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PREFACE

TO THE FIRST EDITION (Paris, 1875, in-8°)

I was in London in the year 1872, and I hunted after old books:

Car que faire là bas, à moins qu'on ne bouquine? (1)

They caused me to live in past ages, happy to escape from the present, and to exchange the petty passions of the day for the peaceable intimacy of Aldus, Dolet or Estienne.

One of my favourite booksellers was Mr Allen, a venerable old gentleman, whose place of business was in the Euston road, close to the gate of Regent's park. Not that his shop was particularly rich in dusty old books; quite the

(1) What can one do over there, unless he hunts up old books?
reverse: it was small, and yet never filled. Scarcely four or five hundred volumes at a time, carefully dusted, bright, arrayed with symmetry on shelves within reach of one's hand; the upper shelves remained unoccupied. On the right, Theology; on the left, the Greek and Latin Classics in a majority, with some French and Italian books; for such were Mr Allen's specialties: it seemed as if he absolutely ignored Shakespeare and Byron, and as if, in his mind, the literature of his country did not go beyond the sermons of Blair or Macculloch.

What, at first sight, struck one most in those books, was the moderation of their price, compared with their excellent state of preservation. They had evidently not been bought in a lot, at so much a cubic yard, like the rubbish of an auction, and yet the handsomest, the most ancient, the most venerable from their size, folios or quartos, were not marked higher than 2 or 3 shillings; an octavo was sold 1 shilling, the duodecimo six pence: each according to its size. Thus ruled Mr Allen, a methodical man, if ever there was one; and he was all the better for it, since, faithfully patronized by clergymen, scholars and collectors, he renewed his stock at a rate which more assuming speculators might have envied.
But how did he get those well bound and well preserved volumes, for which, everywhere else, five or six times more would have been charged? Here also Mr Allen had his method, sure and regular. No one attended more assiduously the auctions which take place every day in London: his stand was marked at the foot of the auctioneer's desk. The rarest, choicest books passed before his eyes, contended for at often fabulous prices by Quaritch, Sotheran, Pickering, Toovey, and other bibliopolists of the British metropolis; Mr Allen smiled at such extravagance; when once a bid had been made by another, he would not add a penny; had an unknown Gutenberg or Valdarfer's Boccacio been at stake. But if occasionally, through inattention or weariness, competition slackened (habent sua fata libelli), Mr Allen came forward: six pence! he whispered, and sometimes the article was left him; sometimes even, two consecutive numbers, joined together for want of having separately met with a buyer, were knocked down to him, still for the minimum of six pence which was his maximum.

Many of those slighted ones doubtless deserved their fate; but among them might slip some that were not unworthy of the honours of the catalogue, and which, at any other time, buyers more attentive, or less whimsical
might perhaps have covered with gold. This, however, did not at all enter into Mr Allen's calculation: the size was the only rule of his estimate.

Now, one day when, after a considerable auction, he had exhibited in his shop purchases more numerous than usual, I especially noticed some manuscripts in the Latin language, the paper, the writing and the binding of which denoted an Italian origin, and which might well be two hundred years old. The title of one was, I believe: *De Venenis*; of another: *De Viperis*; of a third (the present work): *De Daemonialitate, et Incubis, et Succubi*. All three, moreover, by different authors, and independent of each other. Poisons, adders, demons, what a collection of horrors! yet, were it but for civility's sake, I was bound to buy something; after some hesitation, I chose the last one: *Demons*, true, but *Incubi*, *Succubi*: the subject is not vulgar, and still less so the way in which it seemed to me to have been handled. In short, I had the volume for six-pence, a boon price for a quarto: Mr Allen doubtless deemed such a scrawl beneath the rate of type.

That manuscript, on strong paper of the 17th century, bound in Italian parchment, and beautifully preserved, has 86 pages of text. The title and first page are in the author's
hand, that of an old man; the remainder is very distinctly written by another, but under his direction, as is testified by autographic side notes and rectifications distributed all through the work. It is therefore the genuine original manuscript, to all appearances unique and inedited.

Our dealer in old books had purchased it a few days before at Sotheby's House, where had taken place (from the 6th to the 16th of December 1871) the sale of the books of baron Seymour Kirkup, an English collector, deceased in Florence. The manuscript was inscribed as follows on the sale catalogue:

Nr 145. AMEKO (R. P. Ludovicus Maria [Cotta] de'), De Daemonlitate, et Incubis, et Succubis, Manuscript. Sec. XVII-XVIII.

Who is that writer? Has he left printed works? That is a question I leave to bibliographers; for, notwithstanding numerous investigations in special dictionaries, I have been unable to ascertain anything on that score. Brunet (Manuel du libraire, art. Cotta d'Ameno) vaguely surmises his existence, but confuses him with his namesake, most likely also his fellow-townsmen, Lazaro Agostino Cotta of Ameno, a barrister and literary man of Novara. "The author," says he, "whose real Christian names would seem to be Ludovico-Maria, has written many serious works..."
The mistake is obvious. One thing is sure: our author was living in the last years of the 17th century, as appears from his own testimony, and had been a professor of Theology in Pavia.

Be that as it may, his book has seemed to me most interesting in divers respects; and I confidently submit it to that select public for whom the invisible world is not a chimera. I should be much surprised if, after opening at random, the reader was not tempted to retrace his steps and go on to the end. The philosopher, the confessor, the medical man will find therein, in conjunction with the robust faith of the middle ages, novel and ingenious views; the literary man, the curioso, will appreciate the solidity of reasoning, the clearness of style, the liveliness of recitals (for there are stories, and delicately told). All theologians have devoted more or less pages to the question of material intercourse between man and the demon; thick volumes have been written about witchcraft, and the merits of this work were but slender if it merely developed the ordinary thesis; but such is not its characteristic. The ground-matter, from which it derives a truly original and philosophical stamp, is an entirely novel demonstration of the existence of Incubi and Succubi, irrational animals, both corporeal and spiritual.
like ourselves, living in our midst, being born and dying like us, and lastly redeemed, as we are, through the merits of Jesus-Christ, and capable of receiving salvation or damnation. In the Father of Ameno’s opinion, those beings endowed with senses and reason, thoroughly distinct from Angels and Demons, pure spirits, are none other but the Fauns, Sylvans and Satyrs of paganism, continued by our Sylphs, Elfs and Goblins; and thus is connected anew the link of belief. On this score alone, not to mention the interest of details, this book has a claim to the attention of earnest readers: I feel convinced that attention will not be found wanting.

I. L.

May 1875.

The foregoing advertisement was composed at the printer’s, and ready for the press, when, strolling on the quays (1), I met by chance with a copy of the Index librorum prohibitorum. I mechanically opened it, and the first

(1) Paris Embankment.
thing that struck my eyes was the following article:

De Ameno Ludovicus Maria. Vide Sinistrari.

My heart throbbed fast, I must confess. Was I at last on the trace of my author? Was it Demoniality that I was about to see nailed to the pillory of the Index? I flew to the last pages of the formidable volume, and read:

Sinistrari (Ludovicus Maria) de Ameno, De Delictis et Pœnis Tractatus absolutissimus. Donec corrigatur. Decret. 4 Martii 1709.

Correctus autem juxta editionem Romanam anni 1753 permittitur.

It was indeed he. The real name of the Father of Ameno was Sinistrari, and I was in possession of the title of one at least of those « serious works » which Brunet the bibliographer alluded to. The very title, De Delictis et Pœnis, was not unconnected with that of my manuscript, and I had reason to presume that Demoniality was one of the offenses inquired into, and decided upon, by Father Sinistrari; in other words, that manuscript, to all appearances inedited, was perhaps published in the extensive work revealed to me; perhaps even was it to that monography of Demoniality that the Tractatus de Delictis et Pœnis owed its condemnation by the Congregation of the Index. All those points required looking into.
But it is necessary to have attempted investigations of that kind in order to appreciate the difficulties thereof. I consulted the catalogues of ancient books that came in my way; I searched the back-shops of the dealers in old books, the antiquaries, as they say in Germany, addressing especially to the two or three firms who in Paris apply themselves to old Theology; I wrote to the principal booksellers in London, Milan, Florence, Rome, Naples: all to no purpose; the very name of Father Sinistrari of Ameno seemed to be unknown. I should perhaps have begun by enquiring at our National Library; I was obliged to resort to it, and there at least I obtained an incipient gratification. I was shown two works by my author: a quarto of 1704, De incorrigibilium expulsione ab Ordinis Regularibus, and the first tome of a set of his complete works: R. P. Ludovici Mariae Sinistrari de Ameno Opera omnia (Romæ, in domo Caroli Giannini, 1753–1754, 3 vol. in-folio). Unfortunately that first tome contained but the Practica Criminalis Minorum illustrata; De Delictis et Penis was the subject matter of the third tome, which, as well as the second, was missing at the Library.

Yet, I had a positive indication, and I pursued my investigations. I might be more fortunate at the Library of St Sulpice Seminary. True,
it is not open to the public; but then, the Sulpician Fathers are hospitable: did they not of yore afford a refuge to repentant Des Grieux, and did not Manon Lescaut herself tread the flag of their parlour? I therefore ventured into the holy House; it was half past twelve, dinner was nearly over; I asked for the librarian, and after a few minutes, I saw coming to me a short old man, unexceptionably civil, who, leading me through the common parlour, introduced me into another much narrower, a mere cell, looking into a gallery and glazed full breadth, being thus exposed to every eye. An ingenious provision of which Des Grieux's escape had fully shown the urgency. I had no small trouble in explaining the object of my visit to the good Father, who was deaf and near sighted. He left me to go to the library, and soon returned, but empty-handed: there also, in that sanctuary of Catholic Theology, Father Sinistrari of Ameno was entirely unknown. But one more expedient could I try: namely, to go to his brothers in St Francis, the Capuchin Fathers, in their convent of rue de la Sante! A cruel extremity, it will be granted, for I had but little chance of meeting there, as here, the lovely shadow of Manon.

At last a letter from Milan put an end to my perplexity. The unfindable book was found; I received at the same time the first
edition of De Delictis et Pœnis (Venetiis, apud Hieronymum Albriciurn, 1700), and the edition of Rome, 1754.

It was a complete treatise, tractatus absolutissimus, upon all imaginable crimes, offenses and sins; but, let us hasten to say, in both those voluminous folios, Demoniality occupies scarcely five pages, without any difference in the text between the two editions. And those five pages are not even a summary of the manuscript work which I now give forth; they only contain the proposition and conclusion (Nos 1 to 27 and 112 to 115). As for that wherein lies the originality of the book, to wit the theory of rational animals, Incubi and Succubi, endowed like ourselves with a body and soul, and capable of receiving salvation and damnation, it were vain to look for it.

Thus, after so many endeavours, I had settled all the points which I had intended to elucidate: I had discovered the identity of the Father of Ameno(1); from the comparison of the two editions of De Delictis et Pœnis, the first condemned, the second allowed by the Congregation of the Index, I had gathered that the printed fragments of Demoniality had nothing to do with the condemnation of the

(1) Vide biographical notice at the end of this volume.
book, since they had not been submitted to any correction; lastly, I had become convinced that, save a few pages, my manuscript was absolutely inedited. A happy event of a bibliographical Odyssey which I shall be excused for relating at length, for the « jollification » of bibliophiles « and none other ».

Isidore Isieux.

August 1875.
DEMONIALITY

OR

INCUBI AND SUCCUBI
Vocabulum Daemonialitatis primo inventum reperio a Jo. Carmenuele in sua Theologia fundamentali, nec ante illum inveni Auctorem, qui de hoc crimine tanquam distincto a Bestialitate loctus sit. Omnes enim Theologi Morales, secuti D. Thomam, 2.2., q. 154. in corp., sub specie Bestialitatis recensent omnem concubitum cum re non ejusdem speciei, ut ibi loquitur D. Thomas; et proinde Cajetanus, in Commentario illius questionis et articuli, 2.2., q. 154., ad 3. sub., coitum cum Daemonem ponit in specie Bestialitatis; et Cajetanum sequitur Silvester, vo Luxuria, Bonacina, de Matrim., q. 4., et alii.
THE first author who, to my knowledge, invented the word *Demoniality* is John Caramuel, in his *Fundamental Theology*, and before him I find no one who distinguished that crime from *Bestiality*. Indeed, all Theological Moralists, following in the train of S. Thomas (2, 2, question 154), include, under the specific title of *Bestiality*, « *every kind of carnal intercourse with any thing whatever of a different species* »: such are the very words used by S. Thomas. Cajetanus, for instance, in his commentary on that question, classes intercourse with the Demon under the description of *Bestiality*, so does Sylvester, *de*
2. Sed revera D. Thomas in illo loco considerationem non habuit ad coitum cum Dænome: ut enim infra probabimus, hic coitus non potest in specie specialissima Bestialitatis comprehendi; et ut veritati cohaeret sententia S. Doctoris, dicendum est, quod in citato loco, quando ait, quod peccatum contra naturam, alio modo si fiat per concubitum ad rem non ejusdem speciei, vocatur Bestialitas: sub nomine rei non ejusdem speciei intellexerit animal vivens, non ejusdem speciei cum homine: non enim usurpare potuit ibi nomen rei pro re, puta, ente communi ad animatum et inanimatum: si enim quis coiret cum cadavere humano, concubitum haberet ad rem non ejusdem speciei cum homine (maxime apud Thomistas, qui formam corporis humanæ ne-gant in cadavere), quod etiam esset si cadaveri bestiali copularetur; et tamen talis coitus non esset bestialitas, sed mollities. Voluit igitur ibi D. Thomas praecise intelligere concubitum cum re vivente non ejusdem speciei cum homine, hoc est cum bruto, nullo autem modo comprehendere voluit coitum cum Dænome.
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Luxuria, Bonacina, de Matrimonio, question 4, and others.

2. However it is clear that in the above passage S. Thomas did not at all allude to intercourse with the Demon. As shall be demonstrated further on, that intercourse cannot be included in the very particular species of Bestiality; and, in order to make that sentence of the holy Doctor tally with truth, it must be admitted that when saying of the unnatural sin, "that committed through intercourse with a thing of different species, it takes the name of Bestiality", S. Thomas, by a thing of different species, means a living animal, of another species than man: for he could not here use the word thing in its most general sense, to mean indiscriminately an animate or inanimate being. In fact, if a man should fornicate *cum cadavere humano*, he would have to do with a thing of a species quite different from his own (especially according to the Thomists, who deny the form of human corporeity in a corpse); similarly *si cadaveri bestialicopulare* : and yet, *taliscoitus* would not be bestiality, but pollution. What therefore S. Thomas intended here to specify with preciseness, is carnal intercourse with a
3. Coitus igitur cum Dæmon, sive Incubus, sive Succubus (qui proprie est Dæmonialitas), specie differt a Bestialitate, nec cum ea facit unam speciem specialissimam, ut opinatus est Cajetanus: peccata enim contra naturam specie inter se distinguui contra opinionem nonnullorum Antiquorum, et Caramuelis, Summ., Armill., v. Luxur., n. 5., Jabien., eo. v. n. 6., Asten. lib. 2. tit. 46. art. 7., Caram. Theol. fundam. post Filiiucium, et Crespinum a Borgia, est opinio communis; et contraria est damnata in proposit. 24. ex damnatis ab Alexandro VII.; tum quia singula continent peculiarem, et distinctam turpitudinem repugnantem cons titati, et humanæ generationi; tum quia quodlibet ex iis privat bono aliquo secundum naturam, et institutionem actus venerei, ordinati ad finem generationis humanæ; tum quia quodlibet ipsorum habet diversum motivum, per se sufficiens ad privandum eodem bono diversimodo, ut optime philosophatur Filliuc., tom. 2. c. 8. tract. 30. q. 3. no 142; Cresp., q. mor. sel. contro.; Caramuel., q. 5. per tot.
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living thing of a species different from man, that is to say, with a beast, and he never in the least thought of intercourse with the Demon.

3. Therefore, intercourse with the Demon, whether Incubus or Succubus (which is, properly speaking, Demoniality), differs in kind from Bestiality, and does not in connexion with it form one very particular species, as Cajetanus wrongly gives it; for, whatever may have said to the contrary some Ancients, and later Caramuel in his Fundamental Theology, unnatural sins differ from each other most distinctly. Such at least is the general doctrine, and the contrary opinion has been condemned by Alexander VII: first, because each of those sins carries with itself its peculiar and distinct disgrace, repugnant to chastity and to human generation; secondly, because the commission thereof entails each time the sacrifice of some good by its nature attached to the institution of the venereal act, the normal end of which is human generation; lastly, because they each have a different motive which in itself is sufficient to bring about, in divers ways, the deprivation of the same good, as has been
4. Ex his autem infertur, quod etiam Dæmonialitas specie differt a Bestialitate: singula enim ipsarum peculiarem et distinctam turpitudinem, castitati ac humanæ generationi repugnantem, involvit; siquidem Bestialitas est copula cum bruto vivente, ac sensibus et motu proprio prædito: Dæmonialitas autem est commixtio cum cadavere (stando in sententia communi, quam infra examinabimus), nec sensum, nec motum vitalem habente; et per accidens est, quod a Dæmonie moveatur. Quod si immunditia commissa cum brutali cadavere, vel humano, differt specie a Sodomia et Bestialitate, ab ista differt pariter specie etiam Dæmonialitas, in qua, juxta communem sententiam, homo cum cadavere concumbit accidentaliter moto.

5. Et confirmatur: quia in peccatis contra naturam, seminatio innaturalis (hoc est, ea ad quam regulariter non potest sequi generatio) habet rationem generis; subiectum vero talis seminationis est differentia constituens species sub tali genere: unde si seminatio fiat in terram, aut corpus inanime, est mollities; si fiat cum homine in
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clearly shown by Fillucius, Crespinus and Caramuel.

4. It follows that Demoniality differs in kind from Bestiality, for each has its peculiar and distinct disgrace, repugnant to chastity and human generation. Bestiality is connexion with a living beast, endowed with its own peculiar senses and impulses; Demoniality, on the contrary, is copulation with a corpse (according at least to the general doctrine which shall be considered hereafter), a senseless and motionless corpse which is but accidentally moved through the power of the Demon. Now, if fornication with the corpse of a man, a woman, or a beast differs in kind from Sodomy and Bestiality, there is the same difference with regard to Demoniality, which, according to general opinion, is the intercourse of man with a corpse accidentally set in motion.

5. Another proof: in sins against nature, the unnatural semination (which cannot be regularly followed by generation) is a genus; but the object of such semination is the difference which marks the species under the genus. Thus, whether semination takes place on the ground, or on an inanimate body, it is pollution; if
10. Dæmonialitas

vase præpostero, est Sodemia; si fiat cum bruto, est bestialitas: quæ absque controversia inter se specie differunt, eo quod terra, seu cadaver, homo, et brutum, quæ sunt subjecta talis seminationis, specie differunt inter se. Sed Dæmon a bruto non solum differit specie, sed plusquam specie: differunt enim per corporeum, et incorporeum, quæ sunt differentiae genericae. Sequitur ergo quod seminationes factæ cum aliis differunt inter se specie, quod est intentum.

6. Pariter, trita est doctrina Moralistarum fundata in Tridentino, sess. 14, c. 5. D. Th. in 4. dist. 16. q. 3. art. 2., Vasquez, q. 91. art. 1. dub. 2. n. 6., Reginald. Valenz. Medin. Zerola. Pesant. Sajir. Sott. Pitiq. Henriquez apud Bonac. de Sac. disp. 5. q. 5. sect. 2. punct. 2. § 3. diffic. 3. n. 5., et tradita per Theologos, quod in confessione manifestandæ sint tantum circumstantiæ quae mutant speciem peccatorum. Si igitur Dæmonialitas et Bestialitas sunt ejudem speciei specialissimæ, sufficit in confessione dicere: Bestialitatis peccatum com-misi, quantumvis confitens cum Dæmone
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cum homine in vaso præpostero, it is So-
domy; with a beast, bestiality: crimes which unquestionably all differ from each other in species, just as the ground, the corpse, the man and the beast, passive objects talis seminationis, differ in species from each other. But the difference between the Demon and the beast is not only spe-
cific, it is more than specific: the nature of the one is corporeal, of the other incorp-
oreal, which makes a generic difference. Whence it follows that seminationes prac-
tised on different objects differ in species from each other: and that is substan-
tiated.

6. It is also a trite doctrine with Mor-
lists, established by the Council of Trent, session 14, and admitted by Theologians, that in confession it suffices to state the circumstances which alter the species of sins. If therefore Demoniality and Bestia-
ity belonged to the same very particular species, it would be enough that, each time he has fornicated with the Demon, the penitent should say to his confessor: I have been guilty of the sin of Bestiality. But that is not so: therefore those two sins do not both belong to the same very par-
ticular species.
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concubuerit. Hoc autem falsum est: igitur non sunt ejusdem speciei specialissimae.

7. Quod si dicatur, aperiendum esse in confessione circumstantiam concubitus cum Dæmone ratione peccati contra Religionem: peccatum contra Religionem com- mittitur, aut ex cultu, aut ex reverentia, aut ex deprecatione, aut ex pacto, aut ex societate cum Dæmone (D. Thomas, 2. 2. q. 90. art. 2. et q. 95. art. 4. in corp.); sed, ut infra dicemus, dantur Succubi, et Incubi, quibus nullum prædictorum exhibe- tur, et tamen copula sequitur: igitur re- spectu istorum nulla intervenit irreligio- sitas, et commixtio cum istis nullam habe- bit rationem ulteriorem, quam puri et sim- plicis coitus, qui, si est ejusdem speciei cum Bestialitate, sufficienter expressetur dicendo: Bestialitatem commisi; quod tamen falsum est.

8. Ulterius in confessione est apud omnes Theologos Morales, quod longe gravior est copula cum Dæmone, quam cum quoli- bet bruto; in eadem autem specie specialissimae peccati, non datur unum peccatum gravius altero, sed omnia æque gravia sunt;
7. It may be urged that if the circumstances of a sensual intercourse with the Demon should be revealed to the Confessor, it is on account of its offense against Religion, an offense which comes either from the worship rendered to the Demon, or from the homage or prayers offered up to him, or from the compact of fellowship entered into with him (S. Thomas, quest. 90). But, as will be seen hereafter, there are Incubi and Succubi to whom none of the foregoing applies, and yet copula sequitur. There is consequently, in that special case, no element of irreligion, no other charac-
ter quam puri et simplicis coitus; and, if of the same species as Bestiality, it would be adequately stated by saying: I have been guilty of the sin of Bestiality; which is not so.

8. Besides, it is acknowledged by all Theological Moralists that copula cum Da-
mone is much more grievous than the same act committed with any beast soever. Now, in the same very particular species of sins, one sin is not more grievous than
perinde enim est coire cum cane, aut asina, aut equa; sequitur ergo, quod si Dæmonialitas est gravior Bestialitate, non sint ambo ejusdem speciei. Nec dicendum gravitatem majorem in Dæmonialitate petendum esse ab irreligiositate, seu superstitione ex societate cum Dæmore, ut scribit Cajetanus ad 2. 2. q. 154., ar. 11. § ad 3. in fine, quia hoc fallit in aliquibus Succubis et Incubis, ut supra dictum est; tum quia gravitas major statuitur in Dæmonialitate præ Bestialitate, in genere vitii contra naturam: major autem gravitas in illa supra istam ratione irreligiositatis exorbitat ex illo genere, proinde non facit in illo generè, et ex se graviorem.

9. Statuta igitur differentia specifica Dæmonialitatis a Bestialitate, ut gravitas illius percipiatur in ordine ad pœnæm de quà principaliter nobis tractandum est, est necessarium inquirere quotupliciter Dæmonialitas accidat. Non desunt qui sibi nimis sciolæ negant quod gravissimi Auctores scripsere, et quod quotidiana constat expe- rientia, Dæmonem scilicet tum Incubum, tum Succubum, non solum hominibus, sed etiam brutis carnaliter conjungi. Aiunt
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another; all are equally so: it comes to the same whether connection is had with a bitch, an ass, or a mare; whence it follows that if Demoniality is more grievous than Bestiality, those two acts are not of the same species. And let it not be argued, with Cajetanus, that Demoniality is more grievous on account of the offense to religion from the worship rendered to the Demon or the compact of fellowship entered into with him: as has been shown above, that is not always met with in the connection of man with Incubi and Succubi; moreover, if in the genus of unnatural sin Demoniality is more grievous than Bestiality, the offense to Religion is quite foreign to that aggravation, since it is foreign to that genus itself.

9. Now, having laid down the specific difference between Demoniality and Bestiality, so that the gravity thereof may be duly appreciated in view of the penalty to be inflicted (and that is our most essential object), we must inquire in how many different ways the sin of Demoniality may be committed. There is no lack of people who, infatuated with their small baggage of knowledge, venture to deny what has been written by the gravest authors

10. Sed non negatur, quin aliquando mulierculæ, illusæ a Dæmonibus, videantur nocturnis Sagarum ludis corporalisiter interesse, dum tamen sola imaginaria visione ipsis hoc accidit: sicut etiam in somnis videtur nonnullis cum fæmina aliqua concumbere, et semen vere excernitur, non tamen concubitus ille realis est, sed tantum phantasticus, paratus non raro per illusioinem diabolicam; et in hoc verissimum est quod habent citatum Capitulum et Concilia.
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and is testified by every day experience: namely, that the Demon, whether Incubus or Succubus, unites carnally not only with men and women, but also with beasts. They allege that it all comes from the human imagination troubled by the craft of the Demon, and that there is nothing in it but phantasmagoria and diabolical spells. The like happens, they say, to Witches or Sagas, who, under the influence of an illusion brought on by the Demon, fancy that they attend the nightly sports, dances, revels and vigils, and have carnal intercourse with the Demon, though in reality they are not bodily transferred to those places nor taking part in those deeds, as has been defined verbatim by a Capitule and two Councils.

