desert the church till the church had betrayed them. The church in this country will have too much cause to regret the flippancy of the rum champions, and to atone in sackcloth and ashes for the great betrayal.”¹

Countless appeals in favor of total abstinence have been made; but they fell quite flat in the presence of monks under the immediate jurisdiction of the Pope, brewing and selling beer, or railing at temperance “fanatics preaching nothing but their all-saving teetotalism.”

“The plague of intemperance,” as Pope Leo XIII rightly calls it, seems to be as virulent in the West as in the East: “From one end of the year to the

¹ The Index, Jan. 15, 1898.

CAN THE POPE REFORM THEM?

other no word in favor of total abstinence is ever spoken, and how badly the Catholic people are suffering from the curse of drink in most of the cities and towns of the great West, only a personal visit discloses. Excessive drink is cutting down hundreds of thousands of young men in their prime throughout the country, while there is hardly a single endeavor to save them." ¹ "We have to marry sots," says Miss M. T. Elder, "or marry none at all." Hence Catholic girls in different parts of the country, are marrying outside of the church, with the probability that half or two-thirds will be lost to the church of their fathers.²

In regard to Catholic losses the Providence Visitor said in January, 1898: "In the city of Chicago, with its present population of 1,700,000, it is estimated that there are 500,000 Catholics. Of this number not more than 200,000 can be called practical Catholics. In this estimate we include infants and others incapable of observing the requirements of the church. The remaining 300,000 men and women may virtually be regarded as dead to the church. A similar condition prevails in all our large cities. . . . The State of Georgia, with a population of 2,200,000, has but 20,000 Catholics. In the diocese of St. Augustine there are 450,000 people, 7,000 of whom are Catholic. Mississippi, with a population of 1,525,000, has 17,000 Catholics.

¹ Colorado Catholic, Jan. 2, 1897.

² Catholic Citizen, March 12, 1898.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

The diocese of Little Rock, with a population of 1,400,000, has 11,500 Catholics; of its 410,000 negroes, only 100 are Catholic. The diocese of Nashville, with a population of nearly 2,000,000, has 28,000 Catholics, and less priests than thirty years ago."

Archbishop Ireland said at the Catholic Total Abstinence convention in 1894: "America looks upon any church that refuses to come out for temperance, as an odious excrescence of her soil." In regard to this indispensable temperance work, the secular priests, on the whole, are well enough disposed; but the monastic orders, with few exceptions, are not. Though only one-third in numbers, the monk priests, who control so many large parishes in populous centers, and so many of the leading Catholic educational institutions, exercise a greater influence on the Catholic body than the diocesan priests.¹ It will not do to dazzle the authorities in Rome with plans of that million dollar Newark cathedral and similar exhibitions of "Catholic growth." The Holy Father should make his cardinals bestir themselves; he might dispense them from their cumbersome livery

¹ There are 8,137 diocesan priests in the United States, to 2,774 monk priests. A year ago they numbered respectively 8,106 and 2,646. Four years ago the diocese of St. Paul had 80 monk priests to 112 diocesan priests; now it has 36 monk priests to 175 diocesan priests. In Denver, Kansas City and Mobile there are about as many monk priests as others. In Rochester there are four, in Harrisburg three, in Burlington two, in Scranton none. New York has 162, St. Louis 128, Chicago 104, Cincinnati 91, Buffalo 91.

CAN THE POPE REFORM THEM ?

long enough to help him fill our monks with that love for temperance which is indispensable to save the Catholics we have, not to speak of converting the many who would be satisfied with the Catholic system if they saw much less drunkenness among Catholics. Dumb temperance monks will do more good to this class of people than eloquent wine-drinking preachers.

In the United States the consumption of beer during 1895 was 15 gallons per inhabitant; it was $16\frac{1}{3}$ gallons if the consumption of wine and spirits is added. The per capita sale of beer in New York State in the same year was 45 gallons. Out of the 9,659,215 barrels sold in the State, New York city sold 4,691,464 barrels.¹ At the same time two-fifths of the population of New York city belonged to that class of people who receive medical aid from organized or legalized or private charities.² Whilst the sale of beer was 45 gallons per capita in New York State, in Georgia, with 20,000 Catholics in a population of over two million, it was $1\frac{1}{3}$ gallon per capita; in Tennessee with 28,000 Catholics in a population of nearly two millions, it was $1\frac{1}{3}$; in Utah it was $3\frac{1}{3}$ gallons.

In the archdiocese of New York during 1895, confirmation was administered to 16,133 persons; and the Catholic orphan, foundling and reform houses sheltered 19,303 inmates. If the cardinals in Rome

¹ Prohibition Handbook, p. 13 and 14.

² Report of State Board of Charities to Legislature, 1898.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

knew how many Catholic waifs in America are sheltered in non-Catholic homes, they would probably hop out of their carriages. A recent begging circular from the sisters who conduct a girls' orphan asylum not in the city, but in the province of New York, says: "We assure you that we have been compelled to refuse admission, on an average, to more than twelve children a month."

It is to be feared that the five-day celebration, in May, 1898, of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Archbishop Corrigan's elevation to the episcopate, will not be prolific in plans to check the ravages of drink in New York, especially if the rumor should be well founded "that one of the gifts will be a red hat from the Pope."¹ If the Holy Father should send a cardinal's hat to New York without explicit stipulations for temperance reforms, it would appear to vast numbers of people like an official approval of a very unreformed state of affairs.

The Catholic population in the archdiocese of New York was given as 800,000 for the year 1891. Only 825,000 are now reported by Catholic journals for 1897. Probably 25,000 Italian immigrants have settled in the archdiocese since 1891. What became of the natural increase? What of the other immigrants? What of the converts? With the exception of seven or eight dioceses, the increase, where there was any, may be considered natural. Where then did the missing New York Catholics go, some

¹ Catholic Citizen, Feb. 12, 1898.

WHERE IS THEIR CHARITY NOW ?

of whom may have obtained spirituous drinks from the "Catholic Club, 120 Central Park, West." ¹ They have not gone to the archdiocese of Baltimore where an annual excess of, 6,000 baptisms over funerals ought to show an increase of 24,000 instead of a total increase of 5,000 in four years. They have not gone to the dioceses of Albany and Syracuse which had no increase in many years. They have not gone to Cincinnati which has less Catholic population than two years ago; nor to Louisville, Peoria and Denver which have no more Catholic souls now than four years ago; nor to San Francisco which has 5,000 Catholic souls less than four years ago.² Did they walk into the Pacific Ocean, or are they on the trail to Alaska where Jesuit monks want to raise sheep and northern fleece? We had no war, famine or pestilence, and somebody must account for them. Let the monks who sneer at total abstinence, answer! Let the Benedictine brewers answer! The taunts of some Catholic journals that "the Pope himself is no total abstainer," ³ and that "the Apostolic Delegate does not see Old Nick in every glass of wine," ⁴ are not calculated to remedy the wretched condition of Catholicity in America.

Monks should not be completely separated from

¹ On Jan. 1, 1897, this "Catholic Club" had a U. S. license to sell intoxicating liquors by retail. New York Voice of April 22, 1897.

² Catholic Directory.

³ Catholic Union and Times, Feb. 4, 1897.

