

ullian (*Apolog.* c. 39) con- of the Christian agapae, in as much as hungry men turian and Bacchanal fe- of cooks is ordered; and which is most likely to pro- of calamity (*Ibid.* c. 40), so the full and about forth- Christian dried up with th every sort of abstinence. agapae did not long sur- cease must be made for Ter- guage, and his own habits ut after these deductions ew that Christian meals were a standing protest xcess in matter of food, inveighs (*Paedagog.* li. 1) and gluttony of heathen Christian converts to be are; he urges that meat at sauces and boiled rather mends in preference such milk, cheese, fruit, and specific directions of a later il of Carthage, A.D. 398 rican bishops to maintain les that bishops should be nagistrates and others in to thus obtain readier acces r criminals, is rejected by an. cc. 3, 4). Judges, he respect to frugal clergy . He adds, in the same an who takes every oppor- entertainments to which s in estimation. By the s (II. 4) widows who are gluttony or idleness are from the church. The s of Benedict, which was acetic in its aim, give the red sufficient for all the rious life in Italy at the century. Each monk was daily, but flesh only in ner two dishes of cooked e placed on the table, and and salad when it could 40). The composition of "pulmentaria" was va- tables cooked in different ry ingredients. Eggs, fish, if the flesh was minced, m. One definition states ex mediae qualitatis ma- ny included any ordinary meat. (See Dugan, s. v.) middle ages the ecclesi- arding food take the form y rather than of luxury, of the particular vices of hich were being gradually church. The council of *Concilia*, vi. 188), forbid ereaten himself to touch 'penitential' of Gildas, which earlier canonical rules s is enacted 'that if a monk h food on a day when he sifies, he shall go without ven additional fasts (c. 7);

on any other day he shall keep one fast and be severely chided (c. 8). Similar injunctions are found in the early ecclesiastical documents of the Anglo-Saxon church. Theodore in his *Penitential* (I. i. 8) imposes a penance of three days on any one making himself ill by gluttony, with an additional penance (c. 9) if the offence is committed after receiving the sacred elements. In these rules he is followed by Archbishop Egbert, who moreover inflicts different sentences on different orders. Thus a 'clericus' overeating himself is to fast forty days (*Penitent.* xi. 7), a monk or deacon sixty, a priest seventy, a bishop eighty (*Ibid.* *Penitent.* vi. 3, 4). Theodore (I. i. 4) made an exemption in favour of any one who had been fasting a long time, and then at Christmas or Easter, or any of the saints' days eat moderately, but did not make allowance for the weakness which succeeds a long fast, and causes sickness on eating.

The eating of unclean food frequently comes under notice in the Penitential Books of the 7th and 8th centuries. The existence of these decrees points to some remote influence of the Mosaic Law in the mediæval church, and also indicates the lingering of barbarous habits among the converts to Christianity in the remote corners of Europe. The *Canones Hibernenses* (*Wasserschleben, Die Bussordnungen der Abendländischen Kirke*, p. 136) inflict (c. 13) four years on bread and water on any eating horseflesh; a severity which was probably called for by some local practices. For the same canons only impose (c. 14, 15) forty days on those who eat flesh which dogs have torn or which has died from natural causes. By the *Penitential* of Theodore (I. vii. 6) it is no canonical offence if carrion is eaten from necessity. In the case (cc. 8, 9) of food which has been contaminated by a mouse or weasel having been drowned in it, if there is a small quantity it must be thrown away; but if there is much, it will be sufficient to sprinkle it with holy water. A goat or deer found dead in the forest (II. xi. 1), unless there is some appearance of its having been slain by the hand of man, must be thrown to the swine or dogs, on no account be eaten. Birds or beasts strangled in nets or slain by hawks (c. 2) must also be rejected, because the *Capitula* in the Acts of the Apostles prohibit the using of things strangled. Fish, however (c. 3), caught in a net may be eaten, because they belong to another order. The direction with regard to horse-flesh (c. 4) differs from the Irish canon. Theodore does not forbid it, but states it is not customary to eat it. Hares are allowable (c. 5), their flesh is said to be good for dysentery, more particularly the gall mixed with pepper. The *Confessio* of Pseudo-Egbert adds that it is a remedy for face-ache. Bees (c. 9) stinging a man to death must be killed, but their honey may be kept. It is not necessary to reject either swine or fowl (c. 7) which have fed on carrion or human blood; but any which have fed on human flesh must not be eaten (c. 8) till the meat has been soaked. Bede (*Penitential*, vii.) lays down the same injunctions in the main about unclean food. In these he is followed by Egbert, with some curious varieties of penance. Any one (Egbert, *Penitential*, xiii. 4) knowingly eating or drinking what has been polluted by a cat or dog shall chant 100 psalms, or fast three days; if the offence is

committed unknowingly the penalty is halved. So any secular (c. 5) deliberately drinking any liquor in which a mouse or a weasel has been drowned, shall do seven days' penance in a monastery and chant 300 psalms. The penalty of eating food half raw was three days' penance, or chanting the psalter.

Luxuria in the middle ages was used in ecclesiastical language to signify lust, more particularly such indulgence of the passions as was not included under ADULTERY, FORNICATION, or INCEST. The lascivious desire which stopped short of overt act was not generally brought under canonical censure; the rule of discipline being that the church judges actions only, and of actions those alone which create scandal. Secret thoughts, intentions, and desires were left to spiritual remedies. So the council of Neocaesarea, A.D. 314 (c. 4), merely states that any man who desires to sleep with a woman and does not accomplish it, has fallen from grace. No mention is made of penance. Even the Penitentials which pursue offenders into the minutest details, either assign no penalty to a desire, or a very slight one. The British canonical book which bears the name of the Penitential of Vianianus (*Wasserschleben*, p. 108) states that if a man has meditated uncleanness but checked himself, although the sin is the same, the penance may be light. And Theodore (I. ii. 21, 22) only bids such a man seek pardon from God; but if he has proceeded to wanton words, then he must be a penitent for seven days. Kissing a woman per desiderium was punished with twenty days (I. viii. 2). Rape was severely visited, both by civil and ecclesiastical law. One of the laws of Constantine (*Cod. Theod.* IX. xxiv. 1) condemned to the flames not only any one who committed a rape on a virgin, but even carried her off with her own consent against the will of her parents. This severity was a little modified by Constantius (*Ibid.* c. 2); the crime was still a capital one, but only slaves guilty of it were to be burned. Under Jovian the scope of the law was extended (*Cod. Theod.* IX. xxv. 2), not only was it a capital offence to ravish a consecrated virgin, but even to solicit her to marry against the rule of her profession, whether she was willing or not. The offence was also brought under canonical discipline. The Apostolical Canons (c. 66) expel from the church the man who offers violence to a virgin not espoused to him, and prohibits his marrying any one but her however poor she may be. Basil assigns (*ad Amphilo.* c. 22) four years' penance to one carrying off a virgin espoused to another man; and directs (*Ep.* 244) that not only shall the man himself suffer, but all his accomplices shall be censured, even to his family and the inhabitants of his village. The proof of the widespread existence of unnatural crime during the decay of the empire is too strong to be questioned (Clement Alex. *Paedagog.* ii. 10; Cyprian, *cont. Donat.* c. 8). And no serious efforts were made by the heathen emperors to put an end to it (see the authorities quoted by Bingham, *Antiq.* XVI. ix. 11). In the Christian imperial code, however, it was treated with extreme severity. Constantine ordered (*Cod. Theod.* IX. vii. 3) that offenders should be executed; and Theodosius (*Ibid.* c. 6) that they should be burned. The decrees of the church on the subject shew that even Christians were not