10. Of course, it is not contested that sometimes young women, deceived by the Demon, fancy taking part, in their flesh and blood, in the nightly vigils of Witches, without its being any thing but an imaginary vision. Thus, in a dream, one sometimes fancies *cum fœmina aliqua concumbere, et semen vere excernitur, non tamen concubitus ille realis est*, but merely fantastic, and often brought about by a diabolical illusion: and here the above mentioned Capitule and
Sed hoc non semper est; sed ut in pluribus, corpore deferuntur Sagae ad ludos nocturnos, et vere carnaliter corpore conjunguntur Daemoni, et Malefici non minus Daemoni succubo miscentur, et haec est sententia Theologorum, et jure consultorum Catholicorum, quos abunde citat Frater Franciscus Maria Guaccius in suo libro intitulato Compendium Maleficarum; Grilland. Remig. Petr. Damian. Sylvest. Alphon. a Cast. Abul. Cajet. Senon. Crespet. Spine. Anan. apud Guaccium, Comp. Malef., c. 15. § Altera, quam verissimam... n. 69. lib. p.; quae sententia confirmatur decem et octo exemplis, ibidem allatis et relatis per viros doctos et veridicos de quorum fide ambigendum non est, quibus probatur Maleficos et Sagas corporaliter ad ludos convenire, et cum Daemonibus succubis et incubis corporaliter turpissime commisci. Et pro omnibus sufficere debet auctoritas Divi Augustini, qui loquens de concubitu hominum cum Daemonis, sic ait lib. 15. de Civitate Dei, c. 23.: «Et quoniam creberrima fama est, multique se expertos, vel ab eis qui experti essent, de quorum fide dubitandum non est, audivisse confirmant, Sylvanos et Faunos, quos vulgo Incubos vocant, improbos sæpe extitisse mulieribus, et earum appetisse et pere-
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Councils are perfectly right. But this is not always the case; on the contrary, it more often happens that Witches are bodily present at nightly vigils and have with the Demon a genuine carnal and corporeal connection, and that likewise Wizards copulate with the Succuba or female Demon. Such is the opinion of Theologians as well as of jurists, whose names will be found at length in the Compendium Maleficarum, or Chronicle of Witches, by Brother Francis Marie Guaccjus. This doctrine is therein confirmed by eighteen instances adduced from the recitals of learned and truthful men whose testimony is beyond suspicion, and which prove that Wizards and Witches are indeed bodily present at vigils and most shamefully copulate with Demons, Incubi or Succubi. And, after all, to settle the question, we have the authority of S. Austin, who, speaking of carnal intercourse between men and the Demon, expresses himself as follows, book 15th, chapt. 23rd of the City of God: «It is widely credited, and such belief is confirmed by the direct or indirect testimony of thoroughly trustworthy people, that Sylvans and Fauns, commonly called Incubi, have frequently molested women, sought and obtained from
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gisse concubitum. Et quosdam Daemones, quos Dusios Galli nuncupant, hanc assidue immunditiam et tentare et efficere, plures talesque asseverant, ut hoc negare impudentia videatur. » Hæc Augustinus.


12. Quantum ad primum modum, non copulatur Daemon Sagis, seu Maleficis, nisi præmissa solemni professione, qua inquisimisi homines Daemoni addicuntur; quæ professio, ut ex variis Auctoribus referentibus confessiones Sagarum judiciales in tormentis factas, quas collegit Franciscus Maria Guaccius, Comp. Malef., c. 7., lib. 1., consistit in undecim ceremoniis:

13. Primo, ineunt pactum expressum cum Daemon, aut alio Mago seu Maleficovicem
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them coition. There are even Demons, whom the Gauls call Duses or Elfs, who very regularly indulge in those unclean practices: the fact is testified by so many and such weighty authorities, that it were impudent to doubt it. » Such are the very words of S. Austin.

11. Now, several authors profess, and it is confirmed by numerous experiments, that the Demon has two ways of copulating carnally with men or women: the one which it uses with Witches or Wizards, the other with men or women entirely foreign to witchcraft.

12. In the first case, the Demon does not copulate with Witches or Wizards until after a solemn profession, in virtue of which such wretched human beings yield themselves up to him. According to several authors who have related the judicial admissions of Witches when on the rack, and whose recitals have been collected by Francis-Marie Guaccius, Compend. Malef., book 1, chapt. 7, that profession consists of eleven ceremonials:

13. Firstly, the Novices have to conclude with the Demon, or some other Wizard or
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Dæmonis gerente, et testibus præsentibus, de servitio diabolico suscipiendo: Dæmon vero vice versa honores, divitias, et carnales delectationes illis pollicetur. Guacc. loc. cit. fol. 34.


16. Quarto, vovent in manibus Diaboli obedientiam, et subjectionem, eique præstant homagium et vassallagium, tangendo quoddam volumen nigerrimum. Spondent, quod nunquam redibunt ad fidem Christi, nec Dei præcepta servabunt, nec ulla bona opera facient, sed ad sola mandata Dæ-
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Magician acting in the Demon's place, an express compact by which, in the presence of witnesses, they enlist in the Demon's service, he giving them in exchange his pledge for honours, riches and carnal pleasures.

14. Secondly, they abjure the catholic faith, withdraw from the obedience to God, renounce Christ and the protection of the most blessed Virgin Mary, and all the Sacraments of the Church.

15. Thirdly, they cast away the Crown, or Rosary of the most blessed Virgin Mary, the girdle of S. Francis, or the strap of S. Austin, or the scapular of the Carmelites, should they belong to one of those Orders, the Cross, the Medals, the Agnus Dei, whatever other holy or consecrated object may have been about their person, and trample them all under foot.

16. Fourthly, in the hands of the Devil they vow obedience and subjection; they pay him homage and vassalage, laying their fingers on some very black book. They bind themselves never to return to the faith of Christ, to observe none of the divine precepts, to do no good work, but
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monis attendent, et ad conventus nocturnos diligenter accedent. Guacc. loc. cit. fol. 36.
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to obey the Demon alone and, to attend diligently the nightly conventicles.

17. Fifthly, they promise to strive with all their power, and to give their utmost zeal and care for the enlistment of other males and females in the service of the Demon.

18. Sixthly, the Devil administers to them a kind of sacrilegious baptism, and after abjuring their Godfathers and Godmothers of the Baptism of Christ and Confirmation, they have assigned to them a new Godfather and a new Godmother, who are to instruct them in the arts of witchcraft; they drop their former name and exchange it for another, more frequently a scurrilous nickname.

19. Seventhly, they cut off a part of their own garments, and tender it as a token of homage to the Devil, who takes it away and keeps it.

20. Eighthly, the Devil draws on the ground a circle wherein stand the Novices, Witches and Wizards, and there they confirm by oath all their aforesaid promises.


23. *Undecimo, sigillantur a Dæmine aliquo charactere, maxime ii, de quorum constantia dubitat. Character vero non est semper ejusdem forme, aut figuræ: aliquando enim est simile lepori, aliquando pedi bufonis, aliquando araneæ, vel catello, vel gliri; imprimitur autem in locis corporis magis occultis: viris quidem aliquando sub palpebris, aliquando sub axillis, aut labiis, aut humeris, aut sede ima, aut alibi; mulieribus autem plerumque in mammis, aut locis muliebris. Porro sigillum, quo talia signa imprimuntur, est unguis Diaboli. Quibus peractis ad instru-
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21. Ninthly, they request the Devil to strike them out of the book of Christ, and to inscribe them in his own. Then comes forth that very black book on which, as has been said before, they laid hands when doing homage, and they are inscribed therein with the Devil's claw.

22. Tenthly, they promise the Devil sacrifices and offerings at stated times: once a fortnight or at least each month, the murder of some child, or an homicidal act of sorcery, and other weekly misdeeds to the prejudice of mankind, such as hailstorms, tempests, fires, cattle plagues, etc.

23. Eleventhly, the Demon imprints on them some mark, especially on those whose constancy he suspects. That mark, moreover, is not always of the same shape or figure: sometimes it is the image of a hare, sometimes a toad's leg, sometimes a spider, a puppy, a dormouse. It is imprinted on the most hidden parts of the body: with men, under the eye-lids, or the armpits, or the lips, on the shoulder, the fundament, or somewhere else; with women, it is usually on the breasts or the privy parts. Now, the stamp which imprints those marks is none other but the Devil's claw. This ha-
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tionem Magistrorum qui Novitios initia-
runt, hi promittunt denuo, se nunquam
Eucharistiam adoraturos; injuriosos Sanc-
tis omnibus; et maxime B. V. M. futuros;
conculcaturos ac conspurcatus Sacras
Imagines, Crucem, ac Sanctorum Reli-
quias; nunquam usuros Sacramentis, aut
sacramentalibus, nisi ad maleficia; inte-
gram confessionem sacramentalem sacer-
doti nunquam facturos, et suum cum
Dæmone commercium semper celaturos.
Et Diabolus vicissim pollicetur, se illis
semper praesto futurum; se in hoc mundo
votis eorum satisfacturum, et post mortem
illos esse beatum. Sic peracta profes-
sione solemni, assignatur singulis eorum
Diabolus, qui appellatur Magistellus, cum
quo in partes secedunt, et carnaliter com-
miscentur: ille quidem in specie fœminæ,
si initiatus est vir; in forma autem viri, et
aliquando satyri, aliquando hirci, si fœmina
est saga professa. Guacc. loc. cit. fol. 42
et 43.

24. Quod si quæratur ab Auctoribus,
quomodo possit Dæmon, qui corpus non
habet, corporalem commixtionem habe-
re cum homine: respondent communiter,
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ving been all performed in accordance with the instructions of the Teachers who have initiated the Novices, these promise lastly never to worship the Eucharist; to insult all Saints and especially the most blessed Virgin Mary; to trample under foot and vilify the holy images, the Cross and the relics of Saints; never to use the sacraments or sacramental ceremonials; never to make a full confession to the priest, but to keep always hidden from him their intercourse with the Demon. The Demon, in exchange, engages to give them always prompt assistance; to fulfil their desires in this world and to make them happy after their death. The solemn profession being thus performed, each has assigned to himself a Devil, called Magistellus or Assistant Master, with whom he retires in private for carnal satisfaction; the said Devil being, of course, in the shape of a woman if the initiated person is a man, in the shape of a man, sometimes of a satyr, sometimes of a buck-goat, if it is a woman who has been received a witch.

24. If the authors be asked how it comes to pass that the Demon, who has no body, yet has carnal intercourse with man or woman, they unanimously answer that
quod Dæmon aut assumit alterius maris aut fœminæ, juxta exigentiam, cadaver, aut ex mixtione aliarum materiarum ef-
fingit sibi corpus, quod movet, et mediante quo homini unitur. Et subdunt, quod quando fœminæ gaudent imprægnari a Dæmone (quod non fit, nisi in gratiam fœminarum hoc optantium), Dæmon se transformat in succubam, et juncta homini semen ab eo recipit; aut per illusionem nocturnam in somnis procurat ab homine pollutionem, et semen proiectum in suo nativo calore et cum vitali spiritu conservat, et incubando fœminæ infert in ipsius matricem, ex quo sequitur conceptio. Ita multis citatis docet Guaccius, l. 1. c. 12., per totum, qui prædicta multis exemplis desumptis a variis Doctoribus confirmat.

25. Alio modo jungitur Dæmon tum Incubus, tum Succubus, hominiibus, fœmi-
nis aut maribus, a quibus nec honorem, nec sacrificia, oblationes, maleficia, quæ a Sæ-
gis et Malefiscis, ut supra dictum est, pra-
tendit, recipit; sed ostendens deperdite amorem, nil aliud appetit, quam carnaliter commisceri cum iis quos amat. Multa
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the Demon assumes the corpse of another human being, male or female as the case may be, or that, from the mixture of other materials, he shapes for himself a body endowed with motion, and by means of which he is united with the human being; and they add that when women are desirous of becoming pregnant by the Demon (which only occurs by the consent and express wish of the said women), the Demon is transformed into a Succuba, et juncta homini semen ab eo recipit; or else he procures pollution from a man during his sleep, et semen prolectum in suo nativo calore, et cum vitali spiritu conservat, et incubando foeminae infert in ipsius matricem, whence follows impregnation. Such is the teaching of Guaccius, book 1, chapt. 12, who supports it on a number of quotations and instances taken from various Doctors.

25. At other times also the Demon, whether Incubus or Succubus, copulates with men or women from whom he receives none of the sacrifices, homage or offerings which he is wont to exact from Wizards or Witches, as aforesaid. He is then but a passionate lover, having only one desire: the carnal possession of the
sunt de hoc exempla, quae ab Auctoribus referuntur, ut Menippi Lycii, qui fuit sollicitatus a quaedam femina ad sibi nubendum, postquam cum ea multoties coivit; et detecta femina quænam esset a quodam Philosopho, qui convivio nuptiali intererat, et Menippo dixit illam esse Compusam, puta Dæmonem succubam, statim ejulans evanuit, ut narrat Cælius Rhodiginus, Antiq., lib. 29. c. 5. Pariter adolescens quidam Scotus a Dæmone succuba omnium gratissima, quas vidisset, forma, quæ occlusis cubiculi foribus ad se ventitabat, blanditiis, osculis, amplexibus per multos menses fuit sollicitatus, ut secum coiret, ut scribit Hector Boethius, Hist. Scotor. lib. 8., quod tamen a casto juvene obtinere non potuit.

26. Similiter, multas feminas legimus ab Incubo Dæmone expetitas ad coitum, ipsisque repugnantibus facinus admittere, precibus, siletibus, blanditiis, non secus ac perditissimus amasius, procurasse animum ipsarum demulcere, et ad congressum inclinare; et quamvis aliquoties hoc eveniat
loved ones. Of this there are numerous instances to be found in the authors, amongst which the case of Menippus Lycius, who, after frequent coition with a woman, was by her entreated to marry her; but a certain philosopher, who partook of the wedding entertainment, having guessed what that woman was, told Menippus that he had to deal with a *Compusa*, that is a Succuba Demon; whereupon the bride vanished bewailing: such is the narrative given by Cælius Rhodiginus, *Antiq.*, book 29, chapt. 5. Hector Boethius (*Hist. Scot.*) also relates the case of a young Scot, who, during many months, with closed doors and windows, was visited in his bedroom by a Succuba Demon of the most bewitching beauty; caresses, kisses, embraces, entreaties she resorted to every blandishment *ut secum coiret*, but she could not prevail on the chaste young man.

26. We read likewise of numerous women incited to coition by the Incubus Demon, and who, though reluctant at first of yielding to him, are soon moved by his entreaties, tears and endearments; he is a desperate lover and must not be denied. And although this comes sometimes of the craft of some
ob maleficium, ut nempe Dæmon missus a maleficis hoc procuret: tamen non raro Dæmon ex se hoc agit, ut scribit Guaccius, Comp. Mal. lib. 3. c. 8., et non solum hoc evenit cum mulieribus, sed etiam cum equabus, cum quibus commiscetur; quæ si libenter coitum admittunt; ab eo curantur optime, ac ipsarum jubæ varie artificiosis et inextricabilibus nodis texuntur; si autem illum adversentur, eas male tractat, percutit, macras reddit, et tandem necat, ut quotidiana constat experientia.

27. Et quod mirum est, et pene incapable, tales Incubi, qui Italice vocantur Folletti, Hispanice Duendes, Gallice Follets, nec Exorcistis obediunt, nec exorcismos paven, nec res sacras reverentur ad earum approximationem timorem ostendendo, sicuti faciunt Dæmones, qui obsessos vexant; quantumvis enim maligni Spiritus sint obstinati, nec parere velint Exorcistæ præcipienti, ut exeat a corporibus quæ obsident, tamen ad prolationem Sanctissimi Nominis Jesu, aut Mariæ, aut aliquorum versuum Sacrae Scripturae, impositionem Reliquiarum, maxime Ligni Sanctæ Crucis, approximationem Sacrarum Imaginum, ad os obsessi rugiunt, strident, frendent, concutiuntur, et timo-
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Wizard who avails himself of the agency of the Demon, yet the Demon not infrequently acts on his own account; and it happens not merely with women, but also with mares; if they readily comply with his desire, he pets them, and plaits their mane in elaborate and inextricable tresses; but if they resist, he ill-treats and strikes them, smites them with the glanders, and finally puts them to death, as is shown by daily experience.

27. A most marvellous and well nigh incomprehensible fact: the Incubi whom the Italians call Folletti, the Spaniards Duendes, the French Follets, do not obey the Exorcists, have no dread of exorcisms, no reverence for holy things, at the approach of which they are not in the least overawed; very different in that respect from the Demons who vex those whom they possess; for, however obstinate those evil Spirits may be, however restive to the injunctions of the Exorcist who bids them leave the body they possess, yet, at the mere utterance of the most holy name of Jesus or Mary, or of some verses of Holy Writ, at the mere imposition of relics, especially of a piece of the wood of the Holy Cross, or
rem ac horrorem ostendunt. Folletti vero nihil horum, ut dictum est, ostendunt, nec a divexatione, nisi post longum tempus, cessant. Hujus rei testis sum oculatus, et historiam recito quae reipsa humanam fidem superat: sed testis mihi sit Deus quod puram veritatem multorum testimonio comprobatam describo.

28. Viginti quinque abhinc annis, plus minusve, cum essem Lector Sacrae Theologiae in Conventu Sanctae Crucis Papiae, reperiebatur in illa civitate honesta quae-dam femina maritata optimae conscientiae, et bonum habens ab omnibus eam agnoscentibus, maxime Religiosis, testimonium, quae vocabatur Hieronyma; et habitat in parochia Sancti Michaelis. Hae qua-dam die domi sua panem pinserat, et per furnarium miserat ad illum decoquendum. Reportat panes coctos furnarius, et cum illis grandem quamdam placetam curiosse elaboratam, conditam butyro, et pastulis Venetis, ut in ea civitate solent fieri pla-centae hujusmodi. Renuit illa placetam recipere, dicens se talem nullam fecisse. Replicat furnarius, se illa die alium pa-
the sight of the holy images, they roar at the mouth of the possessed person, they gnash, shake, quiver, and display fright and awe. But the Folletti show none of those signs, and leave off their vexations but after a long space of time. Of this I was an eye-witness, and shall relate a story which verily passes human belief: but I take God to witness that I tell the precise truth, corroborated by the testimony of numerous persons.

28. About twenty-five years ago, when I was a lecturer on Sacred Theology in the convent of the Holy Cross, in Pavia, there was living in that city a married woman of unimpeachable morality, and who was most highly spoken of by all such as knew her, especially by the Friars; her name was Hieronyma, and she lived in the parish of S. Michael. One day, this woman had kneaded bread at home and given it out to bake. The oven-man brought her back her loaves when baked, and with them a large cake of a peculiar shape, and made of butter and Venetian paste, as is usual in that city. She declined to take it in, saying she had not made any thing of the kind. — « But, said the oven-man, « I had no other bread but yours to bake to-day, therefore this
nem coquendum non habuisse, nisi illum quem ab ea habuerat; oportere proinde, etiam placentam a se fuisse factam, licet minime de illa recordaretur. Acquievit fæmina, et placentam cum viro suo, filia quam habebat triennem, et famula comedite. Sequenti nocte dum cubaret mulier cum viro suo, et ambo dormirent, expergefacta est a quadam tenuissima voce, velut acutissimi sibili ad ipsius aures susurrante, verbis tamen distinctis: interrogavit autem fæminam, num placent illi placuisset? Pavens fæmina coepit se munire signo Crucis, et invocare sæpius nomina Jesu et Mariæ. Replicabat vox, ne paveret, sè nolle illi nocere, immo quæcumque illi placerent paratum exsequi, esse filo captum pulchritudinis sue, et nil amplius desiderare, quam ejus amplexi frui. Tum fæmina sensit aliquem suaviorem ipsius genas, sed tactus ita levis, ac mollis, ac si esset gossiptum subtilissime carminatum id a quo tacta fuit. Respuit illa invitantem, nec ulla respondit illi dedit: sed jugiter nomen Jesu et Mariæ repetebat, et se Crucis signo muniebat; et sic per spatium quasi hora dimidia tentata fuit, et postea absessit tentator.

Sequenti mane fuit mulier ad confessarium virum prudentem ac doctum, a quo
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cake also must have come from your house; your memory is at fault. The good lady allowed herself to be persuaded, and partook of the cake with her husband, her little girl three years old, and the house servant. The next night, whilst in bed with her husband, and both asleep, she suddenly woke up at the sound of a very slender voice, something like a shrill hissing, whispering in her ears, yet with great distinctness, and inquiring whether the cake had been to her taste? The good lady, frightened, set about guarding herself with a sign of the cross and repeatedly calling the names of Jesus and Mary. « Be not afraid,» said the voice, «I mean you no harm; quite the reverse: I am prepared to do anything to please you; I am captivated by your beauty, and desire nothing more than to enjoy your embraces.» And she felt somebody kissing her cheeks, so lightly, so softly, that she might have fancied being grazed by the finest down. She resisted without giving any answer, merely repeating over and over again the names of Jesus and Mary, and crossing herself; the tempter kept on thus for nearly half an hour, when he withdrew.

The next morning the dame called on her Confessor, a discreet and learned man,
fuit in fide confirmata et exhortata, ut viriliter, sicut fecerat, resisteret, et sacris Reliquiis se muniret. Sequentibus noctibus par priori fuit tentatio, et verbis, et osculis, et par etiam in muliere constantia. Hæc pertæsa talem ac tantam molestiam, ad Confessarii consultationem, et aliorum gravium virorum, per Exorcistas peritos fecit se exorciçare ad sciendum num esset obsessa; et cum invenissent a nullo malo spiritu possideri, benedixerunt domui, cubiculo, lecto, et præceptum Incubo fece-runt, ne auderet molestiam amplius mulieri inferre. Sed omnia incassum: si quidem tentationem inceptam prossequatur, ac si præ amore langueret, ploratus et ejulatus emittebat ad mulierem demulcendam, quæ tamen gratia Die adjuta semper viriliter restitit. Renovavit Incubus tentationem, ipsi apparens interdiu in forma pusionis, seu parvi homunculi pulcherrimi, caesariem habens rutilam et crispam, barbamque fulvam ac splendentem velut aurum, glau-cosque oculos, ut flos lini, incedebatque indutus habitu Hispanico. Apparebat autem illi quamvis cum ea alii morarentur; et questus, prout faciunt amantes, exercens, et jactando basia, solitasque preces repetendo tentabat mulierem, ut ad illius amplexus admitteretur. Videbatque, et au-
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who confirmed her in her faith, exhorted her to maintain her energetic resistance and to provide herself with some holy relics. On the ensuing nights, like temptation with the same language and kisses, like constancy also on the part of the woman. Weary however of such painful and persistent molestation, taking the advice of her Confessor and other grave men, she had herself exorcised by experienced Exorcists, in order to ascertain whether perchance she was not possessed. Having found in her no trace of the evil Spirit, they blessed the house, the bed-room, the bed, and enjoined on the Incubus to discontinue his molestations. All to no purpose: he kept on worse than ever, pretending to be love-sick, weeping and moaning in order to melt the heart of the lady, who however, by the grace of God, remained unconquered. The Incubus then went another way to work: he appeared in the shape of a lad or little man of great beauty, with golden locks, a flaxen beard that shone like gold, sea-green eyes, calling to mind the flax-flower, and arrayed in a fancy Spanish dress. Besides he appeared to her even when in company, whimpering, after the fashion of lovers, kissing his hand to her, and endeavouring by
diebat illa sola præsentem ac loquentem, minime autem cæteri adstantes.

every means to obtain her embraces. She alone saw and heard him: for every body else, he was not to be seen.

The good lady kept persevering in her admirable constancy till, at last, after some months of courting, the Incubus, incensed at her disdain, had recourse to a new kind of persecution. First, he took away from her a silver cross filled with holy relics, and a holy wax or papal lamb of the blessed Pontiff Pius V, which she always carried on her person; then, leaving the locks untouched, he purloined her rings and other gold and silver jewelry from the casket wherein they were put away. Next, he began to strike her cruelly, and after each beating bruises and marks were to be seen on her face, her arms or other parts of her body, which lasted a day or two, then suddenly disappeared, the reverse of natural bruises which decrease slowly and by degrees. Sometimes, while she was nursing her little girl, he would snatch the child away from on her breast and lay it upon the roof, on the edge of the gutter, or hide it, but without ever harming it. Sometimes he would upset all the furniture, or smash to pieces saucepans, plates and other earthenware which, in the twinkling of an eye, he res-
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deprecabatur ab ea concubitum, et dum ipsa de more constans resisteret, in furem actus Incubus abscessit, et infra breve temporis spatium reversus est, secum ferens magnum copiam laminarum saxearum, quibus Genuenses in civitate sua et universa Liguria domos tegunt, et ex ipsis fabricavit murum circa lectum tantæ altitudinis, ut ejus conopeum adæquaret, unde necesse fuit scalis uti, si debuerunt de cubili surgere. Murus autem fuit absque calce, et ipso destructo, saxa in angulo seposita, quæ ibi per duos dies remanserunt visa a multis, qui ad spectaculum convenerant; et post biduum disparuerunt.

Invitaverat maritus ejus in die S. Stephani quosdam amicos viros militares ad prandium, et pro hospitum dignitate dapes paraverat; dum de more lavantur manus ante accubitum, disparet in momento mensa parata in triclinio; disparent obsonia cuncta, olla, caldaria, patinæ, ac omnia vasa in coquina; disparent amphoræ, canthari, callices parati ad potum. Attoniti ad hoc student commensales, qui erant octo, inter quos Dux peditum Hispanus ad alios convertus ait: «Ne payeatis, ista est illusio,
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tored tho their former state. One night that she whas lying with her husband, the Incubus, appearing in his customary shape, vehemently urged his demand which she resisted as usual. The Incubus withdrew in a rage, and shortly came back with a large load of those flag stones which the Genoese, and the inhabitants of Liguria in general, use for roofing their houses. With those stones he built around the bed a wall so high that it reached the tester, and that the couple could not leave their bed without using a ladder. This wall however was built up without lime; when pulled down, the flags were laid by in a corner where, during two days, they were seen by many who came to look at them; they then disappeared.

On S. Stephen's day, the husband had asked some military friends to dinner, and, to do honour to his guests, had provided a substantial repast. Whilst they were, as customary, washing their hands before taking their seats, suddenly vanished the table dressed in the dining-room; all the dishes, saucepans, kettles, plates and crockery in the kitchen vanished likewise, as well as the jugs, bottles and glasses. You may imagine the surprise, the stupor of the guests, eight in number; amongst them was a
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» sed pro certo mensa in loco in quo erat, 
» adhuc est, et modo modo eam tactu percipiam. » Hisque dictis circuibat cœnaculum manibus extentis, tentans mensam deprehendere, sed cum post multis circuitus incassum laborasset, et nil præter aerem tangeret, irrisus fuit a cœteris; cumque jam grandis esset prandii hora, pallium proprium eorum unusquisque sumpsit propriam domum petiturus. Jam erant omnes prope januam domus in procinctu eundi, associati a marito vexatae mulieris, urbaniatis causa, cum grandem quendam strepitum in cœnaculo audiunt Subsistunt parumper ad cognoscendum causam strepitus, et accurrrens famula nuntiat in coquina vasa nova obsoniis plena apparuisse, mensamque in cœnaculo jam paratam esse restitutam. Revertuntur in cœnaculum, et stupent mensam mappis et manutergius insolitis, salino, et lancibus insolitis argenteis, salemmentis, ac obsoniis, quæ domi parata non fuerant, instructam. A latere magna erecta erat credentia, supra quam optimo ordine stabant calices crystallinis, argentini et aurei, cum variis amphoribus, lagenis, cantharis plenis vinis exteriis, puta Cretensi, Campano, Canariensi, Rhenano, etc. In coquina pariter in ollis, et vasis itidem in ea domo nunquam visis, varia obsonia. Dubitarunt
Spanish Captain of infantry, who, addressing the company, said to them: « Do not be frightened, it is but a trick: the table is certainly still where it stood, and I shall soon find it by feeling for it.» Having thus spoken, he paced round the room with outstretched arms, endeavouring to lay hold of the table; but when, after many circuitous perambulations, it was apparent that he laboured in vain and grasped at nought but thin air, he was laughed at by his friends; and it being already high time for having dinner, each guest took up his cloak and set about to return home. They had already reached the street-door with the husband, who, out of politeness, was attending them, when they heard a great noise in the dining-room: they stood to ascertain the cause thereof, and presently the servant came up to announce that the kitchen was stocked with new vessels filled with food, and that the table was standing again in its former place. Having gone back to the dining-room, they were stupefied to see the table was laid, with cloths, napkins, salt-cellars, and trays that did not belong to the house, and with food which had not been cooked there. On a large sideboard all were arrayed in perfect order: crystal, silver and gold chalices, with all
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prius nonnulli ex iis eas dapes gustare, sed confirmati ab aliis accubuerunt, et exquisitissime omnia condita repererunt; ac immediate a prandio, dum omnes pro usu illius tempores ad ignem sedent, omnia us tensilia cum reliquis ciborum disparuere, et repertæ sunt antiquæ domus supellectiles simul cum dapibus, quæ prius parata fuerant; et quod mirum est, convivæ omnes saturati sunt, ita ut nullus eorum cænam sumpserit præ prandii lautitia. Quo convincitur cibos appositos reales fuisse, et non ex præstigio representatos.