⁴ The Review (St. Louis), Jan. 13, 1898.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

the rest of mankind. The ideal monks sanctified themselves by helping to sanctify others. Very often their charity impelled them to befriend the most forsaken specimens of humanity. Palladius, who was born in 368, wrote thus of the charitable deeds of the monks of the desert in Egypt: "It is the custom among nearly all the Egyptian monks that at harvest time each one exchange the fruit of his labors¹ for about eighty bushels of grain, more than half of which must be spent for the use of the poor. Not only the poor of that country are thus fed, but shiploads of grain are taken to Alexandria for prisoners, travelers and the poor."² For many centuries all monastic rules prescribed that a certain portion of the revenues should be used for the poor. Rule 15 of St. Isidore of Spain says: "Whatever money comes to the monastery must be divided in three parts, one of which shall be for the infirm and the aged, one for the clothing of the brethren and of children, and one for the poor."³ Another part of the same rule prescribes that "whatever is left after meals must be reserved for the poor." "Whatever is left from the meals of monks must be wholly spent in alms; no abbot, prior or almoner can be permitted to deviate from this."⁴ St. Ansbert, abbot of Fontanelle, instituted an hospital for imbeciles and

¹ During the year they made baskets, mats and other useful articles.

² Migne's *Fathers of the Church*. Lat. vol. 66, p. 310.

³ *Ibid.* P. 311.

⁴ *Conc. Angliæ*. T. II, p. 312.

WHERE IS THEIR CHARITY NOW ?

decrepit poor. St. Odilo of Cluny sold the crown of Emperor Henry, and other valuables, for the use of the poor. There were monasteries in Germany which fed during certain parts of the year from four to six thousand poor.¹

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries many monasteries lost much of the spirit of charity. Out of the 1,500 Benedictine monasteries in 1414, only 30 remained in 1814. Many monastic libraries were sold to grocers and butchers. At the time of the cholera in Madrid in 1834, a rumor that monks were the cause of the malady, led to a popular outbreak and a pillage of the monasteries, which were afterwards confiscated by the government. The Benedictine monasteries in France were closed by order of the government in 1880. This order has now about 120 monasteries, mostly in Austria.²

Among the orders of monks who were devoted to works of charity, may be mentioned the Trinitarians, Hermits of St. Augustin, Hermits of St. Paul, Alexian Brothers, Jesuates (of the Jesuits a little later), Merciful Brothers, Somaskers, Camillians, Piarists, and Christian Brothers.

The Trinitarians were started in 1198 by John of Matha and Felix of Valois to redeem christians held as slaves by the Mahommedans. Their rule prescribed that one third of their receipts had to be de-

¹ Migne's *Fathers of the Church*. Ibid, p. 313.

² Joseph II, Emperor of Austria, closed 700 monasteries and convents in 1782.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

voted to the buying of slaves. Archbishop Peter Corbelin and other Englishmen were valuable members of the order. The first batch of christian slaves, numbering 186, were redeemed in northern Africa by John Anglic of London and William Scot of Oxford. As these ex-slaves, still bearing on their wrists and ankles the marks of Turkish chains, were led in procession by Trinitarian monks through the streets of Paris they received a great ovation. Many Trinitarians accompanied the Crusaders as chaplains and hospital nurses. They never ate meat except in travel and in war. There is a small remnant of this order now educating a few negro children in northern Africa.

The Hermits of St. Augustin were started in 1211 by Durandus of Huesca and other ex-Waldenses, under the name of Order of Catholic Poor. The Spanish remnant of this order maintains seven missions in Japan. These monks eat no fish nor meat nor warm victuals; but they drink wine—the seed of dissolution of monastic discipline.

The Hermits of St. Paul were called in France Fathers or Brothers of Death. They salute each other with “Memento mori”—“remember death.” A skull is always on their eating table. Where they lived in cities they were obliged to give spiritual and physical care to the sick, visit prisoners, and bury the dead. They now have only two monasteries, which are in Austria.

The Alexian Brothers were started in the four-

WHERE IS THEIR CHARITY NOW ?

teenth century to take care of the sick in times of pestilence. They were poor.¹ Many of the Alexian Brothers are now engaged in teaching schools.

The Jesuates were at first lay brothers. Their main object was to care for the sick and bury the dead. Later they were priests, and became mostly famous for preparing liquors for the sick. They were called "Patres del acquavita."² The order was dissolved by Pope Clement IX.³

The Merciful Brothers were founded in 1540 by the Spaniard St. John of God, to care for the sick and the insane. To this day they allow but one priest in their institutes. In France they were called Brothers of Charity; in Italy, Benfratelli, from a saying of St. John of God, "Fate bene fratelli."⁴ In 1605 Prince Lichtenstein invited Brother Gabriel of Ferrara, the best surgeon of his time, to start an hospital at Feldsberg, Austria. In 1858 they founded in Paris an hospital for scrofulous children. They have at present about 120 institutions. In 1889 their fifteen Austrian hospitals treated 12,288 patients at an average of 17½ days' care per patient. They are located at Algiers, Manila and Nazareth. Besides the three

¹ They took for patron St. Alexis who had left his home. After a long absence he returned without being recognized, obtained the use of an out-of-the-way corner in one of the buildings of his father, and lived there as a beggar doing good to other poor during 17 years. A few lines on a slip of paper found on his body after death, revealed his identity.

² Brandy Fathers.

³ Heimbucher's Orden, vol. 1, p. 487.

⁴ do good, brethren.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

usual monastic vows of obedience, celibacy and poverty, they take a fourth vow to devote their lives to nursing the sick without pay. The older records of their hospitals are highly interesting to medical students. Similar to the Merciful Brothers were the Bethlehemites in South America. In connection with every hospital they conducted a free school. Their fourth vow obliged them to nurse the sick "even those who were pestilent or unbelieving."¹ When they were suppressed by the Spanish Cortes in 1820 they had 33 houses.

The Somaskers, approved by Paul III in 1540, took care of orphans, of the poor and sick. They also taught in public schools. The greatest number of their institutes was 119 a century ago. Now they have 21, of which 20 are in Italy.

The Camillians or Servants of the Sick were founded in 1584 by Camillus of Lellis for the purpose of nursing the sick both in hospitals and in their homes. At the time of the pestilence which killed 60,000 in Rome in 1590, Camillus had 3,000 deaths within a few days in his hospital of S. Sisto, and lost five of his eight companions. The Camillians now have four monasteries in France, one in Holland and 34 in Italy.

The Piarists were organized in 1597. They are priests, and their fourth vow is to teach the young, especially the poor, without charge. They have now

¹ Ibid, p. 498.

WHERE IS THEIR CHARITY NOW ?

about 33 institutes in Austria and Hungaria, 20 in Italy, some in Spain and Cuba. When the government expelled the monks from Spain it excepted the Piarists.

The Christian Brothers had their beginning with Peter Franchot, a lawyer who started a school for poor children in Orleans in 1652. A few years later the diocese of Orleans had 20 free schools for the poor. In 1684 La Salle organized the teachers of such free schools into a monastic order, where the members, aside from the three usual vows, make a vow to teach the young without charge. The majority of their institutes are in semi-civilized countries. In Egypt they have 19. Altogether they have about 1,300 with 12,000 members.

Among the monks who long ago devoted their best energies to works of charity, but who are no longer to any large extent given to such work, may be mentioned the Redemptorists, the Jesuits, the Franciscans and the Dominicans. In the following letter Cardinal Wiseman tells that he found out this truth when it was too late: "When I first came to London there was not a single community of men (monks). Now it is different. The Jesuits have a splendid church, a large house, several priests, besides Westminster. Their church by its splendor attracts and absorbs the wealth of two parishes, but maintains no schools, and contributes nothing to the education of the poor at its very door. I could say much more, but I forbear. The Redemptorists came

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

to London as a missionary order, and I cheerfully approved of and authorized their coming. When they were settled down, I spoke to them of my cherished plan of missions to and among the poor. I was told that this was not the purpose of their Institute *in towns*, and that another order would be required for what I wanted. The Passionists I first brought to England. They have spread; but they have never done me a stroke of work among the poor. . . .

In a great city religious communities alone can and will undertake the huge work of converting the corrupt masses. I have acted on this conviction. I have introduced or greatly encouraged the establishment of five religious congregations in my diocese; and I am just (for the great work) where I began.

. . . If it appear to you that there is nothing to be done, and that I have been wrong in expecting from religious orders the active assistance which I anticipated, I will beg from you such assistance as your influence will enable you to give towards the establishment of a community such as I have described for supplying the wants of the diocese."¹ An organized band or community of diocesan priests under the jurisdiction of the bishop was started amidst difficulties by his successor, Cardinal Manning. To judge from the following letter of Manning in 1859, he did not expect much assistance from the monk priests: "We are in a crisis in which, if the

¹ To Father Faber of the order of Oratorians. In *Life of Cardinal Manning*. Vol. 2, p. 2.

WHERE IS THEIR CHARITY NOW?

spirit represented by Dr. Errington, Dr. Grant, and Searle prevail, the work of the church in England will be done by the Religious;¹ and the mission of the church as contemplated by the re-establishment of the hierarchy, will be thrown back for a whole generation."²

The Redemptorists were founded in 1735 by St. Alphonsus Liguori. Their principal object was to preach to the neglected people in small towns. By some irony of fate the Redemptorists in America are now located in the largest centers of population.³

The Catholic church in America could not have a weaker rampart against the spread of the slum evil in large cities than many of these Redemptorist monk priests. Twenty-five years ago the neighborhood of the Redemptorist St. Mary's church in Buffalo was quite a respectable locality. Since then the putrid saloon atmosphere has been so congenial to the weaving of slum webs close up to St. Mary's church, that some of the good monks are waking up,

¹ Monk priests want to be called Religious, as though mere secular or diocesan priests were not supposed to be religious.

² Life of Cardinal Manning. Vol. 2, p. 99.

³ They have four parishes in Baltimore, two in Chicago with over 1,500 parochial school children in each, three in New Orleans, four in New York, two in Philadelphia, one in Buffalo, Detroit, Pittsburg, Rochester, Denver and Grand Rapids. Outside of large cities they have only two parishes, one at Annapolis and the other at Ilchester, Md. They would probably not do any parish work in these two country parishes if they had not a novitiate at the former place, and a theological school at the latter. The Redemptorist theological schools train only such for the priesthood as are members of their order.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

and standing aghast at the sudden revelation that decent people who have children to bring up, are loth to remain there. Some of the German Catholics who have left the saloon-ridden section near their church for a part of the city mostly inhabited by non-Catholics with no saloon, are no longer favorably impressed with the monk priests whom they left behind.

Most of the diocesan priests in country towns prepare the children for the total abstinence pledge at First Communion or Confirmation. If this remedy should have been tried anywhere on earth, it was in St. Mary's Redemptorist church in Buffalo; and if these monks should now be convinced that "the all-saving teetotalism" is good for the young men who have to live, breathe and work in the midst of gaping and vice-flouting saloons, it may be too late. Bellesheim says that the Redemptorist order in America "bears a thoroughly German character."¹

The Redemptorist order was expelled from Switzerland in 1848, and from Germany in 1873. It has in all about 2,600 members nearly half of whom are lay brothers.

The Society of Jesus or Jesuits was approved by

¹ Heimbucher's Orden, vol. 2, p. 297.—It does not seem wise that monks who are able to maintain a thoroughly foreign character for a great length of time, and who are not under the jurisdiction of any American bishop, should rule over so many of the largest city parishes. Monk priests cannot settle in a diocese without the bishop's consent; but after they are settled, the bishop cannot remove them.

WHERE IS THEIR CHARITY NOW ?

the Pope before it had adopted a rule or constitution. Its founder, St. Ignatius of Loyola, laid before Paul III a "Plan of Life" which seemed full of promise: "Let the members of this society," it says, "remember that they fight for God under the orders of our most holy lord the Pope and his successors. . . . We have believed that it would be very useful to bind ourselves by an additional vow to execute, instantly and without excuse, whatever the Roman Pontiff or his successors may command us concerning the progress of souls and the propagation of the faith. . . . All shall make a vow to obey our General Superior in all that concerns our rule, and the General will prescribe the things which he shall find suitable to the end which God and our Society have had in view." In regard to the poverty of the Jesuits, the "Plan of Life" says: "We wish that those who belong to the Society make a vow of perpetual poverty; with the understanding that for their support and for the use of the Society, they cannot acquire, personally nor even in common, any claim to immovable goods, rents or revenues. They must be content with that which shall be given to them to procure the necessaries. Nevertheless, at the universities they may have colleges possessing revenues and funds applicable to the use and necessities of the students."¹ In 1540 the Pope approved the new Society, with the provision that it

¹ *Historie de la Compagnie de Jesus*. Cretineau-Joly. Vol. I, p. 44.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

could not be composed of more than sixty members.

After they had the approval of the Pope, the Jesuits gave a clear definition of what was meant by an additional vow of obedience to the Pope. Loyola's Declarations which were added to his Constitutions, say: "The whole intent of this fourth vow was to obey the sovereign Pontiff in regard to the missions;¹ and the apostolical letters touching this obedience must be thus understood."²

At the death of Loyola, Paul IV requested that the General should be elected for a term of years instead of for life; and that the Jesuits should recite the Office³ in common like other monks. The Jesuits were not ready to "obey the most holy lord pope," as their "Plan of Life" had promised. Laynez, the new General, and Salmeron told the Pope of the unanimous protest of the Jesuits against the proposed changes. "You are stubborn insubordinates,"⁴ said the Pope, and he remained firm. The Jesuits then began to say the Office in common, and in re-

¹In heathen countries.

²Ibid, p. 95. Fifty years ago the objection was made by Frenchmen that among the twenty general superiors none had been French, and that "at the bottom of the French heart there is a leaven of independence, a germ of liberty quite incompatible with the absolution of the general superior." Creteineau-Joly, the best historian of the Jesuits, repeats the objection and seems to admit its force. Will the Jesuits ever have an American for their General?

³The Office is a collection of prayers and extracts from the Bible and from the lives of saints. It is called Breviary, and it varies somewhat for each day in the year. Its daily recitation, which is obligatory on all priests, takes about an hour.

⁴Histoire de la Comp. de Jesus. Vol. I, p. 300.

JESUITS—THE LEADING ORDER.

gard to the term of their General, they trusted that the question would not again have to be raised by "that octogenarian pope." At the death of the Pope one year later, the Jesuits dropped the saying of the Office in common. The modifications had been "but the simple commandment of the Pope, and not a decision of the Holy See."¹ Instead of "the most holy lord pope," Paul IV was simply "an old man always impetuous."²

Sixtus V was another pope who had the misfortune to dabble in Jesuit constitutions. "But the General Aquaviva had the same energy, as much talent and a longer future."³ Sixtus V decreed that no lesser Jesuit authority than a provincial superior should receive novices. The Pope had to modify his decree which ceased to be in force with the Pope's death. He considered the name Society of Jesus as "arrogant and unjust to the other orders." After he had decided to change the Jesuit constitution in regard to fraternal correction and the distribution of alms, he received protests from Emperor Rudolph, King Sigismund and King William of Bavaria. Sixtus suspected that the Jesuits had been fomenting the protests. He answered the kings that he had no intention to change the nature of the Jesuit society, adding, however: "What displeases me most is the

¹Ibid, p. 301. It may take a Jesuit to appreciate the full import of this distinction.