Interea effluxerant multi menses, ex quos coeperat hujusmodi persecutio: et mulier votum fecit B. Bernardino Feltrensi, cujus sacrum corpus veneratur in Ecclesia S. Jacobi prope murum illius urbis, incedendi per annum integrum indutam panno griseo, et chordulato, quo utuntur Fratres Minores, de quorum ordine fuit B. Bernardinus, ut per ipsius patrocinium a tanta Incubi vexatione liberaretur. Et de facto
kind of amphorae, decanters and cups filled with foreign wines, from the Isle of Crete, Campania, the Canaries, the Rhine, etc. In the kitchen there was also an abundant variety of meats in saucepans and dishes that had never been seen there before. At first, some of the guests hesitated whether they should taste of that food; however, encouraged by others, they sat down, and soon partook of the meal, which was found exquisite. Immediately afterwards, as they were sitting before a seasonable fire, everything vanished at once, the dishes and the leavings, and in their stead reappeared the cloth of the house and the victual which had been previously cooked; but, for a wonder, all the guests were satisfied, so that no one thought of supper after such a magnificent dinner. A clear proof that the substituted viands were real and nowise fictitious.

This kind of persecution had been going on some months, when the lady betook herself to the blessed Bernardine of Feltri, whose body is worshipped in the church of St James, a short distance from the walls of the city. She made a vow to him that she would wear, during a whole twelve-month, a grey frock, tied round her waist with a piece of cord, and such as is worn by the Minor-Brethren, the order
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die 28 Septembris, qui est pervigilium Dedicationis S. Michaelis Archangeli, et festum B. Bernardini, ipsa veste votiva induta est. Mane sequenti, quod est festum S. Michaelis, ibat vexata ad ecclesiam S. Michaelis, quæ ut diximus erat parochialis ipsius, circa medium mane, dum frequens populus ad illam confluebat; et cum pervenisset ad medium plateæ ecclesiae, omnia ipsius indumenta et ornamenta ceciderunt in terram et rapta vento statim disparuerunt, ipsa relictà nuda. Adfuerunt sorte inter alios duo equites viri longævi, qui factum videntes, dejectis ab humero propriis palliis mulieris nuditatem, ut potuerunt, velarunt, et rhedæ imposiám ad propriam domum duxerunt. Vestes et jocalia quæ rapuerat Incubus, non restituit nisi post sex menses.

Multa alia, et quidem stupenda operatus est contra eam Incubus, quæ tædet exscribere, et per multos annos in ea tentatione
to which had belonged the blessed Bernardine; this she vowed, in the hope of being, through his intercession, at last rid of the persecution of the Incubus. And accordingly, on the 28th of September, the vigil of the Dedication of the Archangel S. Michael, and the festival of the blessed Bernardine, she assumed the votive robe. The next morning, which was S. Michael’s festival, the afflicted woman proceeded to the church of St Michael, her own parish, already mentioned; it was about ten o’clock, a time when a crowd of people were going to mass. She had no sooner set foot on the treshold of the church, than her clothes and ornaments fell off to the ground, and disappeared in a gust of wind, leaving her stark naked. There happened fortunately to be among the crowd two cavaliers of mature age, who, seeing what had taken place, hastened to divest themselves of their cloaks with which they concealed, as well as they could, the woman’s nudity, and having put her into a vehicle, accompanied her home. The clothes and trinkets taken by the Incubus were not restored by him before six months had elapsed.

I might relate many other most surprising tricks which that Incubus played on her, were it not wearisome. Suffice it to say that,
permansit; tandemque Incubus videns operam in ea perdere, destitit a tam importuna et insolita vexatione.

29. In hoc casu, et similibus qui passim audientur et leguntur, Incubus ad nullum actum contra Religionem tentat, sed solum contra castitatem. Hinc fit quod ipsi consentiens non peccat irreligiositate, sed incontinentia.

30. In confessu autem est apud Theologos et Philosophos, quod ex commixtione hominis cum Daemonis aliquoties nascuntur homines, et tali modo nasciturum esse Antichristum opinantur nonnulli Doctores: Bellarm. lib. 1, de Rom. Pont., cap. 12; Suarez, tom. 2, disp. 54, sec. 1.; Maluend., de Antichr., l. 2., c. 8. Immo observant, quod, qui gignuntur ab hujusmodi Incubis, naturali causa etiam evenit, ut nascantur grandes, robustissimi, ferocissimi, superbissimi, ac nequissimi, ut scripsit Maluenda, loc. cit., § Ad illud; et hujus rationem recitat ex Vallesio Archia. Reggio. Sac. Philosoph., c. 8., dicente quod Incubi summittant in uteros non quaecumque, neque quantumcumque semen, sed plurimum, crassissimum, calidissimum, spiritibus af-
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for a number of years he persevered in his temptation of her, but that finding at last that he was losing his pains, he desisted from his vexatious importunities.

29. In the above case, as well as in others that may be heard or read of occasionally, the Incubus attempts no act against Religion; he merely assails chastity. In consequence, consent is not a sin through ungodliness, but through incontinence.

30. Now, it is undoubted by Theologians and philosophers that carnal intercourse between mankind and the Demon sometimes gives birth to human beings; that is how is to be born the Antichrist, according to some Doctors, such as Bellarmin, Suarez, Maluenda, etc. They further observe that, from a natural cause, the children thus begotten by Incubi are tall, very hardy and bold, very proud and wicked. Thus writes Maluenda; as for the cause, he gives it from Vallesius, Archphysician in Reggio: "What Incubi introduce in uteros, is not qualecumque neque quantumcumque semen, but abundant, very thick, very warm, rich in spirits and free from serosity. This moreover is an easy thing for them, since they have but to choose
54 Dæmonialitas

ardent, robust men, et abundantes multo semine, quibus succumbant, and then wo-
men of a like constitution, quibus incum-
bant, taking care that both shall enjoy
voluptatem solito majorem, tanto enim
abundantius emittitur semen, quanto cum
majori voluptate excernitur. » Those are
the words of Vallesius, confirmed by Ma-
luenda who shows, from the testimony of
various Authors, mostly classical, that
such associations gave birth to: Romulus
and Remus, according to Livy and
Plutarch; Servius-Tullius, the sixth king
of Rome, according to Dyonisius of Hali-
çarnassus and Pliny the Elder; Plato the
Philosopher, according to Diogenes Laer-
tius and Saint Hieronymus; Alexander
the Great, according to Plutarch and
Quintus-Curtius; Seleucus, king of Syria,
according to Justinus and Appianus;
Scipio Africanus the Elder, according to
Livy; the emperor Cæsar Augustus,
according to Suetonius; Aristomenes the
Messenian, an illustrious Greek com-
mander, according to Strabo and Pausanias;
as also Merlin or Melchin the Englishman,
born from an Incubus and a nun, the
daughter of Charlemagne; and, lastly, as
shown by the writings of Cochlaeus quoted
by Maluenda, that damned Heresiarch
ycleped Martin Luther.
Heresiarcha scribit Cochlaeus apud M. luendam, de Antich., lib. 2, c. 6, § Caeterum.

31. Salva tamen tot, et tantorum Doctorum, qui in ea opinione conveniunt, reverentia, non video, quomodo ipsorum sententia possit subsistere; tum quia, ut optime opinatur Pererius, tom. 2, in Genes., cap. 6, disp. 5, tota vis et efficacia humani seminis consistit in spiritibus, qui difflandur, et evanescent statim ac sunt extra genitalia vasa, a quibus foventur et conservantur, ut scribunt Medici. Nequit proinde Daemon semen acceptum conservare, ita ut aptum sit generationi, quia vas, quodcumque sit illud, in quo semen conservare tentaret, oporteret quod caleret calore assimetro a nativo organorum humanae generationis; similarem enim a nullo alio praeterquam ab organis ipsis habere potest generatio. Tum quia generatio actus vitalis est, per quem homo generans de propria substantia semen defert per organa naturalia ad locum generationi congruentem. In casu autem delatio seminis non potest esse actus vitalis hominis generantis, quia ab eo non infertur in matricem; proinde nec dici potest, quod homo
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However, with due deference to so many and such learned Doctors, I hardly see how their opinion can bear examination. For, as Pererius truly observes in his Commentary on the Genesis, chapt. 6, the whole strength and efficiency of the human sperm reside in the spirits which evaporate and vanish as soon as issued from the genital vessels wherein they were warmly stored: all medical men agree on that point. It is consequently not possible that the Demon should preserve in a fit state for generation the sperm he has received; for it were necessary that whatever vessel he endeavoured to keep it in should be equally warm with the human genital organs, the warmth of which is nowhere to be met with but in those organs themselves. Now, in a vessel where that warmth is not intrinsical but extraneous, the spirits get altered, and no generation can take place. There is this other objection, that generation is a vital act by which man, begetting from his own substance, carries the sperm through natural organs to the spot which is appropriate to generation. On the contrary, in this particular case, the introduction of sperm cannot be a vital act of the man who begets, since it is not carried into the womb by his agency; and, for
cujus est semen, generet foetum, qui ex eo nascitur. Neque Incubus ipsius pater dici potest; quia de ipsius substantia semen non est. Hinc fiet, quod nascetur homo, cujus nemo pater sit, quod est incongruum. Tum quia in patre naturaliter generante duplex causalitas concurrit, nempe materialis, quia semen, quod materia generationis, ministrat, et efficiens, quia agens principale est in generatione, ut communiter statuunt Philosophi. In casu autem nostro homo ministrando solum semen, puram materiam exhiberet absqueulla actione in ordine ad generationem; proinde non posset dici pater filii qui nascetur: et hoc est contra id, quod homo genitus ab Incubo non est illius filius, sed est filius ejus viri, a quo Incubus semen sumpsit.

32. Præterea omni probabilitate caret quod scribit Vallesius, et ex eo recitavimus
the same cause, it cannot be said that the man, whose sperm it was, has begotten the fetus which proceeds from it. Nor can the Incubus be deemed its father, since the sperm does not issue from his own substance. Consequently, a child would be born without a father, which is absurd. Third objection: when the father begets in the course of nature, there is a concurrence of two casualties: the one, material, for he provides the sperm which is the matter of generation; the other, efficient, for he is the principal agent of generation, as Philosophers agree in declaring. But, in this case, the man who only provided the sperm would contribute but a mere material, without any action tending to generation; he could therefore not be regarded as the father of the child begotten under those circumstances; and this is opposed to the notion that the child begotten by an Incubus is not his son, but the son of the man whose sperm the Incubus has taken.

3a. Besides, there is not a shadow of probability in what was written by Vallesius and quoted from him by us (Vide supra n° 30); and I wonder that any thing so extravagant should have fallen from
supra no 30; mirorque a doctissimi viri calamo talia excidisse. Notissimum enim est apud Physicos, quod magnitudo foetus non est a quantitate molis, sed est a quantitate virtutis, hoc est spirituum in semine: ab ea enim tota generationis ratio dependet, ut optime testatur Michael Ettmullerus, Inst. Medic. Physiolog., car. 22, thes. 1, fol. m., 39, scribens: Tota generationis ratio dependet a spiritu genitali sub crassioris materiae involucro excreto; ista materia seminis crassa nullo modo, vel in utero subsistente, vel seu materia foetum constitutae: sed solus spiritus genitalis maris unitus cum spiritu genitali mulieris in poros uteri, seu, quod rarius fit, in tubos uteri se insinuat, indeque uterum fecundum reddit. Quid ergo facere potest magna quantitas seminis ad foetus magnitudinem? Præterea nec semper verum est, quod tales geniti ab Incubis magnitudine molis corporae insignes sint: Alexander enim Magnus, qui, ut diximus, natus taliter scribitur, statura pusillus erat; unde carmen,

Magnus Alexander corpore parvus erat.

Item quamvis taliter concepti supra caeteros homines excellant, non tamen hoc semper est in vitis, sed aliquando in virtutibus
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the pen of such a learned man. Medical men are well aware that the size of the fetus depends, not indeed on the quantity of matter, but on the quantity of virtue, that is to say of spirits held by the sperm; there lies the whole secret of generation, as is well observed by Michael Etmüller, Institut. Medic. Physiolog.: «Generation», says he, «entirely depends upon the genital spirit contained within an envelope of thicker matter; that spermatic matter does not remain in the uterus, and has no share in the formation of the fetus; it is but the genital spirit of the male, combined with the genital spirit of the female, that permeates the pores, or, less frequently, the tubes of the uterus, which it fecundates by that means. » Of what moment can therefore the quantity of sperm be for the size of the fetus? Besides, it is not always a fact that men thus begotten by Incubi are remarkable for the huge proportions of their body: Alexander the Great, for instance, who is said to have been thus born, as we have mentioned, was very short; as the poet said of him:

Magnus Alexander corpore parvus erat.

Besides, although it is generally a fact that those who are thus begotten excel
etiam in moralibus, ut patet in Scipione Africano, Cæsare Augusto, et Platone Philosofo, de quibus Livius, Suetonius et Laertius respective scribunt, quod optimi in moribus fuere; ut proinde arguere possumus, quod si alii eodem modo geniti pessimi fuere, hoc non fuerit ex hoc, quod fuerint ab Incubo geniti, sed quia tales ex proprio arbitrio exstitere.
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other men, yet such superiority is not always shown by their vices, but sometimes by their virtues and even their morals; Scipio Africanus, for instance, Cæsar Augustus and Plato the Philosopher, as is recorded of each of them respectively by Livy, Suetonius and Diogenes Laertius, had excellent morals. Whence may be inferred that, if other individuals begotten in the same way have been downright villains, it was not owing to their being born of an Incubus, but to their having, of their own free will, chosen to be such.

We also read in the Testament, Genesis, chap. 6, verse 4, that giants were born when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men: that is the very letter of the sacred text. Now, those giants were men of great stature, says Baruch, chap. 3, verse 26, and far superior to other men. Not only were they distinguished by their huge size, but also by their physical power, their plundering habits and their tyranny. Through their criminal excesses the Giants were the primary and principal cause of the Flood, according to Cornelius a Lapide, in his Commentary on Genesis. Some contend that by Sons of God are meant the sons of Seth, and by Daughters
Cain vice versa: nam salva opinantium, Chrysost., Cyrill., Theodor. Rupert. Ab. et Hilar. in Psalm. 132, apud Cornel., a Lap., c. 6; G., v. 2, § Verum dies, reverentia, talis expositio non cohaeret sensui patenti litterae; ait enim Scriptura, quod ex conjunctione talium nati sunt homines monstruosae proceritatis corporeae: ante illam ergo tales gigantes non extiterunt: quod si ex ea orti sunt, hoc non potuit esse ex eo, quod filii Seth coivissent cum filiibus Cain, quia illi erant staturae ordinariae, prout etiam filiae Cain, unde oriri ex his naturaliter non potuerunt nisi filii staturae ordinariae: si ergo monstruosa statura filii nati sunt ex tali conjunctione, hoc fuit, quia non fuerunt prognati ex ordinaria conjunctione viri cum muliere, sed ex Incubis daemonibus qui ratione naturae ipsorum optime possunt vocari filii Dei, et in hac sententia sunt Philosophi Platonici, et Franciscus Georgius Venetus, tom. 1, problem. 74: nec dissentient ab eadem Joseph. Hebraeus, Philo Judaeus, S. Justinus Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, et Tertullianus, Joseph. Hebraeus, Antiq., l. 1.; Philo, l. de Gigant.; S. Justinus M., Apolog. 1.; Clemens Alex., lib. 3; Tertull., lib. de Habit. Mul., apud Cornel., loc. cit.; Hugo de S. Victor., Annot. in Gen., c. 6,
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of men the daughters of Cain, because the former practiced piety, religion and every other virtue, whilst the descendants of Cain were quite the reverse; but, with all due deference to Chrysostom, Cyrilis, Hilarius and others who are of that opinion, it must be conceded that it clashes with the obvious meaning of the text. Scripture says, in fact, that of the conjunction of the above mentioned were born men of huge bodily size: consequently, those giants were not previously in existence, and if their birth was the result of that conjunction, it cannot be ascribed to the intercourse of the sons of Seth with the daughters of Cain, who being themselves of ordinary stature, could but procreate children of ordinary stature. Therefore, if the intercourse in question gave birth to beings of huge stature, the reason is that it was not the common connection between man and woman, but the performance of Incubi Demons who, from their nature, may very well be styled sons of God. Such is the opinion of the Platonist Philosophers and of Francis Georges the Venetian; nor is it discrepant from that of Josephus the Historian, Philo the Jew, S. Justinus the Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, who look upon Incubi as corporeal 6.
qui opinantur illos fuisse Angelos quos-
nam corporeos qui in luxuriam cum mulie-
ribus delapsi sunt: ut enim infra ostend-
demus, istæ duæ sententiae in unam et eamdem
conveniunt.

33. Si ergo Incubi tales, ut fert communis
sententia, Gigantes genuerunt, accepto se-
mine ab homine, juxta id, quod supra
dictum est, non potuerunt ex illo semine
nasci nisi homines ejusdem staturæ plus
minusve, cum eo a quo semen acceptum est:
nec enim facit ad altiorem corporis staturam
major seminis quantitas, ita ut attracta
insolite a Dæmone, dum Succubus fit homini,
augat ultra illius staturam enormiter cor-
pus ab eo geniti; quia, ut supra diximus,
hoc resedit in spiritu, et non in mole semi-
nis: ut proinde necesse sit concludere,
quod ab alio semen, quam humano, hujus-
modi gigantes nati sint, et proinde Dæmon
Incubus non humano, sed alio semen utatur
ad generationem. Quid igitur dicendum?
Angels who have allowed themselves to fall into the sin of lewdness with women. Indeed, as shall be shown hereafter, though seemingly distinct, those two opinions are but one and the same.

33. If therefore these Incubi, in conformity with general belief, have begotten Giants by means of sperm taken from man, it is impossible, as aforesaid, that of that sperm should have been born any but men of approximately the same size as he from whom it came; for it would be in vain for the Demon, when acting the part of a Succubus, to draw from man an unwonted quantity of prolific liquor in order to procreate therefrom children of higher stature; quantity has nothing to do here, since all depends, as we have said, upon the vitality of that liquor, not its quantity. We are therefore bound to infer that Giants are born of another sperm than man’s, and that, consequently, the Incubus Demon, for the purpose of generation, uses a sperm which is not man’s. But then, what is to be said?
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34. Quantum ad hoc, sub correctione Sanctæ Matris Ecclesiae, et mere opinative dico, Incubum Dæmonem, dum mulieribus commiscetur, ex proprio ipsius semine hominem generare.

35. Paradoxa in fide, et parum sana nonnullis videbitur hæc opinio; sed lectorem meum deprecor, ut judicium non præcipitet de ea: ut enim incivile est nondum tota lege perspecta judicare, ut Celsus, lib. 24. ff. de legib. et S. C., ait, ita neque damnanda est opinio, nisi prius examinatis, ac solutis argumentis, quibus inmititur. Ad probandam igitur supradatam conclusionem, nonnulla sunt necessario præmittenda.

34. Subject to correction by our Holy Mother Church, and as a mere expression of opinion, I say that the Incubus Demon, when having intercourse with women, bigets the human fetus from his own sperm.

35. To many that proposition will seem heterodox and hardly sensible; but I beg of my reader not to condemn it precipitately; for if, as Celsus says, it is improper to deliver judgment without having thoroughly inquired into the law, no less unfair is the rejection of an opinion, before the arguments upon which it rests have been weighed and confuted. I have therefore to prove the above conclusion, and must necessarily premise with some statements.

36. Firstly, I premise, as an article of belief, that there are purely spiritual creatures, not in any way partaking of corporeal matter, as was ruled by the Council of Lateran, under the pontificate of Innocent III. Such are the blessed Angels, and the Demons condemned to ever-lasting fire. Some Doctors, it is true, have professed, subsequently even to this Council, that the spirituality of Angels and Demons

37. Inaudita forsan erit sententia hæc, sed non destituta erit probabilitate. Si enim a Theologis tanta inter Angelos diversitas
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is not an article of belief; others even have asserted that they are corporeal, whence Bonaventure Baron has drawn the conclusion that it is neither heretical nor erroneous to ascribe to Angels and Demons a twofold substance, corporeal and spiritual. Yet, the Council having formally declared it to be an article of belief that God is the maker of all things visible and invisible, spiritual and corporeal, who has raised from nothing every creature spiritual or corporeal, Angelic or terrestrial, I contend it is an article of belief that there are certain merely spiritual creatures, and that such are Angels; not all of them, but a certain number.

37. It may seem strange, yet it must be admitted not to be unlikely. If, in fact, Theologians concur in establishing
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specifica, et proninde essentialis statuitur, ut
in via D. Thomae, p. p. 50, ar. 4,
plures Angeli nequeant esse in eadem specie,
seu quilibet Angelus propria speciem
constituat, profecto nulla inventur repugnantia,
quod Angelorum nonnulli sunt
purissimi spiritus, et proninde excellentissimae
naturae, alii autem corporei, et minus
excellentes, et eorum differentia petatur
per corporeum et incorporeum. Accedit
quod hac sententia facile solvitur alias insolubilis
contradictio inter duo Concilia
Ecumenica, nempe Septimam Synodum
generalem, et dictum Concilium Lateranense:
si quidem in illa Synodo, quae est
secunda Nicæa, actione quinta, productus
est liber Ioannis Thessalonicensis scriptus
contra quemdam Philosophum gentilem, in
quo ita habetur: De Angelis et Archan-
gelis, atque eorum Potestatibus, quibus
nostras Animas adjungo, ipsa Catholica
Ecclesia sic sentit, esse quidem intelligi-
biles, sed non omnino corporis expertes,
et insensibles, ut vos Gentiles dicitis,
verum tenui corpore praeditos, et aereo,
sive igneo, sicut scriptum est: qui facit
Angelos suos spiritus, et ministros suos
ignem uirentem. Et infra: Quamquam
autem non sint ut nos, corporei, utpote
ex quatuor elementis, nemo tamen vel
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amongst Angels a specific, and therefore essential, diversity so considerable that, according to St. Thomas, there are not two Angels of the same species, but that each of them is a species by himself, why should not certain Angels be most pure spirits, of a consequently very superior nature, and others corporeal, therefore of a less perfect nature, differing thus from each other in their corporeal or incorporeal substance? This doctrine has the advantage of solving the otherwise insoluble contradiction between two Æcumenical Councils, namely the Seventh General Synod and the above-mentioned Council of Lateran. For, during the fifth sitting of that Synod, the second of Nicea, a book was introduced written by John of Thessalonica against a pagan Philosopher, wherein occur the following propositions: «Respecting Angels, Archangels and their Powers, to which I adjoin our own Souls, the Catholic Church is really of opinion that they are intelligences, but not entirely bodyless and senseless, as you Gentiles aver; she on the contrary ascribes to them a subtile body, aerial or igneous, according to what is written: He makes the spirits His Angels, and the burning fire His Minister». And further on: «Although not corporeal in the

38. *Hanc autem Conciliarem adprobationem de materia ad longum pertractata a D. Joanne in libro coram Patribus lecto, statuere articulum fidei circa corporeitatem Angelorum, perspicuum est*: unde ad tollendum contradictionem hujus, cum allata definitione Concilii Lateranensis, multum desudant Theologi. *Unus enim, Suarez, de Angelis, ait, quod Patres non contradixerunt tali asserto de corporeitate Angelorum, quia non de illa re agebatur. Alius, Bann., in p. p. q. 10, ait, quod Synodus adprobavit conclusionem, nempe Angelos pingi posse, non tamen adpro-
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same way as ourselves, made of the four elements, yet it is impossible to say that Angels, Demons and Souls are incorporeal; for they have been seen many a time, invested with their own body, by those whose eyes the Lord had opened". And after that book had been read through before all the Fathers in Council assembled, Tharasisius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, submitted it to the approval of the Council, with these words: «The Father showeth that Angels should be pictured, since their form can be defined, and they have been seen in the shape of men». Without a dissentient, the Synod answered: «Yes, my Lord».

38. That this approbation by a Council of the doctrine set forth at length in the book of John establishes an article of belief with regard to the corporeity of Angels, there is not a shadow of doubt: so Theologians toil and moil in order to remove the contradiction apparent between that decision and the definition, above quoted, by the Council of Lateran. One of them, Suarez, says that if the Fathers did not disprove such an assertion of the corporeity of Angels, it is because that was not the question. Another contends that the Synod did approve the conclusion, namely
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39. Sed quam frigidæ sint istæ respon-siones nemo non videt, ac eas minime sa-tisfacere oppositioni palmariter demonstrat Bonaventura Baro, Scot. Defens., tom. 9, apolog. 2, actio 1, § 2 per totum. Proinde ad tollendam contradictionem Conciliorum dicendum est, Nicæum locutum esse de una, Lateranense autem de alia specie Angelorum, et illam quidem corpoream, hanc vero penitus incorpoream;
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that Angels might be pictured, but not the motive given, their corporeity. A third, Molina, observes that the definitions issued in Council by the Synod were thus issued only at the seventh sitting, whence he argues that those of the previous sittings are not definitions of belief. Others, lastly, write that neither the Council of Nicea nor that of Lateran intended defining a question of belief, the Council of Nicea having spoken according to the opinion of the Platonists, which describes Angels as corporeal beings and was then prevailing, whilst that of Lateran went with Aristotle, who, in his 12th. book of Metaphysics, lays down the existence of incorporeal intelligences, a doctrine which has since carried the day with most Doctors over the Platonists.

39. But any one can discern the invalidity of those answers, and Bonaventure Baro (Scot. Defens., tome 9) proves to evidence that they do not bear. In consequence, in order to agree the two Councils, we must say that the Council of Nicea meant one species of Angels, and that of Lateran another: the former, corporeal, the latter on the contrary absolutely incorporeal; and thus are recon-
et sic concilian tur aliter irreconciliabilia
Concilia.