²Ibid, p. 298.

³Ibid. Vol. 2, p. 264.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

conduct of some, especially of those who frequent the courts, and meddle with public affairs."¹ Finally "the Jesuits made a novena² against the attacks of the Pope who died on the ninth day of the novena." Where was "the most holy lord pope" in those times?

We are told by the Jesuit historian that "the five years of the pontificate of Sixtus V seemed to the Romans like a century of despotism."³

Though the political influence of the Jesuits has been greatly exaggerated, they have at times helped to shape the destiny of nations. The Jesuit Gonzalves had instructions to bring about a marriage between his royal pupil, Sebastian of Portugal, and Margaret of Valois, sister of Charles IX of France.⁴

¹Ibid, p. 272 to 277.

²Prayers said on nine consecutive days.

³Ibid, p. 277. Sixtus V built aqueducts; broke down the high prices of the bread stuff monopolists; erected the 75 feet high obelisk which had been raised at one time by 20,000 men, according to Pliny. He found the treasury empty and left it with \$3,000,000. The papal accounts were inspected and balanced every week. He issued 72 bulls on ecclesiastical discipline, one edict forbidding to insult a Jew, and another in regard to keeping the streets of Rome in a state of perfect cleanliness. He finished St. Peter's basilica, and built the present Vatican library building. If Sixtus V accomplished all this in five years "which seemed like a century of despotism," what must have been accomplished by the Jesuit General Aquaviva, "who had the same energy, as much talent and a longer future"?

⁴Ibid, vol. II, p. 63. In a letter to the General of the Jesuits, Gonzalves wrote: "You tell me that if this affair is not successful, the blame will fall upon our Society. If I have anything to reproach myself in this matter, it is that I have too much urged this marriage."

JESUITS—THE LEADING ORDER.

The Jesuit Possevin made Rudolph II promise to give his sister in marriage to Sigismund, heir of John III. The revolution of 1640, which separated Portugal from Spain, was greatly aided by five or six Jesuits. Four Jesuits became ambassadors of the new king, John IV.¹ When Alphonse VI was insanely drunk his wife could not stand his ill treatment; she left him. Her Jesuit confessor helped to have the marriage declared null on the ground of marital impotency, and advised her to marry don Pedro. Out of gratitude to the Jesuits, Pedro had a Jesuit appointed as a member of the Cortes. The influence of the Jesuits became the gossip of Europe.² In France Louis XIV confided episcopal and other ecclesiastical appointments to his Jesuit confessor, Ferrier. At the death of Ferrier, the Jesuit Lachaise became the supreme dispenser of ecclesiastical honors and benefices.³ In Protestant countries the Jesuits were blamed for Louis XIV's revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

Though there has been a steady drift in modern times toward greater personal freedom, the Jesuits were somewhat inclined to apply to civil government their system of wholly subjugating the free will of the individual to their General or other superior. The famous Jesuit theologians, Ballarmin and

¹Ibid, vol. 3, p. 290.

²Ibid, vol. 4, p. 90.

³Ibid, vol. 4, p. 313.—Lachaise rode in a carriage drawn by six horses. In 1753 a league was formed to keep the Jesuits away from the office of confessor of the King of France.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

Suarez, were extremists in the advocacy of the temporal power of the Pope and of the divine right of kings. In 1626 the Jesuit Santarelli published a treatise in which it was claimed that the Pope had the right to punish kings and to free their subjects from obedience. The Sorbonne, Richelieu and French courts made the French Jesuits disavow that teaching. Add to all this the jealousy of other monks, and it is not at all surprising that a widespread opposition to the Jesuit order was fomenting.

In 1757 Pombal imprisoned 1,700 Jesuits in Portugal. Many were exported; 88 died of neglect; a few were executed. They were expelled from France in 1762,¹ from Spain 1767, from Naples in 1768. Five kings asked the Pope to dissolve the whole order. Cardinal Passionei, who had held the most important positions under five popes, was not favorable to the Jesuits.² Cardinal York, brother of James III, strongly advised their suppression.

On July 23, 1773, Pope Clement XIV asked why the bells were ringing in the Jesuit church in Rome. He was told that it was the beginning of a novena in honor of St. Ignatius. "You are mistaken," replied the Pope, "it is not for the saints that they ring at the Gesu, it is for the dead."³ On the same day he

¹The French government confiscated their properties which were worth 58,000,000 francs.

²Feller's *Biographie Universelle*.—He allowed no Jesuit book in his library, and strongly opposed the canonization of the Jesuit Bellarmin. He insisted on the necessity of radically reforming the monastic orders. He died in 1771.

³*Hist. de la Comp. de Jesus*, vol. 5, p. 294.

JESUITS—THE LEADING ORDER.

signed the famous decree suppressing the Jesuit order. Was he quickened by the thought of Sixtus V dying on the ninth day of a Jesuit novena?

Frederic II of Prussia refused to suppress the Jesuits, saying: "They cannot harm me; the Cordelier Ganganelli¹ has filed off their claws, and extracted their molar teeth. All they can do is to teach the young." Catherine of Russia looked upon the absolutism of the Jesuit order as a bulwark against the ideas of liberty which were sweeping over Europe.² From the time of their suppression until Pius VII sanctioned them again in 1814, they maintained an institute with a General Superior in Russia.³

With all its faults the Jesuit order had more of the spirit of charity during the first two centuries of its existence than now. The Jesuit Frederick of Spee agitated a reform for abolishing executions for witchcraft in Germany, and lived to see his principles adopted in law.⁴ St. Francis Regis in France and many other Jesuits elsewhere devoted their lives to the instruction of the neglected children of the poor. The order performed considerable hospital work. In times of pestilence 11 Jesuits died at Palermo, 18

¹ Name of Clement XIV whilst a mere Franciscan monk wearing a cord.

² Hist. de la Comp. de Jesus, vol. 5, p. 398 and 405.

³ Among the monastic orders abolished by former popes, Clement XIV mentioned the Knights Templars, Humiliants, Reformed Conventual Friars, Ambrosians, and Barnabites.

⁴ He died in 1635 after having nursed French soldiers wounded and made prisoners in Germany. Hist. de la Comp. de Jesus, vol. 3, p. 323

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

at Marseilles, 77 in Germany. The heroic self-sacrifice of Jesuit missionaries among Indians and uncivilized tribes in all parts of the world, will forever command the admiration of unselfish people. They taught Indians how to use squirrels' nerves for thread, discovered Peruvian bark, and were the leaders in many branches of science.¹

In those times the Jesuits must have been less shy of total abstinence than now. The Jesuit Nobili became a Brahman near Goa, lived in a hut built of sods, and abstained from meat and intoxicants.²

The 300,000 Indians of Paraguay were total abstainers whilst they were under the kindly government of the Jesuits.³

When Stonyhurst castle in England was donated to some ex-Jesuits for educational purposes, they received permission from Pius VII in 1803 to affiliate themselves privately⁴ with the Jesuits in Russia. The same permission was given to the Jesuits in America.⁵ At the time of the suppression of the

¹ The Jesuit Gusmao made the first balloon in Brazil. When he was cited before the Inquisition "for raising hellish things up in the air" he said to the Grand Inquisitor "I can raise you too." The Inquisitor looked more serious than ever.

² His head was crowned with a pyramidal cap of red. After having converted thousands, he was obliged to defend himself in Rome against Bellarmin for living like a Brahman. He was told by the Pope to go back to his work. In the last years of his life he was blind; then he wrote books in the language of the natives. He lived 80 years.

³ Hist. de la Comp. de Jesus, vol. 3, p. 249.

⁴ In foro conscientiae.

⁵ Heimbucher's Orden, vol. 2, p. 117.

JESUITS—THE LEADING ORDER.

Jesuits there were 19 priests in Maryland and Pennsylvania. They all were Jesuits. Their superior, Father Lewis, practically remained superior as vicar-general of Bishop Challoner of London. In 1784 these Jesuits organized into a body corporate which held, until the restoration of the Jesuit order, the property formerly held individually by members of the order. One of the rules of this "Body of Clergy in Maryland and Pennsylvania" prescribed that every priest seeking admission to the corporation had to subscribe to the following: "I promise to conform myself to ye forms and regulations established for ye Government of ye Clergy residing in Maryland and Pennsylvania so long as I expect maintenance and support from them." They decided "that a Superior with power to give Confirmation, bless oils, grant faculties and dispensations, is adequate to the present exigencies of religion in this country; and that a bishop is at present unnecessary."¹ They further "bound themselves to promote and effect to the best of their power an absolute and entire restoration to the Society of Jesus (if it should please Almighty God to re-establish it in this country) of all property formerly belonging to it." To prevent all future bishops from the control of the Jesuit properties, Article XIX provided that "the person invested with spiritual jurisdiction in ye country

¹ Shea's Catholic Church in United States, vol. 2, p. 242.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

shall not in ye quality have any power over or in the temporal property of ye clergy.¹

In 1798, Rev. John Carroll, a member of the corporation, was appointed as the first Bishop of Baltimore. After the Jesuits had been somewhat sanctioned by the Pope in 1803, Bishop Carroll thought of resigning the bishopric, and of again following the Jesuit rule. "My bishopric, as you know, gives me no worldly advantages, and is very burthensome. Into whose hands could the diocese be committed, who would not perhaps thwart the establishment of the Society, and oppose a reinvestment in it of the property formerly possessed, and still so providentially retained? These considerations have hitherto withheld my coadjutor² and myself from coming to the resolution of returning to the Society."³ Do not most monk priests now prefer the welfare of their monastic institutes to that of the parish, diocese or country where they labor?⁴

¹ Ibid, p. 239 and 242.

² Neale.

³ Letter of Archb. Carroll. Ibid, p. 521.

⁴ A Jesuit novitiate was opened at Georgetown in 1806. The Jesuit Archbishop Neale succeeded Archbishop Carroll. Marechal, the third archbishop, was no Jesuit, and disputes arose concerning the Jesuit properties. The Jesuits refused to pay to Marechal the annual allowance which they had paid to Carroll and Neale. In a memorial presented to the Pope in 1822, Marechal claimed that the Bull erecting the see of Baltimore vested in the bishop all the property which had been held by the Jesuit fathers in Maryland, that the first Jesuit Superior, Father Molyneux, had by a formal instrument covenanted to pay perpetually to Bishop Carroll the yearly sum of \$1,000, and that certain estates, notably Deer Creek and Whitemarsh,

DRIFTING WITH THE CURRENT.

Whilst Jesuit and other monk priests loudly proclaim their poverty, and preach poverty, generosity and detachment from worldly goods to the people, they are most zealous in acquiring worldly goods. Half of the Catholic people in American cities have habits of squandering. The example of monks and their one-sided preaching encourage this recklessness. If thriftiness is necessary anywhere to keep poor families from being torn asunder, it is in the North American climate where the poorest family must have an annual supply of at least \$30 worth of fuel, and other necessaries in proportion.

Jesuit and other monk priests occupy the lead in ornamenting their well furnished churches with marble and onyx shrines whilst flocks of half-naked and neglected Catholic children are saturated with shame to appear in these gorgeously attired churches.¹

were given not to the Society of Jesus, but to the Catholic church. The Pope decided that Whitemarsh, or as much thereof as did not exceed 2,000 acres, should be turned over to Archbishop Marechal. The Jesuits refused, and the case was finally settled in 1826 by the agreement of the Jesuits to pay to Archbishop Marechal, during his natural life, annually 800 Roman crowns, from Nov. 1, 1826. Marechal died in January, 1828.

¹ A begging circular dated Savannah, Feb. 13, 1898, has been sent to the priests of America. It says: "Our magnificent cathedral has been destroyed by fire. It was the handsomest church in the South. Our insurance leaves us only \$42,000. We have scarcely 20,000 Catholics in the State of Georgia, and they are poor in worldly goods." You have more monk priests in your diocese than diocesan priests. Instead of building gorgeously like monks, try plain churches, and ask the Pope to compel your Benedictine, Jesuit and other monks to preach and practice temperance, and your people will soon be more numerous and less "poor in worldly goods."

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

Large numbers of monk priests are not polite enough to the vast number of non-Catholics in America who are surprisingly respectful to the average priest.

Let one striking instance suffice. In June, 1892, Mr. Morgan, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, expressed the "hope that a large number of children will be transferred to the new Indian industrial school at Fort Shaw, Mont. Children transferred should not be under 12 to 14 years of age. It is desirable that the children should have been previously in attendance at some other school." This called forth a reply in the twenty-page supplement of the American Ecclesiastical Review for October, 1892, by L. B. P., which seems to stand for L. B. Palladino, S. J. (S. J. means Society of Jesus.) "Will the Hon. Commissioner appoint some Catholic priest as spiritual director of his new Fort Shaw school?" asks L. B. P. "One might sooner expect lambs to be protected by wolves than Catholic instruction to be allowed those Indian children by government officials of the Hon. Morgan and Dr. Dorchester kind." Whilst L. B. P. wrote thus, six Jesuit schools in Montana were receiving \$116,754 annually from the U. S. Government whose officials in Indian affairs were more dangerous to Catholic children than wolves to lambs! Continues L. B. P.: "The bulldozing by the Hon. Commissioner of the Catholic Indian Bureau . . . school inspectors, supervisors and superintendents of pronounced anti-Catho-

CAUSING PREJUDICE.

lic propensities whose principal duty would seem to be to find fault with, and run down whatever is Catholic, and the conduct of some of whom has been at times more noticeable for coarseness and shocking vulgarity than polite, gentlemanly breeding; all this, with much that could be added, is evidence enough that the Catholic Indian schools are being interfered with." On the next page the wrathful man contradicts himself by admitting that these supervising officials did not at all seem to run down everything Catholic: "And yet, despite the odds against them, our contract schools are, as a matter of fact, superior to the non-sectarian ones of the government. And this they are in the eyes even of the government officials, some of whom have, time and again, held up our Catholic Indian schools as models and examples for imitation, and have even directed matrons, teachers to go and acquaint themselves with and follow Catholic methods. . . . However, an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit. . . . Catholic Indian teachers are not hirelings; they draw no salaries; they have no families of their own to look after." Had L. B. P. and the other Jesuits shown more politeness to the U. S. officials, and some outward appreciation of the \$116,754 which they were receiving annually for six schools, perhaps the Catholic Indian schools both in Montana and elsewhere would not now be in danger of collapse.¹ Such absolutism may be palatable in

¹ In the same article L. B. P. says: "Commissioner Morgan

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

Russia, but it will forever be repulsive in America.