40. Præmittendum 2°, nomen Angeli
esse nomen officii, non naturæ, ut concor-
diter scribunt S. S. Patres: Ambros. in c. 1 epist. ad Hebr., Hilaris, l. 5 de Trin.,
Augustinus, lib. 15 de Civit. Dei c. 23,
Gregorius, Hom. 34 in Evang., Isidorus,
l. de Sum. Bonit., c. 12; unde præclare
ait D. Ambrosius: Angelus non ex eo
quod est spiritus, ex eo quod agit, An-
gelus, quia Angelus Græce, Latine Nunti-
tius dicitur; sequitur igitur ex hoc, quod
illi, qui ad aliquod ministerium a Deo
mittuntur, sive spiritus sint, sive homines,
Angeli vocari possunt; et de facto ita
vocantur in Scripturis Sacris: nam de
Sacerdotibus, Concionatoribus ac Doc-
toribus, qui tanquam Nuntii Dei explicant
hominibus divinam voluntatem, dicitur,
Malach. c. 2. v. 7: Labia Sacerdotis
custodient scientiam, et legem requirent
ex ore ejus, quia Angelus Domini exerci-
tuum est. D. Joannes Baptistæ ab eodem
Prophe ta, c. 3 v. 1, vocatur Angelus,
dum ait: Ecce ego mitto Angelum meum,
et præparabit viam ante faciem meam. Et
hanc propheticam esse ad litteram de
S. Joanne Baptistæ testatur Christus Do-
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ciled two otherwise irreconcilable Councils.

40. Secondly, I premise that the word Angel applies, not indeed to the kind, but to the office: the Holy Fathers are agreed thereupon (St. Ambrose, on the Epistle to the Hebrews; St. Austin, City of God; St. Gregory, Homily 34 on Scripture; St. Isidorus, Supreme Goodness). An Angel, very truly says St. Ambrose, is thus styled, not because he is a spirit, but on account of his office: ἀγγέλος in Greek, Nuntius in Latin, that is to say Messenger; it follows that whoever is entrusted by God with a mission, be he spirit or man, may be called an Angel, and is thus called in the Holy Scriptures, where the following words are applied to Priests, Preachers and Doctors, who, as Messengers of God, explain to men the divine will (Malachi, chapt. 2, v. 7). « The priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth, for he is the Angel of the Lord of Hosts. » The same prophet, chapt. 3, v. 1, bestows the name of Angel on St. John the Baptist, when saying: « Behold, I will send my Angel and he shall prepare the way before me. » That this prophecy literally applies to St. John the Baptist is
minus in Evangelio Matthæi, 11, v. 10. Immo et ipse Deus, quia fuit missus a Patre in mundum ad evangelizandum legem gratiae, vocatur Angelus. Ita in prophetia Isaïæ, c. 9 v. 6, juxta versionem Septuaginta: Vocabitur nomen ejus magni consilii Angelus, et clarius in Malachïæ c. 3 v. 1: Veniet ad templum sanctum suum Dominator quem vos quæritis, et Angelus testamenti quem vos vultis. Quæ prophetia ad litteram est de Christo Domino. Sequitur igitur nullum absurdum sequi ex hoc, quod dicimus Angelos quosdam esse corporeos, nam et homines, qui corpore constant, Angeli vocabulo efferuntur.

41. Præmittendum 30, nondum rerum naturalium, quæ sunt in mundo, satis perspectam esse existentiam, aut naturam, ut proinde aliquid negandum sit ex eo, quod de illo nunquam alias dictum, aut scriptum fuerit. Patet enim tractu temporis detectas esse novas terras, quas Antiqui nostri ignorarunt, novaque animalia, herbas, plantas, fructus, semina nunquam alias visa; et si pervia esset Terra Australis incognita, cujus indagatio, et lustratio
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testified by our Lord Jesus-Christ, in the Gospel, according to St. Matthew, chapt. 11, v. 10. Still more: God himself is called an Angel, because he has been sent by His Father to herald the law of mercy. To witness, the prophecy of Isaiah, chapt. 9, v. 6, according to Septuagint: « He shall be called an Angel of Wonderful Counsel. » And more plainly still in Malachi, chapt. 3, v. 1: « The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Angel of the covenant whom ye delight in », a prophecy which literally applies to our Lord Jesus-Christ. There is consequently nothing absurd in the contention that some Angels are corporeal, since men, who assuredly have a body, are called Angels.

41. Thirdly, I premise that neither the existence nor the nature of the natural things in this world has been sufficiently investigated to allow of denying a fact, merely because it has never been previously spoken of or written about. In the course of time have not new lands been discovered which the Ancients knew not of? New animals, herbs, plants, fruits and seeds, never seen elsewhere? And if that mysterious Austral land came at last to be explored,
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a multis hucusque incassum tentata est, adhuc nova nobis alia panderentur. Patet adhuc, quod per inventionem microscopiæ, et alias machinas, et organa Philosophiæ experimentalis modernæ, sicut etiam per exactiorem indaginem Anatomistarum, multarum rerum naturalium existentiam, vires, naturamque tum innotuisse, tum dietim innotescere, quæ præcedentes Philosophi ignorarunt, ut patet in auro fulminante, phosphoro, et centum aliis chymicis experimentis, circulatione sanguinis, venis lacteis, vasis lymphaticis, et aliis hujusmodi quæ nuper Anatomistæ adinvennerunt. Proinde ineptum erit aliquid exibillare ex hoc quod de eo nullus Antiquorum scripserit, attento maxime Logicorum axiomate, quod locus ab auctoritate negativa non tenet.

42. Præmittendum 4o, quod in Sacra Scriptura, et Ecclesiasticis traditionibus non traditur nisi id, quod ad animæ salutem necessarium est, quoad credendum, sperandum et amandum; unde inferre non licet ex eo, quod nec ex Scriptura, nec ex traditione aliquid habetur, proinde negan-
as has been to this day vainly tried by so many travellers, what unforeseen disclosures would be the result! Through the invention of the microscope and other instruments used by modern experimental Philosophy, combined with the more exact methods of investigation of Anatomists, have there not been, and are there not, every day, brought to light the existence, qualities and characteristics of a number of natural things unknown to ancient Philosophers, such as fulminating gold, phosphorus, and a hundred other chemical compounds, the circulation of the blood, the lacteal vessels, the lymph ducts and other recent anatomical discoveries? To deride a doctrine because it does not happen to be mentioned in any ancient author would therefore be absurd, especially bearing in mind this axiom of Logic: *locus ab auctoritate negativa non tenet.*

42. Fourthly, I premise that Holy Scripture and ecclesiastical tradition do not teach us any thing beyond what is requisite for the salvation of the soul, namely Faith, Hope and Charity. Consequently, from a thing not being stated either by Scripture or tradition it must not be in-
dum sit, quod illud tale existat: aut nos quidem Fides docet, Deum per Verbum suum omnia creasse visibilia, et invisibilia; pariterque ex Jesu Christi Domini nostri meritis tum gratiam, tum gloriam omni, et cuivis rationali creaturæ conferri. Num autem alius Mundus a nostro, quem incolimus, sit, et in eo alii homines non ab Adam propegnati, sed alio modo a Deo creati existant (sicut ponunt illi qui lunarem globum habitatum opinantur); pariterque num in hoc Mundo, quem incolimus, aliae existant creaturæ rationales ultra homines, et Spiritus Angelicos, quæ regulariter hominibus sint invisibiles, et per accidentem, et earum executiva potentia fiant visibiles: hoc nullo modo spectat ad fidem, et hoc scire, aut ignorare non est ad salutem hominis necessarium, sicut nec scire rerum omnium physicarum numerum aut naturam.

43. Præmitendum 50, nullam inveniri repugnantiam, nec in Philosophia, nec in Theologia; quod dari possint creaturæ rationales constantes spiritu et corpore, aliae ab homine, quia si esse repugnantia, hoc esset vel ex parte Dei (et hoc non quia ipse omnipotens est), vel ex parte rei creabilis;
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ferred that that thing is not in existence. For instance, Faith teaches us that God, by His Word, made things visible, and invisible, and also that, through the merits of our Lord Jesus-Christ, grace and glory are conferred on every rational creature. Now, that there be another World than the one we live in, and that it be peopled by men not born of Adam but made by God, in some other way, as is implied by those who believe the lunar globe to be inhabited; or further, that in the very World we dwell in, there be other rational creatures besides man and the Angelic Spirits, creatures generally invisible to us and whose being is disclosed but accidentally, through the instrumentality of their own power; all that has nothing to do with Faith, and the knowledge or ignorance thereof is no more necessary to the salvation of man than knowing the number or nature of all physical things.

43. Fifthly, I premise that neither Philosophy nor Theology is repugnant to the possible existence of rational creatures having spirit and body and distinct from man. Such repugnance could be supported only on God, and that is inadmissible, since he is all-mighty, or on the thing to

44. Astruitur autem magis talium creaturarum possibilitas ex solutione argumentorum, quae contra positam conclusionem fieri possunt, pariterque ex responsione ad interrogationes, quae possunt circa eam formari.

45. Prima interrogatio est, an tales creaturarum dicendae essent animalia rationalia? Quod si sic, quomodo different ab homine, cum quo communem haberent definitionem?
be made, and that likewise cannot be supported; for, as there are purely spiritual creatures, such as Angels, or merely material, such as the World, or lastly semi-spiritual and semi-corporeal, of an earthly and gross corporeity, such as man, so there may well be in existence a creature endowed with a rational spirit and a corporeity less gross, more subtile than man’s. No doubt, moreover, but that after Resurrection, the souls of the blessed will be united with a glorious and subtile body; from which may be inferred that God may well have made a rational and corporeal creature whose body naturally enjoys the subtilty which will be conferred by the grace on the glorious body.

44. But, the possible existence of such creatures will be still better set forth by solving the arguments which can be adduced against our conclusion, and replying to the questions it may raise.

45. First question: should such creatures be styled rational animals? And if so, in what do they differ from man, with whom they would have that definition in common?
46. Respondeo quod essent animalia rationalia sensibus et organis corporis praedita, sicut homo: different autem ab homine non solum ratione corporis tenuioris, sed etiam materiae. Homo siquidem ex crassiore elementorum omnium parte, puta ex luto, nempe aqua et terra crassa formatus est, ut constat ex Scriptura, Gen. 2. v. 7.; ista vero formata essent ex subtiliore parte omnium, aut unius, seu alterius elementorum; ut proinde alia essent terrea, alia aqua, alia aerea, et alia ignea; et ut eorum definitio cum hominis definitione non conveniret, addendum esset definitioni hominis crassa materialitas sui corporis, per quam a dictis animalibus differret.

47. Secunda interrogatio est, quando-nam hujus modi animalia fuisse conditiona, ei num cum brutis producta a terra, aut ab aqua, ut quadrupedia, et aves respective; an vero a Domino Deo format, ut fuit homo?

48. Respondeo quod de fide est, quod posito, quod existant de facto, creatas sint a principio Mundi: sic enim definitur a
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46. I reply: Yes, they would be rational animals, provided with senses and organs even as man; they would, however, differ from man not only in the more subtile nature, but also in the matter of their body. In fact, as is shown by Scripture, man has been made from the grossest of all elements, namely clay, a gross mixture of water and earth: but those creatures would be made from the most subtile part of all elements, or of one or other of them; thus, some would proceed from earth, others from water, or air, or fire; and, in order that they should not be defined in the same terms as man, to the definition of the latter should be added the mention of the gross materiality of his body, wherein he would differ from said animals.

47. Second question: At what period would those animals have been originated, and wherefrom? From earth, like the beasts, or from water, like quadrupeds, birds, etc.? Or, on the contrary, would they have been made, like man, by our Lord God?

48. I reply: It is an article of belief, expressly laid down by the Council of Lateran, that whatever is in fact and at
Concilio Lateranensi (Firm. de sum. Trinit. et fide cathol.); nempe quod Deus sua omnipotenti virtute simul ab initio temporis utramque de nihilo condidit creaturam, spiritualem et corporalem. Sub illa etenim Creaturarum generalitate etiam illa animalia essent comprehensa. Quo vero ad eorum formationem, decusse ipsorum corpus a Deo ministerio Angelorum formatum fuisse, sicut a Deo formatum legimus corpus hominis, quia ipsi copulandus erat spiritus immortalis, quandoquidem spiritus incorporeus et proinde nobilissimus corpori pariter originaliter nobiliori cæteris brutis jungendus erat.

49. Tertia interrogatio, an talia animalia habuisserunt originem ab uno solo, velut omnes homines ab Adam, an vero plura simul forma...
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present, was made in the origin of the world. By His all-mighty virtue, God, from the beginning of time, raised together from nothing both orders of creatures, spiritual and corporeal. Now, those animals also would be included in the generality of creatures. As to their formation, it might be said that God Himself, through the medium of Angels, made their body as he did man's, to which an immortal spirit was to be united. That body being of a nobler nature than that of other animals, it was meet that it should be united to an incorporeal and highly noble spirit.

49. Third question: Would those animals descend from one individual, as all men descend from Adam, or, on the contrary, would many have been made at the same time, as was the case for the other living things issued from earth and water, wherein were males and females for the preservation of the kind by generation? Would there be amongst them a distinction between the sexes? Would they be subject to birth and death, to senses, passions, want of food, power of growth? If so, what their nutrition? Would they lead a social life, as men do? By what laws
num artes, studia, possessiones, et bella
inter ea essent, sicut est in hominibus.

50. Respondeo: potuit esse quod omnia
ab uno, velut homines ab Adam, sint pro-
genita; potuit pariter esse, quod ex iis
multi mares, et plures fœminæ fuissent
formatæ, a quibus per generationem eorum
species essent propagātæ. Ultrro admitte-
remus talia animalia oriri et mori; mares
alios, alias fœminas inter ea esse; passio-
nibus, sensibus agitari velut homines; nu-
triri et crescere secundum molem sui cor-
poris; cibum autem ipsorum non crassum
qualem requirit crassites corporis humani,
sed substantiam tenuem et vaporosam
eemanantem per effluvia spirituosa a rebus
physicis pollentibus corpusculis maxime
volatilibus, ut nidor carnium maxime as-
satarum, vapor vini, fructuum, florum,
aromatum, a quibus copiosa hujusmodi ef-
fluvia usque ad totalem partium subtiliorum
ac volatilium evaporationem scaturiunt.
Talia autem antmala civilem vitam du-
cere posse, et inter ea distinctos esse gra-
dus dominantium ac servientium pro con-
ditione naturæ ipsorum, artesque, scientias,
ministeria, exercitia, loca, mansiones, ac
ruled? Would they build up cities for their dwellings, cultivate the arts and sciences, hold property, and wage war between themselves, as men are wont to?

50. I reply: It may be that all descend from one individual, as men descend from Adam; it may be also that a number of males and females were made initially, who preserved their kind by generation. We will further admit that they are born and die; that they are divided into males and females, and are moved by senses and passions, as men are; that they feed and grow according to the size of their body; their food, however, instead of being gross like that required by the human body, must be delicate and vapoury, emanating through spirituous effluvia from whatever in the physical world abounds with highly volatile corpuscles, such as the flavour of meats, especially of roasts, the fume of wine, the fragrancy of fruit, flowers, aromatics, which evolve an abundance of those effluvia until all their subtile and volatile parts have completely evaporated. To their being able to lead a social life, with distinctions of rank and precedence; to their cultivating the arts and sciences, exercising functions, maintaining armies,
aliam necessaria ad eorum conservationem, nullam penius importat repugnantiam.

51. Quarta interrogatio est, qualis esset eorum corporis figuratio, an humanam, an aliam formam, et qualem haberent, et an partes corporis ipsorum haberent ordinem essentialem inter se, ut corpora cæterorum animalium, an vero accidentalem tantum, ut corpora fluidarum substantiarum, ut olei, aquæ, nubis, fumi, etc.; et num substantiae suarum partium organicarum diversimode constarent, ut organa hominum, in quibus sunt aliae partes crassissimæ, ut ossa, aliae minus crassæ, ut cartilagines, aliae tenues, ut membranæ.

52. Respondeo, quod quantum ad figuram corpoream nihil certi affirmare debemus, aut possumus, cum talis figura non sit exacte nobis sensibilis, nec quod visum, nec quod tactum, præ sui corporis tenuitate, ac perspicacitate; qualis proinde vere sit, noverent ipsi, aliique, qui substantias immateriales intuitive cognoscere possunt. Quoad congruentiam et probabilitatem dico, illa referre speciem corporis humani, cum aliquo distinctivo a corpore humano, nisi forte ad hoc sufficiat sua
Demoniality

building up cities, doing in short whatever is requisite for their preservation, I have in the main no objection.

51. Fourth question: What would their figure be, human or otherwise? Would the ordering of the divers parts of their body be essential, as with other animals, or merely accidental, as with fluid substances, such as oil, water, clouds, smoke, etc.? Would those organic parts consist of various substances, as is the case with the organs of the human body, wherein are to be found very gross parts, such as the bones, others less gross, such as the cartilages, and others slender, such as the membranes?

52. I reply: As regards their figure, we neither can nor should be affirmative, since it escapes our senses, being too delicate for our sight or our touch. That we must leave to themselves, and to such as have the privilege of intuitive acquaintance with immaterial substances. But, so far as probability goes, I say that their figure tallies with the human body, save some distinctive peculiarity, should the very tenuity of their body not be deemed sufficient. I am led to that by the consideration that of all
ipsorum tenuitas. Ducor, quia corpus humanum plasmatum a Deo perfectissimum est, inter animalia quaeque, et cum cætera bruta in terram sint prona, eo quia anima eorum mortalis est, Deus, ut ait poeta Ovid., Metamorphos.:

Os homini sublime dedit, cœlumque tueri
Jussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus;

quia anima hominis immortalis ordinata est
ad cælestem mansionem. Cum igitur animalia, de quibus loquimur, spiritum haberent immaterialem, rationalem, ac immortalalem, et proinde capacem beatitudinis ac damnationis, congruum est, quod corpus, cui talis spiritus copulatur, simile sit omnium animalium nobilissimo, corpori humano. Ex hac positione sequitur, quod ejus corporis partes ordinem inter se essentialem habere deberent; nec enim pes capiti, ant ventri manus conjungi deberet: sed congrua membrorum essentiali dispositione ordinata, ut essent idonea ministeriis propriis perficiendis. Quo autem ad partes componentes ipsarum organa, dico quod necessarium esset, ut nonnullæ ipsarum essent solidiores, aliae minus solidae, aliae tenues, aliae tenuissimæ pro necessitate operationis organicæ. Nec contra hanc positionem fa-
the works of God the human frame is the most perfect, and that whilst all other animals stoop to the ground, because their soul is mortal, God, as Ovid, the poet, says, in his *Metamorphoses*,

*Gave man an erect figure, bidding him behold the heavens*

*And raise his face towards the stars,*

man's soul having been made immortal for the heavenly abode. Considering that the animals we are speaking of would be gifted with a spirit immaterial, rational and immortal, capable therefore of beatitude and damnation, it is proper to admit that the body to which that spirit is united may be like unto the most noble animal frame, that is to say to the human frame. Whence it follows that in the divers parts of that body there must be an essential order; that the foot, for instance, cannot be an appendage to the head, nor the hand to the belly, but that each organ is in its right place, according to the functions it has to perform. As to the constitutive parts of those organs, it is, in my opinion, necessary that there should be some more or less strong, others more or less slender, in order to meet the requirements of the organic working. Nor can this be fairly
cile potest asseri tenuitas ipsorum corporum: quippe soliditas aut crassities organi-
carum partium, de qua dicimus, non esset talis simpliciter, sed comparative ad alias partes tenuiores. Et hoc patere potest in omnibus corporibus fluidis naturalibus, ut vino, oleo, lacte, etc.; quantumvis enim om-
nes partes in ipsis videantur homogeneae ac similares, non tamen ita est: nam in ipsis est pars terrea, pars aquea, sal fixum, sal volatile, et pars sulfurea, quae omnia manipulatione spargirica oculis subjici possunt. Ita esset in casu nostro: posito enim quod talium animalium corpora subtilia et tenuia, ut corpora naturalia fluida, velut aqua et aer, essent, non tamen tolleretur, quin in ipsis partibus diversa inter se essent qualitates, et aliquae ipsarum comparative ad alias essent solidae, et aliae tenuiores, quamvis totum corpus ex ipsis compositum tenue dici posset.

53. Quod si dicatur, quod hae repugnant positioni supra firmatae, circa partium esse-
sentialem ordinationem inter se: quandoquidem videmus, quod in corporibus fluidis ac tenuibus una pars non servat ordi-
nem essentialem ad aliam, sed accidenta-
lem tantum, ita ut haec pars vini, quae
objected to on the ground of the slenderness of the bodies themselves; for the strength or thickness of the organic parts alluded to would not be absolute, but merely in comparison with the more slender ones. That, moreover, may be observed in all natural fluids, such as wine, oil, milk, etc.; however homogeneous and similar to each other their component parts may look, yet they are not so: for some are clayish, others aqueous; there are fixed salts, volatile salts, brimstone, all of which are made obvious by a chemical analysis. So it would be in our case: for, supposing the bodies of those animals to be as subtile and slender as the natural fluids, air, water, etc., there would nevertheless be discrepancies in the quality of their constitutive parts, some of which would be strong when compared with others more slender, although the whole body which they compose might be called slender.

53. It may be objected that this is repugnant to what was said above concerning the essential ordering of the parts among themselves; that it is seen that, in fluid and subtile bodies, one part is not essentially but only accidentally connected with another; that a part of wine, for instance,
modo alteri parti contigua est, mox inverso vase, aut moto vino, alteri parti unitur, et sic omnes partes diversam positionem habent quantumvis semper idem vi-num sit, et ex hoc sequeretur, quod talium animalium corpora figurata stabiliter non essent, et consequenter, nec organica.

54. Respondeo negando assumptum; et enim in corporibus fluidis, quamvis non appareat, manet tamen essentialis partium ordinatio, qua stante stat in suo esse com-positum, et hoc patet manifeste in vino: expressum enim ab uvis videtur liquor totaliter homogeneus, non tamen ita est; in eo enim sunt partes crassae, quae tractu temporis subsident in dolis: sunt etiam partes tenues, quae evaporant: sunt partes fixae, ut tartarus, sunt partes volatile, ut sulphur, sive spiritus ardens; sunt partes mediae inter volatile ac fixum, ut phlegma. Partes istae ordinem essentialem inter se mutant; nam statim ac expressum est ab uvis, et mustum dicitur sulphur, sive spiritus volatile, ita implicatum manet particulus tartari, qui fixus est, ut nullo modo avolare valeat.
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just now contiguous with some other, soon comes in contact with a third, if the vessel be turned upside down or the wine shaken, and that all the parts together exchange positions at the same time, though it be still the same wine. Whence it should be inferred that the bodies of those animals would have no permanent figure, and would consequently not be organic.

54. I reply that I deny the assumption. In fact, if in fluid bodies the essential ordering of the parts is not apparent, it subsists none the less, and causes a compound to preserve its own state. Wine, for instance, when expressed from the grapes, seems a thoroughly homogeneous liquor, and yet is not so; for there are gross parts which, in the long run, subside in the casks; there are also slender parts which evaporate; fixed parts, such as tartar; volatile parts, such as brimstone and alcohol; others again, half volatile and half fixed, such as phlegm. Those divers parts do not respectively maintain an essential order; for no sooner has the must been expressed from the grapes, and been styled brimstone or volatile spirits, than it continues so closely involved with the particles of tartar, which is fixed, as not to be in any way able to escape.
55. Hinc est, quod a musto recenter ab uvis expresso nullo modo potest distillari spiritus sulphureus, qui communiter vocatur aqua vitae: sed post quadraginta dies fermentationis particulae vini ordinem mutant, ita ut spiritus, qui alligati erant particulis tartareis, et propria volatilitate eas suspensas tenebant, et vicissim ab eis ne possent avolare determinantur, ac tartareis particulis separantur, et divulsii ac confusi remanent cum partibus phlegmaticis, a quibus per actionem ignis faciliter separantur, et avolant; sicque per distillationem fit aqua vitae, quae aliquid non est quam sulphur vini volatile cum tenuiore parte phlegmaticis simul cum dico sulphure vi ignis elevata. Post quadraginta dies, alia incipit vini fermentation, quae longiori, aut minus longo tempore perficitur, pro vini perfectioni aut imperfectioni maturitate, et alio atque alio modo terminatur, pro minore aut majore spiritus sulphurei abundantia. Si enim abundat in vino sulphur, acescit fermentatione, et evadit acetum; si autem parum sulphuris continet, lentescit vinum, et Italice dicitur vinum molle, aut vino guasto. Quod si vinum maturum sit, ut ceteris paribus est, vinum dulce breviori tempore, aut acescit, aut lentescit, ut quotidianam constat experientia. In dicta autem
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55. That is the reason why must recently expressed from the grapes is of no use for the distillation of the sulfurous spirits, commonly called brandy; but, after forty days fermentation, the particles of the wine change places: the spirits, no longer bound with the tartaric particles which they kept in suspension through their own volatility, whilst they were, in return, kept down by them and prevented from escaping, sever from those particles, and continue confused with the phlegmatic parts from which they become easily released by the operation of fire, and evaporate: thus, by means of distillation, brandy is made, which is nothing but the brimstone of wine volatilized by heat with the most slender part of phlegm. At the end of forty days another fermentation begins, which extends more or less, according as the maturity of the wine is more or less perfect, and the termination of which is dependent on the greater or lesser abundance of sulphurous spirits. If abounding with brimstone, the wine sours and turns to vinegar; if, on the contrary, it holds but little brimstone, it ropes, and becomes what the Italians call vino molle or vino guasto. If the wine is at once ripe, as happens in other cases, it sours or ropes in less time,
fermentatione ordo essentialis partium vini mutatur; non enim ipsius quantitas, aut materia imminuitur, aut mutatur: vide-mus enim lagenam vino plenam tractu temporis evadere plenam aceto, nullatenus mutatam circa quantitatem materiar, quae prius ibi extabat, sed tantum mutato partium essentiali ordine: nam sulphur, quod, ut diximus, erat phlegmati unitum, ac a tartaro separatum, iterum tartaro implicatur, et cum eo fixatur, et proinde si distilletur acetum, primo prodit phlegma insipidum, et post spiritus aceti, qui est sulphur vini illaqueatum particularis tartari minus fixi. Mutatio autem essentialis partium supradictarum variat substantiam liquoris expressi ab uva, quod manifeste patet ex variis et contrariis effectibus, quos causant mustum, vinum, et acetum, et vinum lentum, quod vocatur corruptum, ut proinde duo prima apta materia sint ad consecrationem, secus alia duo. Hanc porro vini economiam hausimus ab erudito opere Nicolai Lemerti, Regis Galliarum aromatarii, Curs. de Chimi., p. 2. c. 9.
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as is shown by every day experience. Now, in said fermentation the essential order of the parts of wine is altered, but not so its quantity nor its matter, which neither changes nor decreases: a bottle that had been filled with wine is, after a certain time, found to be filled with vinegar, without any alteration in its quantity of matter; the essential order of its parts has alone been modified: the brimstone, which, as we have said, was united to the phlegm and separated from the tartar, becomes again involved and fixed with the tartar; so that, on distilling the vinegar, there issues from it first an insipid phlegm, and then spirits of vinegar, which are the brimstone of wine intermixed with particles of tartar that is less fixed. Now, the essential shifting of the aforesaid parts alters the substance of the juice of the grapes, as is clearly shown by the varied and contrary effects of must, wine, vinegar, and ropy or spoiled wine; for which cause the two first are fit, but the two last unfit materials for consecration. We have borrowed the above exposition of the economy of wine from the able work of Nicholas Lemery, perfumer to the King of France, Course of Chemistry, p. 2. c. q.
56. Datam ergo naturalem doctrinam applicando consequenter dico, quod data dictorum animalium corporeitate subtili et tenui, sicut corpora liquidorum, et data pariter eorumdem organizazione et figuratione, quæ partium essentialem ordinatio-nem exigunt, non sequentur inconvenientia ex adverso illata: nam sicut (quemadmodum dicebamus) ex confusione partium vini, et diversa ipsarum accidentalis positione non variatur ordinatio earumdem essentialis, ita esset in corpore tenui dictorum animalium.