Lord Baltimore tried to exclude the Jesuits from his Maryland settlement.¹ Cardinal Manning mentioned the Society of Jesus as one of the hindrances to the conversion of England to the Catholic church.² Jesuit and other monk priests are apt to insist more on their parochial school laws or on the devotions at their shrines with alms-box attachments than on God's eternal truths which are the immutable framework of christianity. Jesuit and other monk priests seem unable or unwilling to unite with the best tendencies of the nation or community in which they live. Is it possible that the yoke of their monastic rule hinders them from taking their proper places in public movements for a higher morality and betterment of the people?

Through their unreasonable opposition to public and his non-sectarian supporters have mischief-making propensities to undo the noble work of Miss Kate Drexel. Is not the Indian school policy dictated by prejudice and narrow-minded bigotry?" Between non-Catholic Americans and Jesuit or other monk priests, "prejudice and narrow-minded bigotry" have not always been on one side. In the following L. B. P. admits that some of the Jesuit teachers were not overly qualified to teach English to the young Indians: "As to those of our teachers who are foreigners by birth, they have become American citizens, or have declared their intention to become so, as soon as the legal formalities will allow." *Am. Eccl. Review*, Oct., 1892.

¹ *Cath. Church in U. S.* Shea. Vol. I, p. 51.

² *Purcell's Life of Card. Manning*, vol. 2, p. 774.—No wonder that the Jesuits advertise the *Life of Cardinal Manning* by Pressense, a French Protestant, as "the best and only concise life of this eminent prelate." *Messenger of Sacred Heart Supplement*, Feb., 1898.

DRIPTING WITH THE CURRENT.

schools, Jesuit and other monk priests have drawn on the Catholic church in America a vast amount of denunciation and latent opposition. At a meeting of the American archbishops in New York, Nov. 12, 1892, Cardinal Satolli, at the request of the Pope, proposed the famous fourteen propositions to settle the school question.¹ Prop. V says: "Let no bishop or priest dare to refuse the sacraments to parents who may wish to send children to public schools." Prop. VI says: "The young should not be hindered from acquiring the first rudiments and the higher accomplishments of arts and sciences, in the public schools under State control." Prop. IX originally had this: "Where the maintenance of a parochial school would cause too burdensome an expense to the heads of families, it will suffice to organize catechism classes." This was amended by the archbishops, and adopted as follows: "Therefore it will be well to organize catechism classes."² Since the Pope has forbidden priests to refuse the sacraments to parents for sending children to public schools, Jesuits and other monk priests have publicly threatened to refuse the

¹ Ad Scholasticam quæstionem Dirimendam, 11 pages.

² The principles of monk priests on the school question are far less liberal than those of the Pope. Says the Jesuit Holaind: "In our own times the State is that agency which attempts to interfere in the education of the children by controlling the schools . . . You discoursed on an ideal State and ideal schools, but we have to deal with a concrete State, and schools which do a great deal of concrete damage by rapidly disintegrating all the creeds, and undermining the foundations of Christian morality." An Answer to Rev. Bouguillon, Prof. at Cath. University.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

sacraments to such parents. If the Holy Father knew the condition of the slums of America, he might perhaps ask the monk priests under his immediate jurisdiction to turn half of their parochial schools into shelter and supply houses for the half-clothed and ill-fed slum children who now receive their main schooling in and around the saloon. But the monks need the parochial schools as feeders for their colleges; and they pick the most talented boys out of their colleges to feed their novitiates.

In their grasping speed to further their own secular interests, Jesuits and other monk priests may sprain themselves. The Jesuits direct a pious union of 25,000,000 members called the League of the Sacred Heart; and publish the monthly organ of this League, the Messenger of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Their American edition costs \$2.00 a year; their "Irish Messenger has reached a circulation of over 60,000."¹ They also publish smaller Sacred Heart periodicals at 50 cents and 25 cents a year. "To be an active member of the League, that is, to take part in its union of prayer and to know all that concerns its great work of devotion, you will find it indispensable to subscribe to one or other of our periodicals."² If ten out of the twenty-five millions in the league are active members, and if the average active member sends fifty cents a year to the Jesuit periodicals,

¹ League Calendar for 1897, p. 33.—The Jesuits sell the Calendar at 10 cents. The average Catholic paper is lucky when it has five or six thousand subscribers.

² League Calendar for 1897, p. 65.

FRANCISCANS THE POOREST ORDER.

the annual cash receipts for periodicals alone must be five million dollars. The Jesuits also sell to their 25,000,000 League members such supplies as leaflets, emblems, badges, etc. The harvest seems to be great; but the Jesuits are not at all elated: "The League has been a source of blessing to us in the past, and we confidently count upon many blessings through a faithful observance of its practices."¹ Refrain: "To be an active member of the League . . . subscribe to one or other of our periodicals." Diocesan priests are obliged once a year to give a financial report to the bishop. Monk priests, being under the direct jurisdiction of the Pope, give no financial reports to the bishops of their monasteries or of their journalistic enterprises.

Since the Jesuits were sanctioned again in the beginning of this century, they have been expelled from Russia in 1820, from Switzerland in 1847, from Prussia and Italy in 1873. The proposal of Ferdinand VII to re-establish the Inquisition in Spain provoked an uprising against monks in which 25 Jesuits were killed. In 1888 their 42 houses in France were closed. The order has now about 14,000 members, about half of whom are priests.

St. Francis of Assisi was so full of habitual kindness that he attracted even animals. He started his reform among monks and lay people in 1209. In 1256 England had 49 Franciscan monasteries.

The rule of St. Francis read: "I make a strong

¹ Ibid, in Greeting, p. 1.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

precept to all the brethren in no wise to accept money either directly or through an intermediate person. However, according to the necessary requirements of places, times and cold regions, let the superiors and custodians exclusively care, through spiritual friends, for the necessities of the sick, and the clothing of the other brethren, in such a way though as not to accept any money. . . . Let the brethren not appropriate to themselves either house or lot or any other property; but let them go through the world like pilgrims and strangers, serving God in poverty and humility and trusting in the alms which they must not be ashamed to beg. Christ became poor for our sake."¹

The poverty clause gave rise to a dispute which lasted for centuries in the Franciscan order, and gave the Catholic church an anti-pope. In 1254 those in the order who advocated absolute poverty were called Spiritualists; they were opposed by the Conventuals who claimed that the poverty clause of the rule was not obligatory, and that the necessities of the times required the holding of property by the order. Up to that time the order had the mere use of the lands and houses which it occupied. In 1294 the Spiritualists seceded under the name of Celestines, from Pope Celestine V, who approved them. Pope Boniface VIII, being opposed to a division of the order, deposed the General Superior, Gaufredi, who favored the Spiritualists. In 1302 a few of the

¹Heimbucher's Orden, vol. 1, p. 285.

FRANCISCANS THE POOREST ORDER.