57. Quinta interrogatio est, an talia obnoxia essent ægritudinis, ac aliis imperfectionibus, quibus homines laborant, ut ignorantia, metu, segnicie, sensuum impedimentis, etc.? An laborando lassarentur, et ad virium reparationem egerent somno, cibo, ac potu, et quo? et consequenter an interirent, et subinde, an a cæteris animalibus casu, aut ruina possent occidi?

58. Respondéo, quod ex quo corpora ipsorum, quamvis tenuia, essent materiata, essent quidem corruptioni obnoxia; et ex consequenti possent pati ab agentibus contrariis, et ita ægrotare, puta, aut simpli-
56. If now we apply that natural doctrine to our subject, I say that, being given the corporeity of the animals in question, subtile and slender like the substance of liquids; being given also their organisation and figure, which demand an essential order of the various parts, an adverse supposition could raise no argument contrary to their existence; for, just as the jumbling together of the parts of wine and the diversity of their accidental dispositions do not alter their essential order, even so it would be with the slender frame of our animals.

57. Fifth question: Would those animals be subject to diseases and other infirmities under which mankind lies, such as ignorance, fear, idleness, sensual paralysis, etc? Would they be wearied through labour, and require, for recruiting their strength, sleep, food, drink? And what food, what drink? Would they be fated to die, and might they be killed casually, or by the instrumentality of other animals?

58. I reply: Their bodies, though subtile, being material, they would of course be liable to decay: they might therefore suffer from adverse agencies, and consequently be diseased; that is, their organs might
citer, aut nisi ægre, perverse, aut vitiose præstare non posse munera, ad quæ eorum organa essent ordinata; in hoc siguidem consistit animalium quorumdam ægritudo quævis: ut resolutive docet præstantissimus Michael Eitmullerus, Physiol. c. 5., thes. 1. Verum est, quod ex eo quod tantam materiæ crassitatem non haberent, et forte ex tot elementorum mixtione eorum corpus non constaret, et minus compositum esset quam humanum, non tam facile patèrentur a contrariis, et consequenter non tot ægritudinibus velut homines essent obnoxia, et longiorem, etiam homine, vitam ducerent: quo enim perfectius est animal, a tota specie, etiam cæteris diutius vivit, ut patet de specie humana, cujus vita longior cæteris animalibus est. Nec enim admitto sæcularem vitam cornicun, cervorum, corvorum et simulium, de quibus more suo fabulatur Plinius, et ejus somnia sine prævia discussione securi sunt cæteri: quan-doquidem nullus est, qui talium animalium natale et interitus fideliter adnotaverit, ut pari modo de eo scripserit; sed insolitam diu fabulum quisque secutus est; sicut etiam illud, quod de phœnice dicitur, quod ut quid fabulosum, circa ejus vitae spatium recenset Tacitus, l. 6. Annal. Inferendum subinde esset quod illorum animalium vita
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not perform, or painfully and imperfectly perform the office assigned to them, for therein consist all diseases whatever with certain animals, as has been distinctly explained by the most illustrious Michael Ettmuller, Physiologia, c. v. thesis i. In sooth, their body being less gross than the human frame, comprising less elements mixed together, and being therefore less composite, they would not so easily suffer from adverse influences, and would therefore be less liable to disease than man; their life would also exceed his; for, the more perfect an animal, as a species, the longer its days; thus mankind, whose existence extends beyond that of other animals. For I do not believe in the centenary existence of crows, stags, ravens and the like, of which Pliny tells his customary stories; and although his dreams have been reechoed by others without previous inquiry, it is no less clear that before writing thus, not one has faithfully noted the birth nor the death of those animals: they have been content with taking up the strange fable, as has been the case with the Phenix, whose longevity is discarded as a story by Tacitus, Annals, b. 6. It were therefore to be inferred that the animals we are speaking of would live longer still than man; for, as
etiam humana deberet esse diuturnior: ut enim infra dicemus, illa essent homine nobiliora; consequenter dicendum esset, quod essent obnoxia cæteris corporeis pathematis, et quie te, et cibo indigerent, quale diximus supra, n° 50. Quia vero rationalia, et proinde disciplinabilia essent, ex consequenti etiam capacia ignorantia, si eorum ingения non essent exculta studiis, et disciplina, et inter ea pro intellectus eorum majori, et minori acumine essent aliqua magis, aliqua minus in scientiis excellentia: universaliter vero, et a tota specie essent homine doctiora, non ob eorum corpoream subtilitatem, tum forte, ob majo rem spirituum activitatem, tum ob diuturniorem vitae durationem, in qua plura, quam homines discernere possent, quas causas assignat D. Augustinus, lib. de Divin. Dæm. c. 3. init. tom. 3., et lib. de Spir. et Anima, c. 37., pro futurorum prænotione in Dæmonibus. Ab agentibus autem naturalibus pati quidem possent, ac difficulter occidi ratione velocitatis, qua possunt se subtrahere a nocentibus; quapropter, nec a brutis, nec ab homine armis naturalibus, seu artificialibus nisi maxima difficultate possent occidi, aut mutilari, et maxima eorumdem velocitate in declinando contrarium impetum. Possent vero in somno
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shall be said below, they would be more noble than he; consequently also, they would be subject to the other bodily affections, and require rest and food, as mentioned, number 50. Now, as rational beings amenable to discipline, they might also continue ignorant, if their minds did not receive the culture of study and instruction, and some amongst them would be more or less versed in science, more or less clever, according as their intelligence had been more or less trained. However, generally speaking, and considering the whole of the species, they would be more learned than men, not from the subtilty of their body, but perhaps because of the greater activity of their mind or the longer space of their life, which would enable them to learn more things than men: such are indeed the motives assigned by S. Austin (Divin. Demon. ch. 3. and Spirit and Soul, ch. 37), to the prescience of the future in Demons. They might indeed suffer from natural agencies; but they could hardly be killed, on account of the speed with which they could escape from danger; it is therefore most unlikely that they could, without the greatest difficulty, be put to death or mutilated by beast or by man, with natural or artificial weapons, so quick would they be
aut in non adverentia occidi, et mutilari a corpore solido, ut ense vibrato ab homine, aut lapide delapso per ruinam, quia eorum corpus licet tenue, tamen et quantum, et divisibile esset, velut aer qui ferro, fuste, aut alio corpore solido dividitur quamvis tenuis sit. Eorum autem spiritus impartiabilis esset, et ceu anima hominis totus in toto, et totus in quavis corporis parte. Hinc fieret quod diviso corpore ipsorum, ut præfertur, per aliud corpus, sequi posset mutilatio, et proinde etiam mors: non enim fieri posset ut diviso corpore idem spiritus utramque partem informaret, cum ipse indivisibilis esset. Verum est quod sicut partes aeris divisa, per intermedium corpus, hoc sublato iterum uniuntur, et evadit idem aer, possent pariter partes corporis divisa, ut supra pontitur, reuniri, et ab eodem spiritu revivificari. Sed hoc modo nequirent talia animalia ab agentibus naturalibus aut artificialibus occidi: sed rationabilior esset prima positio; ex hoc enim, quod communicarent cum cæteris in materia, æquum est, ut a cæteris etiam usque ad eorum interitum pati possent, ut fit cum cæteris.
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at avoiding the impending blow. Yet, they might be killed or mutilated in their sleep, or in a moment of inadvertence, by means of a solid body, such as a sword brandished by a man, or the fall of a heavy stone; for, although subtile, their body would be divisible, just like air which, though vaporous, is yet divided by a sword, a club, or any other solid body. Their spirit, however, would be indivisible, and like the human soul, entire in the whole and in each and every part of the body. Consequently, the division of their body by another body, as aforesaid, might occasion mutilation and even death, for the spirit, itself indivisible, could not animate both parts of a divided body. True, just as the parts of air, separated by the agency of a body, unite again as soon as that body is withdrawn, and constitute the same air as before, even so the parts of the body divided, as above-mentioned, might unite and be revived by the same spirit. But then, it must be inferred that those animals could not be slain by natural or artificial agencies: and it were more rational to keep to our first position; for, if sharing matter with other creatures, it is natural that they should be liable to suffer through those creatures, according to the common rule, and even unto death.
59. Sexta interrogatio est, an ipsorum corpora possent alia corpora penetrare, ut parietes, ligna, metallæ, vitrum, etc., et an multa ipsorum possent in eodem loco materiali consistere, et ad quantum spatium extenderetur, seu restringeretur eorum corpus?

60. Respondeo, quod cum in omnibus corporibus quantumvis compactis dentur pori, ut ad sensum patet in metallis, de quibus major esset ratio, quod in ipsis non darentur pori : microscopio perfecte elaborentur pori metallorum, cum suis diversis figuris, utique possent per poros insinuari quibusvis corporibus, et hoc modo ista penetrare, quantumvis tales pori penetrari non possent ab alio liquore, aut spiritu materiali, aut vini, salis ammoniaci, aut similium, quia longe tenuiora essent istis liquoribus illorum corpora. Quamvis autem plures Angeli possint esse in eodem loco materiali, et etiam restringi ad locum minorem minore non tamen in infinitum, ut probat Scotus in 2. dist. 2. q. 6. § Ad proposi. et quaest. 8., per totum, hoc tamen concedendum non esset de corporibus talium animalium; tum quia corpora ipsa essent quanta, et eorum dimensionis non esset reciproce penetrabilis; tum
59. Sixth question: Could their bodies penetrate other bodies, such as walls, wood, metals, glass, etc? Could many of them abide together on the same material spot, and to what space would their body extend or be restrained?

60. I reply: In all bodies, however compact, there are pores, as is apparent in metals where, more than in other bodies, it would seem there should be none; through a perfect microscope the pores of metals are discerned, with their different shapes. Now, those animals might, through the pores, creep into, and thus penetrate any other bodies, although such pores were impervious to other liquors or material spirits, of wine, ammoniacal salt, or the like, because their bodies would be much more subtle than those liquors. However, notwithstanding many Angels may abide together on the same material spot, and even confine themselves in a lesser and lesser space, though not infinitely, as is shown by Scott, yet it were rash to ascribe the same power to those animals; for, their bodies are determined in substance and impervious to each other; and if two glorious bodies cannot abide
quia si duo corpora gloriosa non possunt esse in eodem loco, quamvis possent simul esse gloriösum, et non gloriösum, ut voluit Gotofredus de Fontibus, quodlibet 6. q. 5., a quo non discordat Scotus in 2. distinct. 2. q. 8., in fine; multo minus possent simul esse istorum corpora, quæ, licet subtilia, non tamen aequarent subtilitatem corporis gloriösi. Quo autem ad extensionem et restrictio-nem, dicendum esset, quod sicut ex rarefactione, et condensatione, majus aut minus spatium occupatur ab aere, qui etiam arte potest constringi, ut in minori loco contineatur, quam sit sua quantitati naturaliter debitus, ut patet in magnis pilis lusorii, quæ per fistulam seu tubum inflatorium inflantur : in his siquidem aer violenter immittitur, et constringitur, et ejus major ibi continetur quantitas, quam naturalis pilæ capacitas exigat; ita pariformiter talia corpora ex ipsorum naturali virtute possent ad majus spatium, non tamen exceedens eorum quantitatem, extendi : ut pariter etiam restringi, non tamen circa determinatum locum sua quantitati debitum. Et quia ipsorum nonnulla, prout etiam in hominibus est, essent magna, et nonnulla parva, congruum esset, ut magna possent plus extendi, quam parva, et hæc ad minorem locum restringi, quam magna.
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together on the same spot, though a glorious and a non glorious one may do so, according to some Doctors, much less would it be possible for the bodies of those animals, which are indeed subtile, yet do not attain to the subtility of the glorious body. As regards their power of extension or compression, we may instance the case of air, which, rarefied and condensed, occupies more or less room, and may even, by artificial means, be compressed into a narrower space than would be naturally due to its volume; as is seen with those large balls which, for amusement, one inflates by means of a blow-pipe or tube: air, being forced into them and compressed, is held in larger quantity than is warranted by the capacity of the ball. Similarly the bodies of the animals we are speaking of might, by their natural virtue, extend to a larger space, not exceeding however their own substance; they might also contract, but not beyond the determined space due to that same substance. And, considering that of their number, as with men, some would be tall and some short, it were proper that the tall should be able to extend more than the short, and the short to contract more than the tall.
61. Septima interrogatio est, an hujusmodi animalia in peccato originali nascerentur, et a Christo Domino fuissent redempta; an ipsis conferretur gratia, et per quæ sacramenta; sub qua lege viverent, et an beatitudinis et damnationis essent ca- acia?

62. Respondeo, quod articulus Fidei est, quod Christus Dominus pro universa creatura rationali gratiam et gloriam meruit. Pariter articulus Fidei est, quod Creaturæ rationali gloria non conferetur nisi præcedat in ea gratia, quæ est dispositio ad gloriam. Similis articulus est quod gloria non conferetur nisi per merita. Hæ vero fundantur in observantia perfecta mandatorum Dei adimpleta per gratiam. Ex his satis fit positis interrogationibus. Incertum est an tales Creaturæ originaliter peccavit, necne. Certum tamen est, quod si ipsarum Prothoparens peccasset, sicut peccavit Adam, ipsius descendentes in peccato originali nascerentur, quemadmodum nascuntur homines. Et quia Deus nunquam reliquit Creaturam rationalem sine remedio, dum ipsa est in via; si hujusmodi creaturæ in peccato originali, aut actuali inficerentur, Deus providisset illis de remedio, sed quale sit, an fecisset, noverit Deus, nove-
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61. Seventh question: Would those animals be born in original sin, and have been redeemed by the Lord Christ? Would the grace have been conferred upon them and through what sacraments? Under what law would they live, and would they be capable of beatitude and damnation?

62. I reply: It is an article of belief that Christ has merited grace and glory for all rational creatures without exception. It is also an article of belief that glory is not conferred on a rational creature until such creature has been previously endowed with grace, which is the disposition to glory. According to a like article, glory is conferred but by merits. Now, those merits are grounded on the perfect observance of the commands of God, which is accomplished through grace. The above questions are thus solved. Whether those creatures did or did not sin originally is uncertain. It is clear, however, that if their first Parent had sinned as Adam sinned, his descent would be born in original sin, as men are born. And, as God never leaves a rational creature without a remedy, so long as it treads the way, if those creatures were infected with original or with actual sin, God would have provided them with a
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rint ipsæ. Hoc certum est, si inter ipsas essent eadem, aut alia sacramenta, ac sunt in Ecclesia humana militanti, ipsa habuisent, et institutionem, et efficaciam a meritis Jesu Christi, qui omnium creaturarum rationalium Redemptor et Satisfactor universalis est. Convenientissimum pariter, immo necessarium esset quod sub aliqua lege a Deo sibi data viverent, ut per ipsius observantiam possent sibi beatitudinem mereri; quanam autem lex fuisset, an naturalis tantum, aut scripta, Mosaica, aut Evangelica, aut alia ab his omnibus differens, prout Deo placisset, hoc nobis incognitum. Quoquomodo autem fuisset, nulla resultaret repugnantia possibilitatem talium creaturarum excludens.

63. Unicum porro argumentum, et quidem satis debile post longam meditationem mihi subit contra talium creaturarum possibilitatem: et est quod si tales creaturæ in Mundo existerent, de ipsis notitia aliqua tradita fuisset a Philosophis, Sacra Scriptura, Traditione Ecclesiastica, aut Sanctis Patribus; quod cum non fuerit, tales creaturas minime possibles esse concludendum est.
remedy; but whether it is the case, and of what kind is the remedy, is a secret between God and them. Surely, if they had sacraments identical with or different from those in use in the human Church militant, for the institution and efficacy thereof they would be indebted to the merits of Jesus-Christ, the Redeemer and universal Atoner of all rational creatures. It would likewise be highly proper, nay necessary, that they should live under some law given them by God, and through the observance of which they might merit beatitude; but what would be that law, whether merely natural or written, Mosaic or Evangelical, or different from all these and specially instituted by God, that we are ignorant of. Whatever it might be though, there would follow no objection exclusive of the possible existence of such creatures.

63. The only argument, and that a rather lame one, which long meditations has suggested to me against the possibility of such creatures, is that, if they really existed in the World, we should find them mentioned somewhere by Philosophers, Holy Scripture, Ecclesiastical Tradition, or the Holy Fathers: such not being the case, their utter impossibility should be inferred.
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65. Stabilita huc usque talium creaturarum possibilitate, ad earundem existentiam probandum descendamus. Supposita tot historiarum veritate de coitu hujusmodi Incuborum et Succuborum cum hominibus
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64. But that argument which, in fact, calls in question their existence rather than their possibility, is easily disposed of by our premises, Nrs 41 and 42; for no argument can stand in virtue of a negative authority. Besides, it is not correct to assert that neither the Philosophers, nor the Scriptures, nor the Fathers have handed down any notion of them. Plato, as is reported by Apuleius (The Demon of Socrates) and Plutarch (Isis and Osiris), declared that Demons were beings of the animal kind, passive souls, rational intelligences, aerial bodies, everlasting; and he gave them the name of Demons, which of itself is nowise offensive, since it means replete with wisdom; so that, when authors allude to the Devil (or Evil Angel), they do not merely call him Demon, but Cacodemon, and say likewise Eudemon, when speaking of a good Angel. Those creatures are also mentioned in Scripture and by the Fathers, as shall be said hereafter.

65. Now that we have proved that those creatures are possible, let us go a step further, and show that they exist. Taking for granted the truth of the recitals concerning the intercourse of Incubi and Succubi
et brutis, ita ut hoc negare impudentia videatur, ut ait D. Augustinus quem dedimus supra n° 10., ita arguo: Ubi reperitur propria passio sensus, ibidem necessario reperitur sensus ipse, cum juxta principia philosophica propria passio fluat a natura, sive ubi reperiantur actiones, seu operationes sensus, ibidem reperitur sensus ipse, cum operationes et actiones sint a forma. Atqui in hujusmodi Incubis aut Succubis, sunt actiones, operationes, ac propriae passiones, quae sunt a sensibus; ergo in iisdem reperitur sensus: sed sensus reperiri nequit nisi adsint organa composita, nempe ex potentia animae et determinata parte corporis: ergo in iisdem reperiantur corpus et anima; erunt igitur animalia: sed etiam in ipsis et ab ipsis sunt actiones, et operationes animae rationalis: ergo eorum anima erit rationalis: et ita de primo ad ultimum tales Incubi sunt animalia rationalia.

66. Minor probatur quoad singulas ejus partes. Passio siquidem appetitiva coitus est passio sensus; mœror, ac tristitia, ac iracundia et furor ex coitu denegato passiones sensus sunt, ut patet in quibusvis
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with men and beasts, recitals so numerous that it would look like impudence to deny the fact, as is said by St Austin, whose testimony is given above (Nr 10), I argue: Where the peculiar passion of the sense is found, there also, of necessity, is the sense itself; for, according to the principles of philosophy, the peculiar passion flows from nature, that is to say: that, where the acts and operations of the sense are found, there also is the sense, the operations and acts being but its external form. Now, those Incubi and Succubi present acts, operations, peculiar passions, which spring from the senses; they are therefore endowed with senses. But senses cannot exist without concomitant composite organs, without a combination of soul and body. Incubi and Succubi have therefore body and soul, and, consequentially, are animals; but their acts and operations are also those of a rational soul; their soul is therefore rational; and thus, from first to last, they are rational animals.

66. Our minor is easy of demonstration in each of its parts. And indeed, the appetitive passion of coition is a sensual passion; the grief, sadness, wrath, rage, occasioned by the denial of coition, are sensual pas-
animalibus; generatio per coitum est opera-
ratio sensus, ut notum est. Hæc porro om-
nia in Incubis sunt: ut enim probavimus
 supra a n° 25. et seq., ipsi coitum mulie-
brem, et quandoque virilem appetunt, tris-
tantur, et furunt, ut amantes, amentes, si
ipsis denegetur; coeunt perfecte et quando-
que generant. Concludendum ergo quod
polleant sensu, et proinde corpore; unde
inferendum etiam perfecta animalia esse.
Pariter clausis ostiis ac fenestris intrant
ubivis locorum: igitur ipsorum corpus te-
nue est; item futura prænoscent, annun-
tiant, componunt, ac dividunt; quæ opera-
tiones sunt propriæ animæ rationalis: ergo
anima rationali pollent; et ita sunt vera
animalia rationalia.

Respondent communiter Doctores, quod
malus Dæmon est ille qui tales impudici-
tias operatur, quod passiones, nempe
amorem, tristitiamque simulat ex coitu
denegato, ut animas ad peccandum alli-
ciat, et eas perdat; et si coit, et generat,
hoc est ex semine, et in corpore alieno, ut
dictum fuit supra n° 24.

67. Sed contra Incubi nonnulli rem ha-
bent cum equis, equabus, aliisque etiam
brutis, quæ si coitum adversentur, male ab
ipsis tractantur, ut quotidiana constat ex-
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sions, as is seen with all animals; generation through coition is evidently a sensual operation. Now, all that happens with Incubi, as has been shown above: they incite women, sometimes even men; if denied, they sadden and storm, like lovers: amantes, amentes; they perfectly practice coition, and sometimes beget. It must therefore be inferred that they have senses, and consequently a body; consequently also, that they are perfect animals. More than that: with closed doors and windows they enter wherever they please: their body is therefore slender; they foreknow and foretell the future, compose and divide, all which operations are proper to a rational soul; they therefore possess a rational soul and are, in sooth, rational animals.

Doctors generally retort that it is the Evil Spirit that perpetrates those impure acts, simulates passions, love, grief at the denial of coition, in order to entice souls to sin and to undo them; and that, if he copulates and begets, it is with assumed sperm and body, as aforesaid (Nr 24).

67. But then, there are Incubi that have to do with horses, mares and other beasts, and, as shown by every day experience, ill-treat them if rebel to coition; yet, in those
perientia; sed in istis cessat ratio adducta, nempe quod fingat appetitum coitus, ut animas perdat, cum anima brutorum damnationis aeternae sit incapax. Praeterea amoris et irae passiones in ipso contrarios effectus reales producunt. Si enim aut mulier aut brutum amatum illis morem gerant, optime ab Incubis tractantur; viceversa pessime habentur, si ex denegato coitu irascantur et furant; et hoc firmatur quotidiana experientia; ergo in ipsis sunt verae passiones sensus. Insuper mali Daemones, ac incorporei, qui rem habent cum Sagis et Maleficis, ipsas cogunt ad eorum adorationem, ad denegandam Fidem Orthodoxam, ad maleficia et scelera enormia perpetranda tanquam pensum infamis coitus, ut supra n° 11. dictum fuit: nihil horum praetendunt Incubi, ergo mali Daemones non sunt. Ulterius malus Daemon, ut ex Peltano et Thyreo scribit Guaccius, Compend. Malef. lib. 1. c. 19. fol. 128., ad prolationem nominis Jesu aut Mariæ, ad formationem signi Crucis, ad approximationem sacrarum Reliquiarum, sive rerum benedictarum, et ad exorcismos, adjurationes, aut præcepta sacerdotum, aut fugit aut pavel, concutiturque, et stridet, ut conspicitur quotidie in energumenis, et constat ex tot historiis, quas recitat
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cases, it can no longer be adduced that the Demon simulates the appetite for coition in order to bring about the ruin of souls, since those of beasts are not capable of everlasting damnation. Besides, love and wrath with them are productive of quite opposite effects. For, if the loved woman or beast humours them, those Incubi behave very well; on the contrary, they use them most savagely when irritated and enraged by a denial of coition: this is amply proved by daily experience: those Incubi therefore have truly sexual passions. Besides, the Evil Spirits, the incorporeal Demons which have to do with Sorceresses and Witches, constrain them to Demon-Worship, to the abjuration of the Orthodox Faith, to the commission of enchantments and foul crimes, as preliminary conditions to the infamous intercourse, as has been above-stated (Nr 11); now, Incubi pretend to nothing of the kind: they are therefore no Evil Spirits. Lastly, as written by Guaccius, at the mere utterance of the name of Jesus or Mary, at the sign of the Cross, the approach of Holy Relics or consecrated objects, at exorcisms, adjurations or priestly injunctions, the Evil Demon either shudders and takes to flight, or is agitated and howls, as is daily seen with
Guaccius, ex quibus habetur, quod in nocturnis ludis Sagarlum facto ab aliquo assistantium signo Crucis, aut pronuntiatum nomine Jesu, Diaboli et secum Sagae omnes disparuerunt. Sed Incubi ad supra-dicta nec fugiunt, nec pavent, quandoque cachinnis exorcismos excipiunt, et quandoque ipsos Exorcistas cadeunt, et sacras vestes discerpunt. Quod si mali Dæmones, utpote a D. N. J. C. domiti, ad ipsius nomen, Crucem, et res sacras pavent: boni autem Angeli eisdem rebus gaudent, non tamen homines ad peccata et Dei offendisse solum sollicitant: Incubi vero sacra non ti- ment, et ad peccata provocant, convincitur ipsos nec malos Dæmones, nec bonos Angelos esse; sed patet, quod nec homines sunt, cum tamen ratione utantur. Quid ergo erunt? Si in termino sunt, et simplices spiritus sunt, erunt aut damnati aut beati: non enim in bona Theologia dantur puri spiritus viatores. Si damnati, nomen et Crucem Christi reverenter; si beati, homines ad peccandum non provocarent; ergo aliud erunt a puris spiritus; et sic erunt corporati, et viatores.
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energumens and is shown by numerous narratives of Guaccius concerning the nightly revels of Witches, where, at a sign of the Cross or the name of Jesus said by one of the assistants, Devils and Witches all vanish together. Incubi, on the contrary, stand all those ordeals without taking to flight or showing the least fear; sometimes even they laugh at exorcisms, strike the Exorcists themselves, and rend the sacred vestments. Now, if the evil Demons, subdued by our Lord Jesus-Christ, are stricken with fear by his name, the Cross and the holy things; if, on the other hand, the good Angels rejoice at those same things, without however inciting men to sin nor to give offense to God, whilst the Incubi, without having any dread of the holy things, provoke to sin, it is clear that they are neither evil Demons nor good Angels; but it is clear also that they are not men, though endowed with reason. What then should they be? Supposing them to have reached the goal, and to be pure spirits, they would be damned or blessed, for correct Theology does not admit of pure spirits on the way to salvation. If damned, they would revere the name and the Cross of Christ; if blessed, they would not incite men to sin; they would therefore be dif-
68. Præterea agens materiale non potest agere nisi in passum similiter materiale; tritum siquidem est axioma philosophorum, quod agens et patiens debent communicare in subjecto; nec id quod materiatum est, potest agere in rem pure spiritualem. Dantur autem agentia naturalia, quæ agunt contra hujusmodi Dæmones Incubos, sequitur igitur quod isti materiati, seu corporei sunt. Minor probatur ex iis quæ scribunt Dioscorides, l. 2. c. 168. et l. 1. c. 100., Plinius, lib. 15. c. 4., Aristoteles, Probl. 34., et Apuleius, l. De Virtute Herbarum, apud Guaccium, Comp. Malef., l. 3. c. 13. fol. 316., et confirmatur experientia, nempe de pluribus herbis, lapidibus ac animalibus, quæ Dæmones depellunt, ut ruta, hypericon, verbena, scor-dium, palma Christi, centaureum, adamas, corallium, gagates, jaspis, pellis capitis lupi aut asini, menstruum muliebre, et centum alia; unde habetur 26, q. 7. cap. final.: Dæmonium sustinenti liceat petras, vel herbas habere sine incantatione. Ex quo habetur, petras aut herbas posse sua vi naturali Dæmonis vires compescere, aliter Canon hoc non permitteret, sed ut super-
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ferent from pure spirits, and thus, have a body and be on the way to salvation.

68. Besides, a material agent cannot act but on an equally material passive. It is indeed a trite philosophical axiom, that agent and patient must have a common subject: pure matter cannot act on any purely spiritual thing. Now, there are natural agents which act on those Incubi Demons: these are therefore material or corporeal. Our minor is proved by the testimony of Dioscorides, Pliny, Aristotle and Apuleius, quoted by Guaccius, Comp. Malef. b. 3, ch. 13, fol. 316; it is confirmed by our knowledge of numerous herbs, stones and animal substances which have the virtue of driving away Demons, such as rue, St-John's wort, verbena, germander, palma Christi, centaury, diamonds, coral, jet, jasper, the skin of the head of a wolf or an ass, women's catamenia, and a hundred others: wherefore it is written: For such as are assaulted by the Demon it is lawful to have stones or herbs, but without recourse to incantations. It follows that, by their own native virtue, stones or herbs can bridle the Demon: else the above mentioned Canon would not permit their use, but would on the contrary forbid it as
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stitiosum vetaret. Et de hoc luculentum exemplum habemus in Sacra Scriptura, ubi Angelus Raphael dixit Tobiae, c. 6, v. 8. : Cordis ejus (nempe piscis, quem a Tigri attraxerat) particulam, si super carbones ponas, fumus ejus extricat omnem genus Dæmoniorum. Et ejus virtutem experientia comprobavit : nam incenso jecore piscis, fugatus est Incubus, qui Saram deperiebat.

69. Respondent ad hæc communiter Theologi, quod talia agentia naturalia inchoative tantum fugant Dæmonem, completive autem vis supernaturalis Dei aut Angeli, ita ut virtus supernaturalis sit causa primaria, directa, et principalis, naturalis autem secondaria, indirecta, et minus principalis. Unde ad probationem, quæ supra adducta est de Dæone fugato a fumo jecoris piscis incensi a Tobia, respondet Vallesius, De Sac. Philosop., c. 28., quod tali fumo indita fuit a Deo vis supernaturalis fugandi Incubum, sicut igni materiali Inferni data est virtus torquendi Dæmones et animas Damnatorum. Ad eamdem autem probationem respondet Lyranus, et Cornelius ad c. 6. Tob. v. 8.
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superstitious. We have a striking instance thereof in Holy Scripture, where the Angel Raphael says to Tobit, ch. 6, v. 8, speaking of the fish which he had drawn from the Tigris: "If thou puttest on coals a particle of its liver, the smoke thereof will drive away all kinds of Demons." Experience demonstrated the truth of those words; for, no sooner was the liver of the fish set on fire, than the Incubus who was in love with Sarah was put to flight.

69. To this Theologians usually retort that such natural agents merely initiate the ejection of the Demon, and that the com- plete effect is due to the supernatural force of God or of the Angel; so that the supernatural force is the primary, direct and principal cause, the natural force being but secondary, indirect and subordinate. Thus, in order to explain how the liver of the fish burnt by Tobit drove away the Demon, Vallesius asserts that the smoke thereof had been endowed by God with the supernatural power of expelling the Incubus, in the same manner as the material fire of Hell has the virtue of tormenting Demons and the souls of the Damned. Others, such as Lyranus and Cornelius,
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Abulentis in 1. Reg. c. 16. q. 46., Pere- rius in Daniel., pag. 272., apud Cornel. loc. cit., fumum cordis piscis expulisse Dæmonem inchoate vi naturali, sed com- plete vi angelica et celesti: naturali autem impediendo actionem Dæmonis per disposi- tionem contrariam, quia hic agit per na- turales causas et humores, quorum qualitates expugnantur a qualitatibus contrariis re- rum naturalium, quæ dicuntur Dæmones fugare; et in eadem sententia sunt omnes loquentes de arte exorcista.

70. Sed hæc responsio, que tamen validas habet instantias, ad plus quadrare potest contra malos Dæmones obsidentes corpora, aut per maleficia inferentes ipsis ægritudi- dines, aut alia incommoda, sed nullo modo facit ad propositum de Incubis: siquidem isti nec corpora obsident, nec ipsis officiis mortale habentes, sed ad plus icti- bus et percussionibus torquent. Quod si equas coitum adversantes macras reddunt, hoc faciunt subducendo illis cibum, et hoc modo macrescere, et tandem interire eas faciunt. Ad hæc autem patranda non eget Incubus alicujus rei naturalis applicatione (qua tamen eget, malus Dæmon inferens agritudinem habitualen), ea enim potest ex sua vi organica naturali. Pariter Dæmon
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profess that the smoke of the heart of the fish initiated the ejection of the Demon by native virtue, but completed it by angelical and heavenly virtue: by native virtue, insomuch that it opposed a contrary action to that of the Demon; for the Evil Spirit applies native causes and humours, the native qualities of which are combated by the contrary qualities of natural things known to be capable of driving away Demons; that opinion is shared by all those who treat of the art of exorcisms.

70. But that explanation, however plausible the facts upon which it rests, can at most be received as regards the Evil Spirits which possess bodies or, through malefic, infect them with diseases or other infirmities; it does not at all meet the case of Incubi. For, these neither possess bodies nor infect them with diseases; they, at most, molest them by blows and ill-treatment. If they cause the mares to grow lean because of their not yielding to coition, it is merely by taking away their provender, in consequence of which they fall off and finally die. To that purpose the Incubus need not use a natural agent, as the Evil Spirit does when imparting a disease: it is enough that it should exert its own native organic
malus plerumque obsidet corpora, et infert ægritudines ad signa cum ipso conventa et posita a Saga aut Malefico, quæ signa multoties res naturales sunt prædita vi nativa nocendi, quibus naturaliter resistunt alia pariter naturalia contraria virtutis. Incubus vero non sic; quia ex se, et nulla concurrente aut Saga, aut Malefico, suas vexationes infert. Præterea res naturales fugantes Incubos suam virtutem exercent, ac effectum sortiuntur absque interventu alicujus exorcismi aut sacræ benedictionis; ut proinde dici non possit, quod fuga Incubi inchoative sit a virtute naturali, completae autem a vi divina, quia ibi nulla particularis intervenit divini nominis invocatio, sed est purus effectus rei naturalis, ad quem non concurrit Deus, nisi concursu universali, tanquam auctor naturæ, et causa universalis, et prima in ordine efficientium.

71. Duas circa hoc historias do, quorum primam habui a Confessario Molinalium, viro gravi, ac fide dignissimo. Alterius vero sum testis oculatus.
force. Likewise, when the Evil Spirit possesses bodies and infects them with diseases, it is most frequently through signs agreed upon with himself, and arranged by a witch or a wizard, which signs are usually natural objects, indused with their own noxious virtue, and of course opposed by other equally natural objects endowed with a contrary virtue. But not so the Incubus: it is of his own accord, and without the cooperation of either witch or wizard, that he inflicts his molestations. Besides, the natural things which put the Incubi to flight exert their virtue and bring about a result without the intervention of any exorcism or blessing; it cannot therefore be said that the ejection of the Incubus is initiated by natural, and completed by divine virtue, since there is in this case no particular invocation of the divine name, but the mere effect of a natural object, in which God cooperates only as the universal agent, the author of nature, the first of efficient causes.

71. To illustrate this subject, I give two stories, the first of which I have from a Confessor of Nuns, a man of weight, and most worthy of credit; the second I was eye-witness to.
In quodam Sanctimonialium monasterio degebat ad educationem Virgo quaedam nobilis tentata ab Incubo, qui diu noctuque ipsi apparebat, ipsam ad coitum sollicitando eniximis precibus, tamquam amasius præ amore dementatus; ipsa tamen semper restitit tentanti gratia Dei, ac sacramentorum frequentia roborata. Incassum abiere plures devotiones, jejunia et vota facta a puella vexata, exorcismi, benedictiones, et praecptae ab exorcistis facta Incubo, ut desisteret a molestia illa; nec quidquam proficiebatur multitudo reliquiarum, aliarumque rerum benedictarum disposita in camera virginis tentatae, nec benedictae candelæ noctu ibidem ardentes impediebant, quominus juxta consuetum apparet ad tentandum in forma speciosissimi juvenis. Consultus inter alios viros doctos fuit quidam Theologus magnæ eruditionis: iste advertens virginem tentatam esse temperamenti phlegmatici a toto, conjectavit Incubum esse daemonem aqueum (dantur enim ut scribit Guaccius, Comp. Malefic. l. 1. c. 19. fol. 129., Dæmones ignei, aerei, phlegmatici, terrei, subterranei, et lucifugi), et consuli, quod in camera virginis tentatae continue fieret suffientum vaporosum sequens. Requirunt ollam novam figulinarum vitream; in hac ponitur calami
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In a certain monastery of holy Nuns there lived, as a boarder, a young maiden of noble birth, who was tempted by an Incubus that appeared to her by day and by night, and with the most earnest entreaties, the manners of a most passionate lover, incessantly incited her to sin; but she, supported by the grace of God and the frequent use of the sacraments, stoutly resisted the temptation. But, all her devotions, fasts and vows notwithstanding, despite the exorcisms, the blessings, the injunctions showered by exorcists on the Incubus that he should desist from molesting her; in spite of the crowd of relics and other holy objects collected in the maiden’s room, of the lighted candles kept burning there all night, the Incubus none the less persisted in appearing to her as usual, in the shape of a very handsome young man. At last, among other learned men, whose advice had been taken on the subject, was a very erudite Theologian who, observing that the maiden was of a thoroughly phlegmatic temperament, surmised that that Incubus was an aqueous Demon (there are in fact, as is testified by Guaccius, igneous, aerial, phlegmatic, earthly, subterranean demons who avoid the light of day), and prescribed an uninterrupted
aromatici, cubebarum seminis, aristolochiae utriusque radicum, cardamomi majoris et minoris, gingiberis, piperis longi, caryophyllorum, cinnamomi, canellae caryophyllatae, macis, nucum myristicarum, styracis calamitae, benzoini, ligni ac radicis rodiae, ligni aloes, triasantalorum una uncia, semiaquae vitae librae tres; ponitur olla supra cineres calidas ut vapor suffumenti ascendat, et cella clausa tenetur. Facto suffimento advenit denuo Incubus, sed ingredi cellam nunquam ausus est: sed si tentata extra eam ibat, et per viridarium ac claustra spatianatur, aliis invisibilis si-bivisus apparebat Incubus, et puellae collo injectis brachiis violenter, ac quasi furtive oscula rapiebat: quod molestissimum honestae virgini erat. Consulsum denuo Theologus ille ordinavit puellae, ut deferret pixinulas unguentarias exquisitorum odorum, ut moschi, ambrae, qibetti, balsami Peruvian, ac aliorum compositorum; quod cum fecisset, deambulanti per viridarium puellae apparuit Incubus faci minaci, ac furenti; non tamen ad illam approximavit, sed digitum sibi mordit tanguam meditans vindictam; tandem disparuit, nec amplius ab ea visus fuit.
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Fumigation in the room. A new vessel, made of glass-like earth, was accordingly brought in, and filled with sweet cane, cubeb seed, roots of both aristolochies, great and small cardamon, ginger, long-pepper, caryophyllae, cinnamon, cloves, mace, nutmegs, calamite storax, benzoin, aloes-wood and roots, one ounce of triasandalis, and three pounds of half brandy and water; the vessel was then set on hot ashes in order to force up the fumigating vapour, and the cell was kept closed. As soon as the fumigation was done, the Incubus came, but never dared enter the cell; only, if the maiden left it for a walk in the garden or the cloister, he appeared to her, though invisible to others and throwing his arms round her neck, stole or rather snatched kisses from her, to her intense disgust. At last, after a new consultation, the Theologian prescribed that she should carry about her person pills made of the most exquisite perfumes, such as musk, amber, chive, Peruvian balsam, and others. Thus provided, she went for a walk in the garden, where the Incubus suddenly appeared to her with a threatening face, and in a rage. He did not approach her, however, but, after biting his finger as if meditating revenge, disappeared and was never more seen by her.
72. Alia historia est, quod in Conventu Magnæ Cartusiae Ticinensis, fuit quidam Diaconus, nomine dictus Augustinus, maximas, ac inauditas, et pene incredibles sustinens a quodam Dæmone vexationes; quæ tolli nullo remedio spirituali (quamvis plura juxta plures exorcistas, qui liberationem, sed incassum tentarunt, fuissent adhibita) potuerunt. Me consuluit illius Conventus vicarius, qui curam divexati, utpote Clerici, ex officio habebat. Ego videns frustranea fuisse consueta exorcismorum remedia, exemplo historiae suprarecensitæ consului suffimentum si-mile superiori, utque divexatus pixidulas odoramentorum supradictas deferret; et quia tabacchi usum habebat, et aqua vitæ delectabatur, suasi ut et tabaccho et aqua vitæ moschata uteretur. Dæmon illi apparebat diu noctuque ultra alias species, puta scheleti, suis, asini, Angeli, avis, modo in forma unius, modo alterius ex suis Religiosis, et semel in forma sui Prælati, nempe Prioris, qui hortatus est
72. Here is the other story. In the great Carthusian Friary of Pavia there lived a Deacon, Austin by name, who was subjected by a certain Demon to excessive, unheard of and scarcely credible vexations; although many exorcists had made repeated endeavours to secure his riddance, all spiritual remedies had proved unavailing. I was consulted by the Vicar of the convent, who had the cure of the poor clerk. Seeing the inefficacy of all customary exorcisms, and remembering the above-related instance, I advised a fumigation like unto the one that has been detailed, and prescribed that the Deacon should carry about his person fragrant pills of the same kind; moreover, as he was in the habit of using tobacco, and was very fond of brandy, I advised tobacco and brandy perfumed with musk. The Demon appeared to him by day and by night, under various shapes, as a skeleton, a pig, an ass, an Angel, a bird; with the figure of one or other of the Friars, once even with that of his own Abbot or Prior, exhorting him to keep his conscience clean, to trust in God, to confess frequently; he persuaded him to let him hear his sacramental confession, recited with him the psalms Exsurgat Deus and Qui habitat, and the Gospel according
vexatum ad puritatem conscientiæ, ad confidientiam in Deum, et ad frequentiam confessionis; suasit ut sibi sacramentalem confessionem faceret, quod etiam fecit; et expost Psalmos Exsurget Deus et Qui habitat, et mox Evangelium S. Joannis simul cum vexato recitavit, et ad ea verba Verbum caro factum est genuflexit, et accepta stola, quæ in cella erat, et aspergillo aquæ benedictæ benedixit cellæ, ac lector vexati, et ac si revera fuisse ipsis Prior praecptum fecit Dæmoni, ne auderet illum suum subditum amplius divexare, et post hæc disparuit, sicque prodidit quisnam esset: aliter vexatus illum suum Prælatum esse reputaverat. Postquam igitur suffimentum, ac odores, ut supra dictum est, consuleram, non destitit Dæmon juxta solitum apparere; imo assumpta figura vexati fuit ad cameram Vicarii, et ab eo petiit aquam vitae, ac tabaccum moschatum, dicens sibi talia valde placere. Vicarius utrumque illi dedit: quibus acceptis disparuit in momento, quo facto cognovit Vicarius se fuisse illusum a Dæmoni tali pacto: quod magis confirmavit assertum vexati, qui cum juramento affirmavit, se illa die nullo modo fuisse in cella Vicarii. Iste mihi totum retulit, et ex tali facto conjeci Dæmonem illum non fuisse aqueum,
to St John: and when they came to the words *Verbum caro factum est*, he bent his knee, and taking hold of a stole which was in the cell, and of the Holy-water sprinkle, he blessed the cell and the bed, and, as if he had really been the Prior, enjoined on the Demon not to venture in future to molest his subordinate; he then disappeared, thus betraying what he was, for otherwise the young deacon had taken him for his Prior. Now, notwithstanding the fumigations and perfumes I had prescribed, the Demon did not desist from his wonted apparitions; more than that, assuming the features of his victim, he went to the Vicar's room, and asked for some tobacco and brandy perfumed with musk, of which, said he, he was extremely fond. Having received both, he disappeared in the twinkling of an eye, thus showing the Vicar that he had been played with by the Demon; and this was amply confirmed by the Deacon, who affirmed upon his oath that he had not gone that day to the Vicar's cell. All that having been related to me, I inferred that, far from being aqueous like the Incubus who was in love with the maiden above spoken of, this Demon was igneous, or, at the very least, aerial, since he delighted in hot substances such as
ut erat Incubus, qui virginem ad coitum sollicitabat, ut dictum supra est, sed igneum, vel ad minus aereum, ex quo gau-debat vaporibus, ac odoribus, tabacco, et aqua vitae, quae calida sunt. Et conjecturae vim addidit temperamentum divexati, quod erat colericum quo ad praedominium cum subdominio, tamen sanguineo. Daemos enim tales non accedunt nisi ad eos, qui secum in temperamento symbolizant; ex quo validatur opinio mea de illorum corporeitate. Unde suasi Vicario, ut acciperet herbas natura frigidas, ut nymphæam, hepaticam, portulacam, mandragoram, sempervivam, plantaginam, hyoscyamum, et alias similes, et ex iis compositum fasciculum fenestrae, alium ostio cellae suspendere; similibusque herbis, tum cameram, tum lectum divexati sternere. Mirum dictu! comparuit denuo Daemos, manens tamen extra cameram, nec ingredi voluit, et cum divexatus illum interrogasset, quare de more intrare non auderet, multis verbis injuriosis jactatis contra me, qui talia consulueram, disparuit, nec amplius reversus est.

73. Ex his duabus historiis appareat tales odorum, et herbas respective sua naturali virtute, nullaque interveniente vi su-
vapours, perfumes, tobacco and brandy. Force was added to my surmises by the temperament of the young deacon, which was choleric and sanguine, choleric predominating however; for, those Demons never approach but those whose temperament tallies with their own: another confirmation of my sentiment regarding their corporeity. I therefore advised the Vicar to let his penitent take herbs that are cold by nature, such as water-lily, liver-wort, spurge, mandrake, house-leek, plantain, henbane, and others similar, make two little bundles of them and hang them up, one at his window, the other at the door of his cell, taking care to strow some also on the floor and on the bed. Marvellous to say! The Demon appeared again, but remained outside the room, which he would not enter; and, on the Deacon inquiring of him his motives for such unwonted reserve, he burst out into invectives against me for giving such advice, disappeared, and never came again.

73. The two stories I have related make it clear that, by their native virtue alone, perfumes and herbs drove away Demons.
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pernaturali Dæmones propulisse; unde convincitur quod Incubi patiuntur a qualitatibus materialibus, ut proinde concludi debat, quod communicant in materia cum iis rebus naturalibus, a quibus fugantur, et ex consequenti corpore sint praediti, quod est intentum.

74. Et magis conclusio firmatur, si impugnetur sententia Doctorum supracitationum, dicentium, Incubum abactum a Sara fuisse vi Angeli Raphaelis, non vero jecoris piscis callionymi, qualis fuit piscis a Tobia apprehensus ad ripam Tigris, ut cum Vallesio, Sacr. Philos., c. 42., scribit Cornelius a Lap. in Tob. c. 6. v. 2., § Quarto ergo: salva enim tantorum Doctorum reverentia, talis expositio manifeste adversatur sensui patenti Textus, a quo nullo modo recedendum est dummodo non sequantur absurda. En verba Angeli ad Tobiam: « Cordis ejus particulam, si super carbones ponas, fumus ejus extricitomne genus Dæmoniorum, sive a viro, sive a muliere, ita ut ultra non accedant ad eos, et fel valet ad unguendos oculos, in quibus fuerit albugo, et sanabuntur. » (Tob., c. 6. v. 8. et 9.) Noteatur, quæso, assertio Angeli absoluta, et
Demoniality

without the intervention of any supernatural force; Incubi are therefore subject to material conditions, and it must be inferred that they participate of the matter of the natural objects which have the power of putting them to flight, and consequently they have a body; that is what was to be shown.

74. But, the better to establish our conclusion, it behoves to impugn the mistake into which have-fallen the Doctors above-quoted, such as Vallesius and Cornelius a Lapide, when they say that Sarah was rid from the Incubus by the virtue of the Angel Raphael, and not by that of the callionymous fish caught by Tobit on the banks of the Tigris. Indeed, saving the reverence due to such great doctors, such a construction manifestly clashes with the clear meaning of the Text, from which it is never justifiable to deviate, so long as it does not lead to absurd consequences. Here are the words spoken by the Angel to Tobias: «If thou puttest on coals a particle of its heart, the smoke thereof will expel all kinds of Demons, whether from man or woman, so that they shall never return, and its gall is good for anointing eyes that have whiteness, and healing them.»

75. Quæro modo, an Angelus veritatem puram dixerit de virtute rerum, an mentiri potuerit; pariter an albugo ab oculis Tobiae senioris ablata sit vi naturali fellis piscis, aut virtute supernaturali Angeli Raphaelis? Angelum mentiri potuisse blasphemia hæreticalis est; sequitur igitur puram veritatem fuisse ab eo assertam; talis autem non esset, si omne genus Dæmoniorum non extricaretur a fumo jecoris piscis nisi addita vi supernaturali Angeli, maxime, si hac esset causa principalis ta-
(Tobit, c. 6, v. 8 and 9). Pray notice that the Angel's assertion respecting the virtue of the heart or liver and gall of that fish is absolute, universal; for, he does not say: « If thou puttest on coals particles of its heart, thou wilt put to flight all kinds of Demons, and if thou anointest with its gall eyes that have a whiteness, they shall be healed. » If he had thus spoken, I could agree with the construction that Raphael had brought about, by his own supernatural virtue, the effects which the mere application of the smoke and the gall might not have sufficed to produce: but he does not speak thus, and, on the contrary, says absolutely, that such is the virtue of the smoke and the gall.

75. It may be asked whether the Angel spoke the precise truth regarding the virtue of those things, or whether he might have lied; and likewise, whether the whiteness was withdrawn from the eyes of the elder Tobit by the native force of the gall of the fish, or by the supernatural virtue of the Angel Raphael? To say that the Angel could have lied would be an heretical blasphemy; he therefore spoke the precise truth; but it would no longer be so if all kinds of Demons were not expelled by the
lis effectus, quemadmodum scribunt de hoc casu Doctores. Mentiretur absque dubio medicus qui diceret: talis herba curat taliter pleuritidem, sive epilepsiam, ut amplius non revertatur: si herba illa non curaret illas ægritudines nisi inchoate, et perfecta illarum sanatio esset ab alia herba conjuncta priori; sic pari modo mentitus fuisset Raphael, asserens fumum jecoris extricare omne genus Dæmoniorum ita ut ultra non accedant, si talis effectus esset a fumo solum inchoate, principaliter vero, et perfecte a virtute Angeli. Præterea talis fuga Dæmonis, vel secutura erat universaliter, et semper posito jecore piscis super carbones a quoquam, vel debebat sequi in illo solummodo casu particulari, jecore incusso a juniori Tobia. Si primum, ergo oportet, quod cuicumque tales fumum per accensionem jecoris paranti, assistat Angelus qui supernaturali virtute Dæmonem miraculose abigat regulariter; et hoc est absurdum; ad positionem enim rei naturalis deberet regulariter sequi miraculum, quod est incongruum, et si absque Angeli operatione fuga Dæmonis non sequetur, mentitus fuisset Raphael asserens eam esse virtutem jecoris. Si autem effectus ille sequi non debet, nisi in illo casu particulari, mentitus fuisset Angelus.
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smoke of the liver of the fish, unless aided by the supernatural force of the Angel, and especially, if such aid was the principal cause of the effect produced, as the Doctors assert in the present case. It would doubtless be a lie if a physician should say: such an herb radically cures pleurisy or epilepsy, and if it should only begin the cure, the completion of which required the addition of another herb to the one first used; in the same manner, Raphael would have lied when averring that the smoke of the liver expelled all kinds of demons, so that they should not return, if that result had been only begun by the smoke, and its completion had been principally due to the virtue of the Angel. Besides, that flight of the demon was either to take place universally and by any one whomsoever putting the liver of the fish on the coals, or else it was only to occur in that particular case, the younger Tobit putting the liver on. In the first hypothesis, any person making that smoke by burning the liver should be assisted by an Angel, who, through his supernatural virtue should expel the Demons miraculously and regularly at the same time; which is absurd; for, either words have no meaning, or a natural fact cannot be regularly followed by a miracle;
enuncians universaliter virtutem piscis, in fugando omni Dæmoniorum genere, quod non est dicendum.
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and, if the Demon was not put to flight without the assistance of the Angel, Raphael would have lied when ascribing that virtue to the liver. If, on the contrary, that effect was only to be brought about in that particular case, Raphael would again have lied when assigning to that fish, universally and absolutely, the virtue of expelling the Demon: now, to say that the Angel lied is not possible.