Spiritualists, who were no longer allowed to be Celestines, fled to Narbonne, where they founded the Minorites. Pope Nicholas III and the Council of Vienne decided all Franciscan disputes in favor of the Minorites or Spiritualists; but John XXII allowed no other but the Conventual or property interpretation of the rule. Four Minorites kept up an argument against the Pope, who condemned them as heretics.¹

In 1322 the General Chapter of the Franciscans declared that Christ and the apostles had no property individually or collectively. Pope John XXII declared the Chapter guilty of heresy. The General Superior in his turn declared the Pope a heretic. In 1328 Emperor Louis of Bavaria went to Rome, deposed the Pope and set up a Franciscan monk as anti-pope under the name of Nicholas V, who resigned in 1330.¹

In spite of these disputes the Franciscans did much good. They died in large numbers whilst nursing the sick in times of pestilence. It is estimated that 2,000 were killed by Turks in or near Jerusalem. They carried on missionary work among heathen nations.

After the Franciscan monasteries had become entitled to considerable property and revenues, a large number of monks agitated for a stricter rule. In time they formed a separate order with the name of

¹Ibid, p. 300.

¹Ibid, p. 303.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

Minor Brethren of the Regular Observance. They had over 1,200 monasteries in 1506. In 1525 another reform led many Minor Brethren to form the order of Capuchins. Their primitive object was to adapt themselves to the wants of the neglected poor, and to take care of those who were sick with pestilence or other diseases. They rise at midnight for prayer, and rest again till five o'clock. Their highest membership was 31,000 before the French Revolution. They have now about 534 monasteries.

Father Mathew was a Capuchin; but it seems that his superiors did not encourage his temperance work. He wrote to Dr. Cullen in Rome: "Obtain a transfer of my obedience from my Religious Superior to the Sacred Congregation."¹ After he was released and appointed Commissary Apostolic, he wrote again: "This has completely rescued me out of the hands of such as may feel inclined to oppress me, and thus impede the glorious cause of Temperance."

The Franciscans have been expelled from several countries. The uprising against monks in Spain killed fifty Minor Brethren in 1834. In America the Franciscan or Mendicant monks are not famous for preaching temperance to their students and parishioners; nor for following the advice of the Pope to priests to "shine before all as models of abstinence."

The Jesuits are not alone in the pious sodality business; the Franciscans conduct a "Crusaders Association for the rescue and preservation of the Holy

¹Am. Cath. Hist. Soc., vol. 8, No. 4.

DRIFTING WITH THE CURRENT.

Shrines in Palestine. . . . The Crusaders contribute an annual fee of 25 cents. Anyone making an offering of \$12.00 is enrolled as a perpetual member of the Crusade. Remember to have your dear deceased friends enrolled in the Crusade. The Crusaders have a share in the 25,000 Holy Masses offered annually for the benefactors by the Franciscan Fathers at the Holy Shrines. . . . All any person who desires to participate in the charity known as *St. Anthony's Bread* has to do is to write his or her request on a piece of paper, adding a promise that if, by the expiration of a given time, St. Anthony should secure its fulfillment, a certain sum of money will be donated to buy bread for the poor. Among the latter may be numbered the poor students who, like St. Anthony, aspire to the priesthood. Such persons should write their requests on a slip of paper and send the same, together with their donation, to St. Anthony's Department, 143 W. 95th St., New York."¹

Do the Franciscans in St. Anthony's Department in New York care for many poor aside from the "poor students" who aspire to become Franciscan or Mendicant monks? The Franciscans, instead of

¹Crusaders' Quarterly, vol. V, No. 1.—Those who have charge of St. Anthony's Department in W. 95th St., New York, seem to be loaded with anathemas, if not with dollars. They say in the preface of the above mentioned quarterly: "The Crusade is no local charity, but a work of the universal Catholic church, and no one can, therefore, presume to forbid it without frustrating the intention of the Church and incurring the heavy censures which have been repeatedly pronounced by the Sovereign Pontiffs against those who in any way oppose this good work."

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

a cardinal, have the Pope for their Protector; and the Holy Father ought to find out whether there is still one link which binds these Franciscan Mendicants to the rule of their great founder which forbade "the brethren in any wise to accept money." Yes, there is one link: They are still Mendicants!

The Dominican monks, founded by St. Dominic in 1215, were to go from place to place like the apostles. St. Dominic tore up a paper which gave him the title to some property. "Let this be your heritage from me: Have charity, keep humility, hold fast to poverty," were his last words. In time the Dominican order, like the Franciscans, yearned for earthly possessions, and to prevent an impending division of the order, Pope Martin V in 1425 allowed the Dominican monasteries to hold property.

The Dominicans admit no one who has been a member of some other monastic order. Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas Aquinas, Las Casas, Savonarola and four popes were Dominicans. The Dominican monastery of the Minerva has the largest library in Italy, next to that of the Vatican.¹

In their opposition to non-Catholics, Dominican and other monks have transgressed far beyond the Catholic principles of toleration. Perhaps there would never have been any Spanish Inquisition if

¹ Heimbucher's Orden, vol. 2, p. 540 to 577.—During the French Revolution the monastery of St. Jacob or St. James, founded in Paris by St. Dominic, was the headquarters of politicians, for that reason called Jacobins.

CAUSING STRIFE.

Spain had never had a Dominican monk. The Spanish Inquisition was planned by Torquemada, a Dominican prior. It was conducted largely under the supervision of monks whilst the popes protested against its cruelties. When will some Catholic apologists stop whitewashing the indelible spots on cowls of monks?

A few years ago a monk was preaching the sermon at the funeral services for Premier Thompson. A number of non-Catholic members of the Canadian Parliament, believing that the preacher was condemning them to eternal perdition, started to leave the church. Mgr. B. O'Reilly, who was requested to step to the altar railing, and to refute the monk, declared that the preacher had uttered private opinions which were not held by the church. It stopped the stampede.¹

Whenever the monks deviated greatly from self-denial, poverty and charity, they were ripe for conflicts with episcopal authority. The most famous dispute of this nature was that of the Jesuits with Bishop Palafox in the diocese of Los Angeles. The Jesuits refused to pay tithes to the bishop who suspended every Jesuit in his diocese from doing priestly functions. The Jesuits did not obey the episcopal injunction. The case was argued at length in Rome, and the decisions of the Pope in regard to the many questions submitted to him during the dispute have become, to an extent, incorporated in Catholic law.

¹ Rev. J. L. Meagher.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

The general decision was, in accordance with the Council of Trent, that monks cannot use the faculties which they have received from their monastic superiors to hear confessions of secular persons, until they have also obtained the approval of the bishop. Many questions were laid before the Roman authorities; and among the answers dated April 16, 1648, the Jesuits obtained the following: "After a bishop has once given his approval to a Regular¹ to hear the confessions of secular persons, the same bishop cannot suspend such a Regular without a new cause appertaining to confessions themselves."² This vague answer probably means that a monk priest once approved by a bishop, cannot be hindered from hearing confessions unless he should become unfit. This interpretation would harmonize with the acknowledged right of a bishop to prohibit monk priests from locating in his diocese; but he cannot oust them after they are located.

In a letter dated Jan. 8, 1649, Palafox wrote to the Pope: "The power of the Jesuits is so terrible to-day in the church that if it is not repressed their great wealth and astonishing credit will place them above all laws, all councils and apostolical constitutions; and the bishops (at least in this part of the world) are compelled to die or to submit to their desires, or

¹ Monk priests are termed Regulars or Religious, as though the diocesan priests were irregular or irreligious.

² Adopted by the Council of Cologne in 1662. Conc. Germ., T. IX, p. 1051 to 1054.