76. The whiteness was withdrawn from the eyes of the elder Tobit, and his blindness healed, through the native virtue of the gall of that same fish, as Doctors aver. In fact, that the gall of the callionymous fish, which the Italians call bocca in capo, and of which Tobias made use, is a highly renowned remedy for removing the whiteness from the eyes, all are agreed, Dioscorides, Galen, Pliny, Aclanius, Vallesius, etc. The Greek Text of Tobit, c. 11, v. 13, says: «He poured the gall on his father’s eyes, saying: Have confidence, father; but, there being erosion, the old man rubbed his eyes, and the scales of the whiteness came out at the corners. » Now, since, according to the same text, the Angel had disclosed to Tobias the virtue of the liver and gall of the fish, and since, through its native vir-
ruerit Tobiae virtutem jecoris, et fellis piscis, et hoc sua naturali virtute caecitatem Tobiae senioris curaverit, concludendum est, quod etiam fumus jecoris sua naturali vi Incubum fugaverit; quod concludenter confirmatur a Textu Graeco, qui ad Tobiae c. 8. v. 2., ubi Vulgata habet: « Partem je-
» coris posuit super carbones vivos », sic habet: « Accepit cinerem, sive prunam
» thimiamatum, et imposuit cor piscis, et
» hepar, fumumque fecit, et quando odo-
» ratus est Daemon odores, fugit. » Et Textus Hebraicus ita cantat: « Percepit
» Asmodeus odorem, et fugit. » Ex quibus textibus apparent, quod Daemon fugit ad per-
ceptionem fumi, sibi contrarii, ac nocentis,
non autem a virtute Angeli supernaturali.
Quod si in tali liberatione Sarae ab impeti-
tione Incubi Asmodei, ultra fumum jecoris intervenit operatio Raphaelis, hoc fuit in alligatione Daemonis in desertio superioris
Ægypti, ut dicitur c. 8. v. 3. Tobiae; fu-
mus quippe jecoris nequibat in tanta di-
stattia agere in Daemonem, aut illum alli-
gare. Quod inservire potest pro concordia
suprascriptorum Doctorum (qui voluerunt
Saram perfecte liberatam a Daemon vir-
tute Raphaelis) cum sententia, quam tue-
mur: dico enim, quod ipsi senserint quod
perfecta curatio Saræ a Dæmone fuerit in
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tue, the gall cured the elder Tobit’s blindness, it must be inferred that it was likewise through its native force that the smoke of the liver put the Incubus to flight; which inference is conclusively confirmed by the Greek text, which, Tobit, c. 8, v. 2, instead of the reading in the Vulgate: « He laid a part of the liver on burning coals », says explicitly: « He took the ashes of the perfumes, and put the heart and the liver of the fish thereupon, and made a smoke therewith; the which smell when the evil spirit had smelled, he fled. » The Hebrew text says: « Asmodeus smelled the smell, and fled. » From all those texts it appears that the Demon took to flight on smelling a smoke which was prejudicial and hurtful to himself, and nowise from the supernatural virtue of the Angel. If, in ridding Sarah from the assaults of the Incubus Asmodeus, the operation of the smoke of the liver was followed by the intervention of Raphael, it was in order to bind the Demon in the wilderness of High-Egypt, as related, Tobit, c. 8, v. 3; for, at such a distance, the smoke of the liver could neither operate on the Demon, nor bind him. And here we have the means of reconciling our opinion with that of the above-mentioned Doctors, who ascribe to Raphael’s power Sarah’s
alligatione ejus in deserto, quæ fuit ab An
gelo, quod et nos concedimus; sed extrica
tio, sive fugatio ejusdem a cubiculo Sara
erit a vi innativa jecoris piscis, quod nos
tuemur.

77. Probatur terto principaliter nostra
conclusio de existentia talium animalium,
seu de Incuborum corporeitate, ex auctorit
itate D. Hieronymi, in vita S. Pauli primi
Eremitæ. Refert is D. Antonium iter per
desertum arripuisse, ut ad visendum D.
Paulum perveniret, et post nonnullas dia
tas itineris Centaurum reperiisse, a quo
cum fuisset percontatus mensionem D. Pauli,
et ille barbarum quid infrendens potius,
quam proloquens, dextræ protensione manus
iter D. Antonio demonstrasset, in sylvam
se additid cursu concitatissimo. Prosecutus
iter S. Abbas in quadam valle invenit haud
grandem quemdam homunculum, aduncis
manibus, fronte cornibus asperata, cujus
extrema pars corporis in caprarum pedes
desinebat. Ad ejus aspectum substitit Anto
nium, et timens Diaboli artes signo Sanctæ
Crucis se munivit. Ad tale signum nec fugit,
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complete riddance from the Demon: for, I say with them, that the cure of Sarah was completed by the binding of the Demon in the wilderness, the deed of the Angel; which I concede; but I maintain that the deliverance properly called, that is to say, the ejection from Sarah's bed-room, was the direct effect of the virtue of the liver of the fish.

77. A third principal proof of our conclusion regarding the existence of those animals, in other words, respecting the corporeity of Incubi, is adduced by the testimony of St Hieronymus, in his Life of St Paul, the first Hermit. St Anthony, says he, set on a journey to visit St Paul. After travelling several days, he met a Centaur, of whom he inquired the hermit's abode; whereupon the Centaur, growling some uncouth and scarcely intelligible answer, shew the way with his out-stretched hand, and fled with the utmost speed into a wood. The Holy Abbot kept on his way, and, in a dale, met a little man, almost a dwarf, with crooked hands, horned brow, and his lower extremities ending with goat's feet. At the sight of him, St Anthony stood still, and fearing the arts of the Devil, comforted himself with a sign of the
nec metuit homuncio ille, immo ad sanctum
senem actu humili appropinquans, palmari-
rum fructus ad viaticum quasi pacis obsides
illi offerebat. Tum B. Antonius quisnam
esse set interrogans, hoc ab eo responsum ac-
ceptit: « Mortalis ego sum, et unus ex ac-
» colis Eremi, quos vario errore delusa
» Gentilitas Faunos, Satyros, et Incubos
» vocans colit; legatione fungor gregis
» mei; precamur, ut pro nobis communem
» Deum depreceris, quem pro salute mundi
» venisse cognovimus, et universam terram
» exiit sonus ejus. » Ad quæ gaudens D.
Antonius de gloria Christi, conversus ad
Alexandriam, et baculo terram percutiens,
aet: « Veh tibi, Civitas meretrix, quæ pro
» diis animalia veneraris! » Hæc D. Hie-
ronymus, qui late prosequitur hoc factum,
ipsius virtutem longo comprobans sermone.

78. De hujus historiæ veritate dubitare
temaritum est, cum eam constanter referat
SS. Ecclesiæ Doctorum maximus D. Hie-
ronymus, de cujus auctoritate nullus Catho-
licus dubitabit. Addit fol. 21. 25. Notandæ
proinde veniunt illius circumstantiæ, quæ
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Cross. But, far from running away, or even seeming frightened at it, the little fellow respectfully approached the old man, and tendered him, as a peace offering, dates for his journey. The blessed St Anthony having then inquired who he was: «I am a mortal,» replied he, «and one of the inhabitants of the Wilderness, whom Gentility, under its varied delusions, worships under the names of Fauns, Satyrs and Incubi; I am on a mission from my flock: we request thee to pray for us unto the common God, whom we know to have come for the salvation of the world, and whose praises are sounded all over the earth.» Rejoicing at the glory of Christ, St Anthony, turning his face towards Alexandria, and striking the ground with his staff, cried out: «Woe be unto thee, thou harlot City, who worshipest animals as Gods!» Such is the narrative of St Hieronymus, who expatiates at length on the fact, explaining its import in a long discourse.

78. It were indeed rash to doubt the truth of the above recital, constantly referred to by the greatest of the Doctors of the Holy Church, St Hieronymus, whose authority no Catholic will ever deny. Let us therefore investigate the circumstances
sententiam nostram evidentissime confirmant.

79. Primo notandum est, quod si ulla Sanctorum artibus Daemonis impetus fuit; si ulla diversas ejus artes nocendi calluit; si ulla victorias, ac illustria de eodem trophaeae reportavit, is fuit D. Antonius, ut constat ex ejus vita a D. Athanasio descripta. Dum igitur D. Antonius homunculum illum non tanquam Diabolum agnovit, sed animal intitulavit, dicens: Veh tibi, Civitas meretrix, quae pro Diis animalia veneraris! convincitur, quod ille nullo modo fuit Diabolus, seu purus spiritus de coelo dejectus, ac damnatus, sed aliquod alium animal. Et confirmatur, quia D. Antonius erudiens suos monachos, eosque animans ad metuendas Daemonis violentias, aiebat, prout habetur in lectionibus Breviarii Romani in festo S. Antonii Abb. l. ii. quae recitantur in festo ipsius: «Mihi credite, Fratres, pertimescit Satanás piorum vigilias, orationes, jejunia, voluntariam paupertatem, misericordiam, et humilitatem; maxime vero ardentem amorem in Christum Dominum, cujus unico Sanctissimæ Crucis signo debilitatus fugit.» Dum igitur homunculus ille, contra quem D. Antonius Crucis signo se munivit, ad ejus aspectum
79. Firstly, we must observe that if ever a Saint was assailed by the arts of the Demon, saw through his infernal devices, and carried off victories and trophies from the contest, that Saint was St Anthony, as is shown by his life written by St Athanasius. Now, since in that little man St Anthony did not recognize a devil but an animal, saying: "Woe be unto thee, thou harlot City, who worshippest animals as Gods!", it is clear that it was no devil or pure spirit ejected from heaven and damned, but some kind of animal. Still more: St Anthony, when instructing his friars and cautioning them against the assaults of the Demon, said to them, as related in the Roman Breviary (Festival of St Anthony, Abbot, b. I): "Believe me, my brethren, Satan dreads the vigils of pious men, their prayers, fasts, voluntary poverty, compassion and humility; but, above all, he dreads their burning love of our Lord Christ, at the mere sign of whose most Holy Cross he flies disabled." As the little man, against whom St Anthony guarded himself with a sign of the Cross, neither took fright nor fled, but approached the Saint confidently
nec pavit, nec fugit, immo confideret, humiliter que accessit ad eum dactalos illi offerens, signum est, illum nullo modo Diabolumuisse.

80. Secundo notandum, quod homunculus ille dixit: Mortalis et ego sum; ex quibus verbis docemur, quod ille erat animal morti obnoxium, et proinde, quod per generationem esse accept: spiritus enim immaterialis immaterialis est, quia simplex, et ideo non accipit esse per generationem ex praevacjente materia, sed per creationem; unde nec amittit esse per corruptionem, quae dicitur mors, sed per annihilationem tantum potest desinere esse. Quod si ille se mortalem esse dixit, professus est se esse animal.

81. Tertio notandum, quod ait se cognovisse communem Deum in carne humana fuisse passum. Ex his verbis convincitur illud fuisse animal rationale: siquidem bruta nihil agnoscent, nisi sensibile et præsens, unde ab ipsis Deus nullo modo cognosci potest. Quod si homunculus ille ait, se cum aliis suis cognovisse Deum in carne humana passum, hoc probat, quod aliquo revelante habuit notitiam de Deo, sicut etiam
and humbly, offering him some dates, it is a sure sign that he was no Devil.

80. Secondly, we must observe that the little man said: « *I also am a mortal*, » whence it follows that he was an animal subject to death, and consequently called into being through generation; for, an immaterial spirit is immortal, because simple, and consequently is not called into being through generation from preexistent matter, but through creation, and, consequently also, cannot lose it through the corruption called death; its existence can only come to an end through annihilation. Therefore, when saying he was mortal, he professed himself an animal.

81. Thirdly, we must observe that he said he knew that the common God had suffered in human flesh. Those words show him to have been a rational animal, for brutes know nothing but what is sensible and present, and can therefore have no knowledge of God. If that little man said that he and his fellows were aware of God having suffered in human flesh, it shows that, by means of some revelation, he had
nos habemus de illo fidem revelatam; paret que Deum carnet humanam assumisse, et in ea passum: quae duo sunt articuli nostrae Fidei principales, nempe Dei unius, et trini existentia, et ipsius Incarnationis, Passio, et Resurrection; ex quibus omnibus habetur, ut dicebam, illud fuisse animal rationale capax divinae cognitionis, per revelationem, ut nos, et proinde pollens anima rationali, et ex consequenti immortalis.

82. Quarto notandum, quod oraverit nomine omnium gregis sui, cujus legatione fungi se profitebatur, D. Antonium, ut communem Deum pro illis deprecaretur. Ex his deductitur, quod homunculus ille capax erat beatitudinis, et damnationis, et quod non erat in termino, sed in via: ex hoc enim, quod, ut supra probatum est, se prodidit rationalem, et anima immortali consequenter donatum, consequens est, quod et beatitudinis, et damnationis capax sit: haec enim propria passio est Creaturarum rationalis, ut constat ex natura angelica, et humana. Item deductitur, quod ipse erat in via, et proinde capax meriti, et demeriti: si enim fuisset in termino, fuisset vel beatus, vel damnatus; neutrum autem potuit esse, quia orationes D. Antonii, quibus se
acquired the notion of God, as we have ourselves the revealed faith. That God assumed human flesh and suffered in it, is the essence of the two principal articles of our Faith: the existence of God one and threefold, His Incarnation, Passion and Resurrection. All that shows, as I said, that it was a rational animal, capable of the knowledge of God through revelation, like ourselves, and endowed with a rational, and consequently, immortal soul.

82. Fourthly, we must observe that, in the name of his whole flock whose delegate he professed to be, he besought St Anthony to pray for them to the common God. Wherefrom I infer that that little man was capable of beatitude and damnation, and that he was not in termino but in via; for, from his being, as has been shown above, rational and consequently endowed with an immortal soul, it flows that he was capable of beatitude and damnation, the proper share of every rational Creature, Angel or man. I likewise infer that he was on the way, in via, that is, capable of merit and demerit; for, if he had been at the goal, in termino, he would have been either blessed or damned. Now, he could be neither the one nor the other; for, St An-
commendabat, ipsi nullo modo prodesse potuissent, si fuisset finaliter damnatus; et si beatus fuisset, illis non eguisset. Quod ipsi se commendavit, signum est eas sibi prodesse potuisse, et proinde ipsum fuisset in statu viae, et meriti.

83. Quinto notandum, quod homunculus ille professus est, se esse legatum aliorum suæ speciei, dum dixit legatione fungor gregis mei, ex quibus verbis plura deducuntur. Unum est, quod homunculus ille non solus erat, unde potuisset credi monstrum raro contingens, sed quod plures erant ejusdem speciei; tum quia simul congregati gregem faciebant; tum quia nomine omnium veniebat: quod esse non posset si multorum voluntates in illum non convenissent. Aliud est, quod isti profinetur vitam socialem: ex quo nomine multorum unus ex ipsis missus est. Aliud est, quod quamvis dicantur habitate in Eremo, non tamen in eo fixa est eorum permanentia: siquidem cum D. Antonius in illa eremo alias non fuisset (distabat enim illa per multas dietas ab eremo D. Antonii), scire non potuerunt quisnam ille esset cujusque sanctitatis; necessarium igitur fuit,
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Anthony's prayers, to which he commended himself, could have been of no assistance to him, if finally damned, and, if blessed, he stood in no need of them. Since he commended himself to those prayers, it shows they could be of avail to him, and, consequently, that he was on the way to salvation, in statu viae et meriti.

83. Fifthly, we must observe that the little man professed to be delegated by others of his kind, when saying: «I am on a mission from my flock», words from which many inferences may be deduced. One is, that the little man was not alone of his kind, an exceptional and solitary monster, but that there were many of the same species, since congregating they made up a flock, and that he came in the name of all; which could not have been, had not the will of many centred in him. Another is, that those animals lead a social life, since one of them was sent in the name of many. Another again is, that, although living in the Wilderness, it is not assigned to them as a permanent abode; for St Anthony having never previously been in that desert, which was far distant from his hermitage, they could not have known who he was nor what his degree of sanctity; it was
quod alibi eum cognoverint, et ex consequenti extra desertum illum vagaverint.

84. Ultimo notandum, quod homunculus ille ait esse ex iis, quos cæco errore delusa Gentilitas Faunos, Satyros et Incubos appellant; et ex his verbis convincitur nostrum intentum principale, Incubos nempe esse animalia rationalia beatitatis, et damnationis capacia.

85. Talium homuncionum frequens est apparitio in metallorum fadinis, ut scribit Gregorius Agricola, lib. De Animal. subterraneo, prope finem. Iste nempe coram fossoribus minerarum comparent induti habitu, qualém habent fossores ipsi, et jocantur inter se, tripudiante, ac rident et cachinnantur, parvosque lapides joco mittunt in metallarios, et tunc signum est, ait Auctor praedictus, optimi proventus, ac invenionis alicujus rami, aut trunci principalis arboris mineralis.

86. Tales homunculos subterraneos negat Petrus Thyraeus Novesianus, lib. De Terrificatio. Noctur., c. 2., per totum, nixus argumentis sane puerilibus, quæ
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therefore necessary that they should have become acquainted with him elsewhere, and, consequently, that they should have travelled beyond that wilderness.

84. Lastly, we must observe that the little man said he was one of those whom the Gentiles, blinded by error, call Fauns, Satyrs and Incubi: and by these words is shown the truth of our principal proposition: that Incubi are rational animals, capable of beatitude and damnation.

85. The apparition of such little men is of frequent occurrence in metallic mines, as is written by Gregorius Agricola in his book De Animal. subterrana. They appear to the miners, clothed like themselves, play and caper together, laugh and titter, and throw little stones at them for the sake of amusement: a sign, says the above-named Author, of excellent success, and of the finding of some branch or body of a mineral tree.

86. Peter Thyrsus, of Neuss, in his book De Terrification. nocturna, denies the existence of such little men, and supports his denial upon the following truly puerile ar-

87. Sed viri parum cordati est negare id, quod graves Auctores, fideque digni scribunt, quodque quotidiana constat experientia. Argumenta Thyraei nec minimum cogunt, ac ea solvimus supra a n° 45. et seq. Remanet solum satisfacere quesitioni ubinam locorum habitent hujusmodi homunculi, seu Incubi? Ad quod dico, quod ut supra dedimus n° 71. ex Guaccio, istorum alii sunt terrei, alii aquei, alii aerei, alii ignei, quorum nempe corpora, aut constant ex talium elementorum subtiliori parte, sive licet ex pluribus constant elementis, prævalet tamen in iis, aut aqua, aut aer pro ipsorum natura. Mansiones igitur, et domicilia eorum erunt in elemento illo cujus natura in eorum corporibus prævalet: ignei enim nisi violenter, et forte nullomodo in aquis aut locis palustri-
guments: given such little men, says he, where do they live, how and where do they dwell? How do they keep up their kind, through generation or otherwise? Are they born, do they die, with what food do they sustain themselves? Are they capable of beatitude and damnation, and by what means do they procure their salvation? Such are the arguments upon which Thy-raeus relies for denying that existence.

87. But it really shows little judgment in a man, to deny that which has been written by grave and credible Authors, and confirmed by every day experience. Thy-raeus's arguments are worthless and have been already refuted, N° 45 and following. The only question which remains to be answered is this: where do those little men, or Incubi, dwell? To that I reply: as has been shown above (N° 71), according to Guaccius, some are earthly, some aqueous, some aerial, some igneous, that is to say, that their bodies are made of the most subtle part of one of the elements, or, if of the combination of many elements, that yet there is one which predominates, either water or air, according to their nature. Their dwellings will consequently be found in that element which is prevalent in their
bus morabuntur, cum haec sint sibi contraria, nec aquei ad superiorem ætheris pars
tem ascendere poterunt ob sibi repugnamentem regionis illius subtilitatem, quod etiam
videmus accidere hominibus, qui ad quorumdam Alpium summa juga pervenire
nequeunt praecsumma aeris subtilitate, quæ homines crassiori aeri assuetos nutrire
nequit.

Thom., q. 50., ar. 1. circa med., probare possemus Dæmonum corporeitatem; quæ
tamen stante determinatione Concilii Late
ranensis de incorporeitate Angelorum, ut
dictum fuit supra no 37., exponi debent
de Dæmonibus istis Incubis, ac viatoribus
adhuc, non autem de Damnatis. Tamen ne
nimis longus sim, solius D. Augustini,
summi Ecclesiæ Doctoris, auctoritates
damus, quibus evidenter convincitur illum
fuisset in sententia, quam nos docemus.

89. D. Augustinus igitur, lib. 2. super
Genesim ad litteram c. 17. de Dæmoni-
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bodies: igneous Incubi, for instance, will only stay forcibly, may be will not stay at all, in water or marshes, which are adverse to them; and aqueous Incubi will not be able to rise into the upper part of ether, the subtlety of which region is repugnant to them. We see the like happen to men who, accustomed to thicker air, cannot reach certain lofty ridges of the Alps where the air is too subtle for their lungs.

88. Many testimonies of Holy Fathers, gathered by Molina, in his Commentary of St Thomas, would go to prove the corporality of Demons; but, taking into account the above-quoted decision of the Council of Lateran (Nr 37), concerning the incorporeity of Angels, we must understand that the Holy Fathers had in view those Incubi Demons which are still on the way to salvation, and not those that are damned. However, to make matters short, we merely give the authority of St Austin, that eminent Doctor of the Church, and it will be clearly seen how thoroughly his doctrine harmonizes with ours.

89. St Austin, then, in his Commentary on Genesis, book 2, ch. 17, writes as fol-
bus, sic habet: «Quaedam vera nosse, partim quia subtiliore sensus acumine, partim quia subtilioribus corporibus vigent, » et lib. 3. c. i., « etsi Daemones aerea sunt animalia, quoniam corporum aereorum natura vigent. » Et Epistola 115. ad Hebridium affirmat, eos esse « animantia aerea, seu ætherea acerrimi sensus. » Et de Civit. Dei lib. 11. c. 23., affirmat « Daemonem pessimum habere corpus aereum. » Et lib. 21. c. 10. scripsit: « Sunt sua quaedam etiam Daemonibus corpora, sicut doctis hominibus visum est, ex isto aere crasso et humido. » Et lib. 17. c. 23. ait « se non audere definire, an Angeli corpore aereo, ita corporati possint etiam hanc pati libidinem, ut quomodo possint, sentientibus feminis miscantur. » Et in Enarrat in Psalm. 85. ait « corpora beatorum futura post resurrectionem, qualia sunt corpora Angelorum; « et in Enarrat. in Psalm. 45. ait « corpus Angelicum inferius esse anima. » Et lib. De Divinit. Daemonum, passim per totum, maxime c. 23., docet « Daemones subtilia habere corpora.»

90. Potest etiam sententia nostra auc-
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lows concerning Demons: « They have the knowledge of some truths, partly through the more subtle acumen of their senses, partly through the greater subtility of their bodies », and, book 3, ch. 1: « Demons are aerial animals, because they partake of the nature of aerial bodies. » In his Epistle 115 to Hebridius, he affirms that they are « aerial or ethereal animals, endowed with very sharp senses. » In the City of God, book 11, ch. 13, he says that « the worst Demon has an aerial body. » Book 21, ch. 10, he writes: « The bodies of certain Demons, as has been believed by some learned men, are even made of the thick and damp air which we breathe. » Book 15, ch. 23: « He dares not define whether Angels, with an aerial body, could feel the lust which would incite them to communicate with women. » In his commentary on Psalm 85, he says that « the bodies of the blessed will, after resurrection, be like unto the bodies of Angels; » Psalm 14, he observes that « the body of Angels is inferior to the soul. » And, in his book De Divinit. Daemonum, he every-where, and especially ch. 23, teaches that « Demons have subtle bodies ».

90. Our doctrine can also be confirmed

91. Sed haec expositio aptissima est quidem, et quam amplectitur Ecclesia in officio Sanctissimi Corporis Christi, sed in sensu spirituali est. Ego autem quero sen- sum litteralem: neque enim in illo Psalmo David loquitur prophetice de futuris, sicut facit in aliis locis, ut proinde facile non sit sensum litteralem habere; sed lo- quitur historice de præteritis. Ille enim Psalmus, ut patet legenti, est pura anacephalestis, seu compendium omnium benefi-
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by the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, which, however diversely construed by commentators, are yet capable of adaptation to our proposition. First, Psalm 77, v. 24 and 25, it is said: «The Lord had given them of the bread of heaven; man did eat angels' food.» David here alludes to Manna, which fed the People of Israel during the whole time that they wandered in the wilderness. It will be asked in what sense it can be said of Manna that it is the Bread of Angels. I am aware that most Doctors construe this passage in a mystical sense, saying that Manna figures the Holy Eucharist, which is styled the bread of Angels, because Angels enjoy the sight of God who, by concomitance, is found in the Eucharist.

91. A most proper construction assuredly, and which is adopted by the Church in the office of the Most Holy Body of Jesus-Christ; but it is in a spiritual sense. Now, what I want, is the literal sense; for, in that Psalm, David does not speak, as a prophet, of things to be, as he does in other places where a literal sense is not easily to be gathered; he speaks here as a historian, of things gone by. That Psalm, as is evident to whoever reads it, is a pure
ciorum, quæ contulit Deus Populo Hebræo
ab egressu ipsius de Ægypto, usque ad
tempus Davidis, et in eo versu loquitur de
Manna Deserti, ut proinde quæratur quo-
modo, et quo sensu Manna vocetur Panis
Angelorum.

92. Scio alios, Lyran., Euthim., Bel-
larm., Titelman., Genebrard., in Psal. 77.
v. 24. et 25., interpretari Panem Angelo-
rum Panem ab Angelis paratum, seu An-
gelorum ministerio a Cælo demissum;
Hugonem autem Cardinalem Panem An-
gelorum exponente: quia ille cibus hoc effi-
ciebat in Judæis, quod in Angelis efficit
cibus illorum, pro parte: Angeli enim non
incurrunt infirmitatem. Voluerunt enim
expositores Hebræi, ut etiam asseverat
Josephus, quod Judæi in Deserto vescentes
manna, nec senescerent, nec ægrotarent,
nec lassarentur; proinde illa esset tan-
quam panis, quo vescuntur Angeli, qui nec
senio, nec ægritudine, nec lassitudine un-
quam laborant.

93. Istas quidem expositiones recipere
æquum est, utpote tantorum Doctorum
auctorialitate suffultas. Fecessit tamen di-
ficultatem, quod ministerio Angelorum
anacephalæosis, or summing up of all the benefits conferred by God on the Hebrew People from the exodus from Egypt to the days of David, and the Manna of the Wilderness is spoken of in it; how, and in what sense is it styled the Bread of Angels? that is the question.

92. I am aware that others look upon the Bread of Angels as bread prepared by Angels, or sent down from Heaven by the ministry of Angels. But Cardinal Hugo explains that qualification by saying that that food partly produced the same effect upon the Jews, which the food of Angels produces upon the latter. Angels, in fact, are not liable to any infirmity; on the other hand Hebrew commentators, and Josephus himself, assert that whilst in the Wilderness, living upon Manna, the Jews neither grew old, nor sickened, nor tired; so that Manna was like unto the bread that Angels feed upon, who know neither old age, nor sickness, nor fatigue.