CAUSING STRIFE.

at least to await the doubtful issue of a very just and holy cause whilst exposing themselves to numberless risks, inconveniences and expenses, and remaining in a continual peril of being crushed under their false accusations."¹ Palafox fled from Los Angeles to the mountains, resigned and wrote to the Pope that he had more peace and security among the wild beasts than among his Jesuit enemies. He would probably have been canonized if the Jesuits had not felt "bound in honor to oppose his canonization."²

The ambition and selfishness of monk priests have often been a hindrance to the spread of religion in America. In the beginning of the eighteenth century the Jesuits petitioned St. Vallier, Bishop of Quebec, that the vicar-general in Louisiana should always be a Jesuit, and that the Jesuits should have the exclusive care of Catholics in Louisiana. At the same time they complained to the King of France of the intrusion into their mission district of missionaries who belonged to another order.³ After the Capuchin Duplessis de Mornay was made Bishop of Quebec, he assigned the most populous sections in Louisiana to Capuchin monk priests, who, after a long struggle with the Jesuits, obtained control of the church in Louisiana.⁴

¹ Hist. de la Comp. de Jesus. Cretineau-Joly. Vol. 4, p. 78.

² Ibid, p. 79.

³ Shea's Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S., vol. 1, p. 543.

⁴ Ibid, vol. 2, p. 114. — When Father Meurin, S. J., in 1764 obtained permission to leave New Orleans, and to go as mis-

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

The spiritual success of the Capuchins in Louisiana may be estimated from a report made in 1795 by Penalver, first bishop of New Orleans: "Out of 11,000 souls composing this parish, scarcely three or four hundred receive Communion at least once a year.

. . . Not more than a quarter of the population of the town ever hear Mass. Fasting on Fridays in Lent, on vigils and ember days, is a thing unknown. There are other evil practices."¹

When Penalver was transferred to Guatemala he appointed two diocesan priests as administrators of the diocese. The Capuchin Sedella then started the tedious rebellion of lay trustees in New Orleans against the ecclesiastical authorities.² The Capuchin Helbron started the schism among the Catholics in Philadelphia. The Franciscan Reuter did the same in Baltimore.³ The Franciscans obtained exclusive

sionary to Illinois and Indiana, it was with the stipulation that he would not recognize any other ecclesiastical superior than the superior of the Capuchins at New Orleans. He replied that if it pleased the Pope to confer jurisdiction on the most miserable negro, he would be as submissive to him as to the most deserving bishop.

¹ Ibid. vol. 2, p. 573.

² *Ib.*, vol. 2 and 3.—"A certain Castanedo was furnished with \$4,000 to obtain a recommendation from Emperor Napoleon for the immediate nomination of Sedella, an artful Spanish friar, to the bishopric of New Orleans." Archb. Carroll to James Madison, Secretary of State. *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 592.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 424.—In a lawsuit Reuter and his trustees claimed that their congregation owed obedience to the civil magistrate and to the Franciscan order, but to no other ecclesiastical person. They were unable to cite any canon in their defense, and the court in 1805 decided in favor of Archbishop Carroll.

CAUSING STRIFE.

control of the missions in New Mexico down to the present century.¹

Upon the recommendation of Archbishop Troy of Dublin, the Dominican Richard L. Concanen became the first bishop of New York. Being a subject of England, then at war with America, he could not secure passports for America. During the two years of his life in Europe as Bishop of New York he managed to secure for his successor the Dominican Connolly, who was consecrated in 1814; but on account of the continued international difficulties, he could not land in New York until the end of 1815.²

The Dominican Harold was highly recommended by Concanen, and after Harold, through ungratefulness, insubordination and fomenting quarrels about church property, had added to the troubles which shortened the life of Bishop Egan of Philadelphia, the Propaganda in Rome was disposed to make him Bishop of Philadelphia before it received a protest from Archbishop Carroll. The Dominicans Concanen, Connolly and Harold had excited so much prejudice in Rome against Archbishop Carroll that the latter "was saved from sharp words of censure by death alone."³

The Dominican Carbry, who ministered to a rebel-

¹Ibid, vol. 1, p. 203.

²Ibid, vol. 2, p. 666.—Concanen had sent permission to Carroll to appoint a vicar-general or administrator for New York. The appointment of the Jesuit Kohlmann displeased Concanen and Connolly.

³Ibid, vol. 2, p. 668.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

lions congregation at Charleston whilst the regular priest had to officiate in a hall, was proposed by the Dominican bishop, Connolly, for bishop of Norfolk, and later for Charlestown.

Bishop Conwell of Philadelphia resigned after the Propaganda in 1827 had condemned him for having conceded too much to the lay trustees in the management of church property. Rome intimated that his retirement to Ireland would be gratifying, and requested the Dominicans, Harold and Ryan, to leave Philadelphia and to "proceed to Cincinnati, the bishop of that city being a member of their order."¹

In Cincinnati the Dominicans, following the example of the Maryland and Pennsylvania Jesuits, formed a corporation to which considerable church property was turned over without the knowledge of the Bishop of Cincinnati. In settling the matter in Rome the Dominicans agreed to pay to future bishops of Cincinnati, not members of their order, \$300 a year.²

Individually monk priests make vows of poverty, though as members of a wealthy order or corporation, they may be better housed and better fed than the average professional man in America. Their "spiritual perfection" has so well filled the Catholic public eye that they are called Religious or Regulars whilst the diocesan priests are mere Seculars. Car-

¹Ibid, vol. 3, p. 250.

²Ibid, p. 353.—There are no Dominican monk priests now in Cincinnati.

HIGH PROFESSIONS.

dinal Manning refused to call his diocesan priests Seculars, saying: "Priests as such are perfectors of others; and they ought to have attained interior spiritual perfection as a pre-requisite to Ordination. The imperfect enter Religious¹ Orders to acquire perfection. Believing the priesthood to be the first and regular Order instituted by our Lord, I look upon all Religious Orders as of ecclesiastical institution."²

The monk priests are under the immediate jurisdiction of the Pope, and if the Holy Father cannot wean them somewhat from intoxicating beverages, from earthly lucre and bodily welfare, if he cannot induce them to acquire more charity and to take care of the neglected children of the poor in the slums, the welfare both of the church and the race may demand that they be abolished.³

Fundamental changes in the monastic rules, in the relation of monks to the church are difficult to accomplish on account of the power which monks now have in the church. But the growing and urgent needs of our times, together with the progressive tendencies in the church, will make such changes imperative.

¹monastic.

²Purcell's *Life of Card. Manning*, vol. 2, p. 789.

³Whilst the State Board of Charities complained to the Vicar-General that "no priest of your church has ever visited the State Industrial School for Girls" at Denver, the Franciscans were negotiating to obtain possession of St. Leo's parish and church in Denver, by paying the church debts involved in a foreclosure sale. *Colorado Catholic*, April 16, 1898. Denver has four different kinds of monk priests.

MONKS AND THEIR DECLINE.

Perhaps the monks cannot be reformed until the church authorities in Rome give the example of greater detachment from unnecessary pomp and bodily ease such as riding in carriages according to the cardinals' ceremonial. And the cardinals may not see any need of a change until they make the discovery that drink and other habits of squandering which are banishing frugality and simplicity out of so many Catholic homes, must cause a dwindling in church revenues.

"St. Michael's church at Hoboken has been renovated inside at a cost of \$75,000. The church is connected with the Passionist monastery." Cath. Union and Times, April 21, 1898.

THE END.



100