93. These interpretations should indeed be received with the respect due to the authority of such eminent Doctors. There is however one difficulty in this: that, by the
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ministry of Angels, the pillars of the cloud and fire, the quails, and the water from the rock were provided for the Hebrews, no less than the Manna; and yet they were not styled the pillar, the water or the beverage of Angels. Why therefore should Manna be called Bread of Angels, because provided by their ministry, when the qualification Beverage of Angels is not given to the water drawn from the rock likewise by their ministry? Besides, in Holy Scripture, when it is said of bread that it is the bread of somebody, it is always the bread of him who feeds on it, not of him who provides or makes it. Of this there are numberless instances: thus, Exodus, ch. 23, v. 25: « That I may bless thy bread and thy water; » Kings, book 2, ch. 12, v. 3: « Eating of his bread; » Tobit, ch. 4, v. 17: « Give of thy bread to the hungry, » and v. 18: « Pour out thy bread on the burial of the Just; » Ecclesiasticus, ch. 11, v. 1: « Scatter thy bread over the flowing waters; » Isaiah, ch. 58, v. 7: « Deal thy bread to the hungry; » Jeremiah, ch. 11, v. 19: « Let us put wood into his bread; » Matthew, ch. 15, v. 26: « It is not meet to take the children's bread; » Luke, ch. 11, v. 3: « Our daily bread. » All those passages clearly show that, in Scripture, the
quidem incocorei (isti enim materiali cibo non egent), sed corporei, ista nempe rationalia animalia, de quibus hucusque disseruimus, degentia in aere, et quæ ratione tenuitatis suorum corporum, ac rationalis naturæ, quam maxime ad Angelos immateriales accedunt, ut proinde nuncupentur.

94. Ducor, quia cum animalia sint, et ideo generalibia et corruptibilia, egent cibo, ut restauretur substantia corporea, quæ per effluvia deperditur; vita enim sentientis non consistit nisi in motu partium corporearum quæ fluunt, ac refluunt, acquiruntur, ac deperduntur, ac iterum reparantur; quæ reparatio fit per substantias spirituosas, materiales tamen, attractas a vivente, tum per aeris inspirationem, tum par fermentationem cibi, per quam substantia illius spiritualizatur, ut ratione natur doctissimus Ettmullerus, Instit. Medic. Physiolog., c. 2.
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bread of somebody is the bread of him who feeds upon it, not of him who makes, brings or provides it. In the passage of the Psalm we have quoted, Bread of Angels may therefore easily be taken to mean the food of Angels, not incorporeal indeed, since these require no material food, but corporeal, that is to say of those rational animals we have discoursed of, who live in the air, and, from the subtlety of their bodies and their rationality, approximate so closely to immaterial Angels as to fall under the same denomination.

94. I deduce that, being animals, consequently reproducible through generation and liable to corruption, they require food for the restoration of their corporeal substance wasted by effluvia: for the life of every sensible being consists in nothing else but the motion of the corporeal elements which flow and ebb, are acquired, lost and recruited by means of substances spirituous, yet material, assimilated by the living thing, either through the inhalation of air, or by the fermentation of food which spiritualizes its substance, as shown by the most learned Ettmüller (Instit. Medic. Physiolog., ch. 2).
95. Quia autem eorum corpus tenue est, tenui pariter, et subtili eget alimento. Hinc est quod sicut odoribus aliisque substantiis vaporosis, ac volatilibus suæ naturæ contrariis læduntur ac fugantur, ut constat ex historiis recitatis supra, nº 71. et 72., ita paribus rebus sibi convenientibus delectantur, et aluntur. Porro «manna non est aliud, quam halitus aquæ, terræque, solis calore exacte attenuatus et coctus, a frigore secutæ noctis in unum coactus, densatusque,» ut scribit Cornelius; manna dico, quam demissam de cælo comederunt Hebraei, quæ toto cælo differt a manna nostrate, quæ in medicinis adhibetur; nam hæc, ut scribit Ettmullerus Schroder. Di-lucid. Physiolog., c. 1. de Manna, fol. m. 154., « nihil aliud est, quam succus quœrumdam arborum tenuis, vel earum trans-sudatio, quæ nocturno tempore permixta cum rore, matutino tempore superventu caloris solis coagulatur, et inspissatur. » Manna autem Hebræorum diversis orta principii calore solis non coagulabatur, sed vice versa liquefiebat, ut patet ex Scrip-tura, Exod. c. 16. v. 22. Manna ergo Hebræorum utpote constans ex halitibus tenuibus terræ et aquæ, profecto tenuissi-mæ erat substantiæ, utpote, quæ a sole solvebatur, et disparebat; optime ergo
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95. But, their body being subtile, equally subtile and delicate must be its food. And, just as perfumes and other vaporous and volatile substances, when adverse to their nature, offend and put them to flight, as testified by what we related above (N. 71 and 72), in the like manner, when agreeable, they delight in and feed upon them. Now, as is written by Cornelius, « Manna is nothing but an emanation of water and earth, refined and baked by the heat of the sun, and then coagulated and condensed by the cold of the following night; » of course, I am speaking of the Manna sent down from Heaven for the nourishment of the Hebrews, and which differs all in all from nostrate or medicinal manna: the latter, in fact, according to Ettmuller (Dilucid. Physiol., ch. 1), « is merely the juice or transudation of certain trees which, during the night, gets mixed up with dew, and, the next morning, coagulates and thickens in the heat of the sun. » The manna of the Hebrews, on the contrary, derived from other principles, far from coagulating, liquefied in the heat of the sun, as is shown by Scripture, Exodus, ch. 16, v. 22. The manna of the Hebrews was therefore undoubtedly of a most subtile substance, consisting as it did of emanations of earth
Dæmonialitas

totius esse talium animalium cibus, ita ut diceretur a David Panis Angelorum.
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and water, and being dissolved by the sun
and made to disappear: consequently, it
may very well have been the food of the
animals we are speaking of, and thus have
been truly called by David Bread of An-
gels.

96. We have another authority in the
Gospel according to St John, ch. 10, v. 16,
where it is said: « And other sheep I have,
which are not of this fold: them also I must
bring, and they shall hear my voice, and
there shall be one fold and one shepherd. »
If we inquire what are those sheep which
are not of that fold, and what the fold of
which the Lord Christ speaketh, we are
answered by all Commentators that the
only fold of Christ is the Church to which
the preaching of the Gospel was to bring
the Gentiles, sheep of another fold than
that of the Hebrews. They are, in fact, of
opinion that the fold of Christ was the
Synagogue, because David had said, Psalm
95, v. 7: « We are the people of his pasture,
and the sheep of his hand », and also
because Abraham and David had been
promised that the Messiah should be born
of their race, because he was expected by
the Hebrew people, foretold by the Pro-
phets who were Hebrews, and that his
97. Sed salva semper Sanctorum Patrum, ac aliorum Doctorum reverentia, non videtur talis expositio ad plenum satisfacere. Habemus enim quod de fide est a principio mundi Ecclesiam Fidelium exstitisse unam, usque ad finem sæculi duraturam. Cujus Ecclesiae caput est mediator Dei et hominum Christus Jesus, cujus contemplatione creatua sunt universa, et omnia per ipsum facta. Fides enim unius Dei Trini (quamvis non ita explicite), et Verbi Incarnatio revelata fuit primo homini, et ab ipso edocti ejus filii, et ab iis descendentes. Hinc est quod quamvis plerique homines ad idolatriam deflexerint, ac veram fidem deseruerint, multi tamen veram fidem a patribus sibi traditam retinuerunt, et legem naturae servantes in vera Ecclesia Fidelium permanerunt, ut observat Cardinalis Toletus in Job, c. 10. v. 16., et appareat in Job, qui inter Gentiles Idolatras sanctus fuit. Quamvis autem Deus populo Hebræo speciales favores contulerit, peculiaremque legem, ac ceremonias illi præscripterit, ac a Gentilibus segregaverit, non
advent, his acts, his passion, death and resurrection were prefigured in the sacrifices, worship and ceremonials of the Hebrew law.

97. But, saving always the reverence due to the Holy Fathers and other Doctors, that explanation does not seem quite satisfactory. For it is an article of belief that the Church of the Faithful has been the only one in existence from the beginning of the world, and will thus endure to the end of time. The head of that Church is Jesus-Christ, the mediator between God and men, by whose contemplation all things were made and created. Indeed, the faith in the divine Trinity, though less explicitly, and the Incarnation of the Word were revealed to the first man, and by him taught his children, who, in their turn, taught them their descendants. And thus, although most men had strayed into idolatry and deserted the true faith, many kept the faith they had received from their fathers, and observing the law of nature, stayed in the true Church of the Faithful, as is noticed by Cardinal Tolet in reference to Job, who was a saint among idolatrous Gentiles. And, although God had conferred especial favours upon the Hebrew people, prescribed
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tamen ad eam legem Gentes tenebantur,
nec fideles Hebræi aliam Ecclesiam consti-
tuebant ab Ecclesia Gentilium, qui fide
unius Dei et Messiæ venturi profitebantur.

98. Hinc est, quod etiam ex Gentilibus
fuerè, qui Christi adventum, et alia Chris-
tianæ fidei dogmata prophetarunt, ut pa-
tet de Balaam, Mercurio Trismægisto, Hy-
daspe, ac Sybyllis, de quibus loquitur Lac-
tiantius, lib. 1. c. 6., ut scribit Cardinalis
Baronius in Apparatu Annal. n° 18. Et
quod Messias erat a Gentilibus expectatus
habet Isaías in pluribus locis, et luculent-
tum testimonium de hoc est prophetia Pa-
triarchæ Jacob de Messiæ, quæ sic ait,
Gen. c. 49. v. 10: Non auferetur sceptrum
de Juda, et dux de femore ejus, donec ve-
niat qui mittendus est, et ipse erit expec-
tatio Gentium. Item Prophetia Aggæi,
c. 2. v. 8: Movebo omnes Gentes, et veniet
desideratus cunctis gentibus, quem locum
explicans Cornelius a Lap. in Aggæ. c. 2.
v. 8. § Denique gentes, ait: « Gentes ante
Christum credentes in Deum lege naturæ,
æque ac Judæi expectabant ac desidera-
bant Christum. » Pariter Christus iuæ se
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for them peculiar laws and ceremonials, and separated them from the Gentiles, yet those laws were not obligatory on the Gentiles, and the faithful Hebrews did not constitute a Church different from that of the Gentiles who professed their faith in one God and the coming of the Messiah.

98. And thus it came to pass that even among the Gentiles there were some who prophesied the advent of Christ and the other dogmas of the Christian faith, to wit Balaam, Mercurius Trismegistus, Hydaspes, and the Sibyls mentioned by Lactantius, book 1, ch. 6, as written by Baronius, Apparat. Annal., n° 18. That the Messiah was expected by the Gentiles is shown by many passages of Isaiah, and plainly testified by the prophecy of Jacob, the Patriarch, thus worded, Genesis, ch. 49, v. 10: « The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh (he who is to be sent) come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be. » — Likewise in the prophecy of Haggai, ch. 2, v. 8: « I will shake all Nations, and the desire of all Nations shall come »; which passage is thus commented by Cornelius a Lapide: « The Gentiles before the advent of Christ,
prodidit, et manifestavit Gentibus, sicut Judæis: si enim in ipsius nativitate per Angelum ejus notitia data fuit Pastoribus, per stellam miraculosam ad sui adorationem vocavit Magos, qui cum essent Gentiles fuerunt primitiae Gentium in Christo agnoscendo, et adorando, ut ait S. Fulgentius, Sermon. 6. de Epiph., sicut Pastores fuerunt primitiae Judæorum. Itidem manifestatio adventus Christi per prædicationem (non quidem Apostolorum) prius facta est Gentilibus, quam Judæis; siquidem ut scribit Ven. Mater Soror Maria de Agreda, in Vita J. C. et B. M. V., p. 1, l. 4, c. 26. n. 664: «Quando B. M. Virgo cum S. Joseph portavit Puerum Jesum in Ægyptum, fugiendo Herodis persecutionem, mansit ibi per septennium: quo tempore ipsa Beatissima Virgo prædicavit Ægyptiis veri Dei fidem, et Filii Dei in carne humana adventum. » Ulterior in Christi nativitate multa fuere prodigia non solum in Judæa, sed in Ægypto, ubi corruerunt idola, ac oracula conticuere; Romæ, ubi fons olei scaturiit; visus globus aurei coloris de caelo in terram descendere; apparuere tres soles; ac contra naturam circulus variegatus ad modum iridis solis discum circumscripsit; in Græcia, ubi oraculum Delphicum obmutuit, et interrogatus Apollo ab
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who believed in God and observed the law of nature, expected and desired Christ equally with the Jews. » Christ himself disclosed and manifested himself to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews; for, at the same time as the Angel apprized the shepherds of his nativity, by means of the miraculous star he called the Magi to worship him, who, being Gentiles, were the first among the Nations, as the shepherds among the Jews, to acknowledge and worship Christ (Vide St Fulgentius, Sermon 6, upon Epiphany). In like manner, the advent of Christ was made known by preaching (I am not speaking of the Apostles) to the Gentiles before it was to the Jews. As is written by the Venerable Mother, Sister Maria of Agreda, in her Life of Jesus-Christ and the Blessed Virgin Mary: « When the Blessed Virgin Mary, fleeing with St Joseph, from the persecution of Herod, carried the Infant Jesus into Egypt, she tarried there seven years; and, during that time, the Blessed Virgin herself preached to the Egyptians the faith of the true God and the advent of the Son of God in human flesh. » Besides, the nativity of Christ was attended by numerous prodigies, not only in Judæa, but also in Egypt, where the idols tumbled and the
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Augusto ipsi sacrificante in proprio palatio, ubi eidem aram extruxerat, de causa silentii sui, respondit, ut referunt Nicephorus, l. 1 c. 17., Suidas, verbo Augustus, et Cedrenus, Compend. Histor.: 

Me puer Hebræus, Divos Deus ipse gubernans, 
Cedere sede jubet, tristemque redire sub orcum; 
Aris ergo dehinc tacitis abscedito nostris.


99. Ex istor patet, quod etiam Gentiles pertinebant ad ovile Christi idem, ad quod spectabant Judæi, puta ad Ecclesiam eamdem fidelem; igitur non potest recte dici, quod illa verba Christi: Alias oves habeo, quæ non sunt ex hoc ovili, accipienda sint de Gentilibus, qui communem cum He-
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oracles were hushed; in Rome, where a spring of oil gushed out, a gold-coloured globe was seen to descend from the skies on earth, three suns appeared, and an extraordinary ring, variegated like a rainbow, encircled the disc of the sun; in Greece, where the oracle of Delphi was struck dumb, and Apollo, asked the reason of his silence by Augustus, who was offering up a sacrifice in his own palace where he had raised an altar to him, answered:

A Hebrew child, who sways the Gods, and himself a God,
Bids me quit my seat and return to the infernal regions;
Depart therefore from our altars, henceforward mute.

There were many more prodigies warning the Gentiles of the advent of the Son of God: they have been collected from various Authors, by Baronius, and are to be found in his Apparat. Annal. Eccles., and Cornelius, Commentary upon Haggai.

99. From all this it is clear that the Gentiles also belonged, like the Jews, to the fold of Christ, that is, to the same Church of the Faithful; it cannot therefore be correctly said that the words of Christ: "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold", are applicable to the Gentiles, who


bræis habuerunt de Deo fidel, de Messia spem, prophetiam, expectationem, et signa, et prædicationem.

100. Dico igitur quod nomine alienum ovium commodum possunt intelligi Creaturæ istæ rationales, sive animalia, de quibus hucusque disseruimus. Cum enim, ut diximus, capaces sint beatitudinis, et damnationis, et Christus Jesus sit mediator Dei, et hominum, immo totius rationalis creaturæ (creaturæ enim rationales, quæ beatitudinem consequuntur, hanc obtinent intuitu meritorum Christi per ab eo sibi collatam gratiam, sine quæ nequit beatitudine obtineri), debuit omnis rationalis creatura de eo venturo spem habere, sicut de uno Deo fidel, et de ipsius in carne nativitate, et de præceptis legis gratiae manifestationem. Istæ igitur erant oves, quæ non erant ex hoc ovili humano, et quas adducere Christum oportebat, et quæ ejus vocem nempe noti.tiam de ipsius adventu, et de evangelica doctrina, quantum per se, tum per Apostolos Christus erat manifestaturus, audire debebant, et ex iis ac hominibus in cælo beatificatis fieri unum ovile, et unus Pastor.
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had, in common with the Hebrews, the faith in God, the hope, prophecy, expectation, prodigies and preaching of the Messiah.

...I therefore say that by the words *other sheep* may very well be understood those rational Creatures or animals of whom we have been treating hitherto. They being, as we have said, capable of beatitude and damnation, and Jesus-Christ being the mediator between God and man, as also every rational Creature (for rational creatures attain to beatitude in consideration of the merits of Christ, through the grace he confers upon them, without which beatitude is impossible of attainment), every rational creature must have cherished, at the same time as the faith in one God, the hope of the advent of Christ, and have had the revelation of his nativity in the flesh and of the principles of the law of grace. Those were therefore the sheep which were not of that human fold, and which Christ had to bring; the sheep which were to hear His voice, that is, the announcement of His advent and of the evangelical doctrine, either directly through Himself, or through the Apostles; the sheep which, partaking with men of heavenly beatitude, were to realize one fold and one shepherd.
101. Huic expositioni quam incongruam non puto, vim addit id quod supra n° 77. ex D. Hieronymo retulimus de homunculo illo qui rogavit D. Antonium, ut communem Deum, quem in carne humana esse passum cognoverat, pro se et suis deprecaretur. Innuitur enim ex his, quod illi notitiam habuerunt de adventu et morte Christi, quem tamquam Deum optabant sibi propitium, ut proinde ad hoc intercessionem D. Antonii expostularent.

102. Facit ad idem id, quod ex Eusebio de Præparat. Evangel. l. 5. c. 9., et Plutarcho l. de Defectu Oracul., refert Cardinalis Baronius, Appar. Annal. n° 129., et recenset inter prodigia, quæ tempore mortis Christi evenere. Recitat igitur ex citatis Authoribus quod Tiberii Imperatoris, sub quo passus est Christus, tempore, navigantibus nonnullis a Græcia in Italian, circa Insulas Echinades, cessatis ventis, noctu navigium appulit prope terram. Audita fuit ab omnibus vox magna quæ vocavit Tramnum. Erat is Naucerus navigii, quo resondente Adsum, replicavit vox: «Quando perveneris prope quandam paludem, annunciabis Magnum Panam mortuum esse»: quod cum Tramnus fecisset,
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101. To this interpretation, which I hold to be in no way improper, force is added by what we related, according to St Hieronymus, of that little man who requested St Anthony to pray, for him and his fellows, unto the common God, whom he knew to have suffered in human flesh. For, it implies that they were aware of the advent and of the death of Christ, whom, as God, they were anxious to propitiate, since they sought, to that effect, the intercession of St Anthony.

102. Thereto tends also the fact mentioned by Cardinal Baronius (Appar. An. n° 129), after Eusebius and Plutarch, as being one of the prodigies which took place at the time of the death of Christ. He relates that in the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, when Christ suffered, whilst mariners bound from Greece to Italy, were by night, and during a calm, in the vicinity of the Echinade Isles, their ship was brought close to land. All the crew heard a loud voice calling Tramnus, the master of the ship. He having answered to his name, the voice replied: « When near such a marsh, announce that the great Pan is dead. » Which Tramnus having done, there arose suddenly, as from a numberless
auditi sunt repente multorum, imo multitudinis prope infinitae gemitus, et ululatus. Profecto isti fuerunt Dæmones, seu Angeli corpori, seu animalia rationalia prope paludem degentia, utpote aqua, quae audita morte Christi, qui nomine magni Pan efferebatur, in lacrymas et lamenta effusa sunt; prout etiam Hebrai nonnulli visa Christi morte percutientes pectora sua revertebantur (Luc. c. 23. v. 48.). Ex huc usque igitur deductis patet, quod dantur hujusmodi Dæmones, succubi et incubi, constantes sensu, et ipsius passionibus obnoxii, ut probatum est; qui generantur, corrumpuntur, et capaces sunt beatitudinis, et damnationis, et ratione corporis subtilioris, nobiliores homine sunt, et qui si cum hominibus, maribus aut fæminis, carnaliter commiscentur, peccant, et eo peccato, quo peccat homo jungendo se cum bruto, quod est homine ignobilium; proinde non raro hi Dæmones consuetudinem habentes cum homine, aut equabus, post longam habitam communicationem eos interficiunt. Causa porro hujus est, quod si inter tales datur peccatum, cum sint in via, dari etiam debet paenitentia; sicut ergo homini peccanti consuetudinaliter cum bruto, ad tollendam occasionem recidivandi, Confessarius injungit, ut brutum
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multitude, groans and shrieks. Doubtless, they were Demons, or corporeal Angels, or rational animals living near the marsh on account of their aqueous nature, and who, hearing of the death of Christ, described by the name of Great Pan, burst into tears and bewailing, like some of the Jews who, after witnessing the death of Christ, went home smiting their breasts (Luke, ch. 23, v. 48). From all that has been deduced above, it is therefore clear that there are such Demons, succubi and incubi, endowed with senses and subject to the passions thereof, as has been shown; who are born through generation and die through corruption, are capable of beatitude and damnation, more noble than man, by reason of the greater subtlety of their bodies, and who, when having intercourse with man, male or female, fall into the same sin as man when copulating with a beast, which is inferior to him. Also, it not unfrequently occurs that those Demons slay the men, women or mares with whom they have had protracted intercourse; and the reason is that, being liable to sin whilst on the way to salvation, in via, they must likewise be open to repentance; and, in the same manner as a man, who habitually sins with a beast, is enjoined by his con-
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tollat de medio, ita tali Dæmoni consuetudinario in peccato, et tandem penitenti accidit, ut animal cum quo peccavit, sive homo, sive brutum fuerit, occidat; nec enim tali Dæmoni mors data homini peccatum erit, sicut mors data bruto non imputatur tamquam peccatum homini: ratione enim essentially differentiae inter Dæmonem hujusmodi, et hominem, idem erit homo Dæmoni, quod est homini brutum.


104. Solvitur ergo ex his, quæ hucusque deducta sunt, quæstio, quam proposui-
fessor to destroy that beast, with a view to suppressing the occasion of relapsing, it may likewise happen that the penitent demon should slay the animal with which it sinned, whether man or beast; nor will death thus occasioned to a man be reckoned a sin to the Demon, any more than death inflicted on a beast is imputed as a sin to man; for, considering the essential difference between a Demon of that kind and man, the man will be the same thing to the Demon as the beast is to man.

103. I am aware that many, perhaps most of my readers, will say of me what the Epicureans and some Stoic Philosophers said of St Paul (Acts of the Apostles, ch. 17, v. 18). "He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods", and will deride my doctrine. But they will none the less have to answer the foregoing arguments, to show what are those Incubi Demons, commonly called Goblins, who dread neither exorcisms, nor the holy things, nor the Cross of Christ, and to explain the various effects and phenomena related when propounding that doctrine.

104. What we have hitherto deduced accordingly solves the question laid down
mus supra n° 30 et n° 34 : resolutive innuimus, quomodo mulier potest ingravi-
dari a dænome Incubo. Non enim hoc præstare potest ex semine sumpto ab ho-
mine, ut fert communis opinio, quam con-
futavimus n° 31 et 32 : sequitur ergo, quod 
ipsa imprægnatur a semine Incubi, cum
enim animal sit, et generet, proprio pollet 
semine : et hoc modo optime salvatur ge-
eratio Gigantum secuta ex commixtione 
Filiorum Dei cum Filiabus hominum; nati
siquidem sunt ex tali concubitu Gigantes, 
qui licet homini essent similres, corpore ta-
men erant majores : et quamvis a Dæmo-
nibus geniti, viribus proinde pollerent, non
tamen Dæmonum vires et potentiam æqua-
bant, ut sequitur in mulis, hinnis et burdo-
nibus, qui medii quodammodo sunt inter
eas species animalium, a quibus promiscue 
generantur, et superant quidem imperfecti-
torem, non attingunt autem perfectiorem 
speciem generantium : mulus enim supe-
rat asinum, sed non æquat perfectionem 
equa, a quibus generatur.

105. Confirmat autem hanc sententiam 
consideratio, quod animalia genita ex com-
mixtione diversarum specierum non gene-
Demoniality

Nrs 30 and 34, to wit: how a woman can be got with child by an Incubus Demon? In fact, it cannot be brought about by sperm assumed from a man, agreeably to the common opinion which we confuted, Nrs 31 and 32; it follows, therefore, that she is directly impregnated by the sperm of the Incubus, which, being an animal and capable of breeding, has sperm of its own. And thus is fully explained the begetting of Giants from the intercourse of the Sons of God with the Daughters of men: for that intercourse gave birth to Giants who, although like unto men, were of higher stature, and, though begotten by Demons, and consequently of great strength, yet equalled them neither in might nor in power. It is the same with mules, which are intermediate, as it were, between the kinds of animals from whose promiscuousness they are sprung, and which excel indeed the most imperfect, but never equal the most perfect: thus, the mule excels the ass, but does not attain the perfection of the mare, which have begotten it.

105. In confirmation of the above inference, we observe that animals sprung from the mixing of different kinds do not
rant: sed sunt sterilia, ut potest in mulis. Gigantes antem non leguntur Gigantes generasse. sed natos a Filiiis Dei, puta Incubis, et Filiiabus hominum: cum enim concepti fuerint ex semine Daemoniaco mixto cum humano, non potuissent, tamquam mediae species inter Daemonem et hominem, generare.

106. Dicitur fortasse contra hoc, non posse, ex semine Daemonium, quod pro sui natura opportet esse tenuissimum, fieri mixturae cum semine humano, quod crassum est; unde nec generatio sequi possit.

107. Respondeo quod, ut dictum fuit supra n. 32: virtus generandi consistit in spiritu, qui simul cum materia spumosa et viscosa deciditur a generante; sequitur ex hoc, quod semen Daemonis quantumvis tenuissimum, quia tamen materiale, optime potest commisceri cum spiritu materiali seminis humani, ac fieri generatio.

108. Replicabitur adhuc contra conclusionem, quod si vere fuisset Gigantum generatione ex semine Incuborum et Mulierum,
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breed, but are barren, as is seen with mules. Now we do not read of Giants having been begotten by other Giants, but of their having been born of the Sons of God, that is Incubi, and the Daughters of men: being thus begotten of the Demoniac sperm mixed with the human sperm, and being, as it were, an intermediate species between the Demon and man, they had no generative power.

106. It may be objected that the sperm of Demons, which must, by nature, be most fluid, could not mix with the human sperm, which is thick, and that, consequently, no generation would ensue.

107. I reply that, as has been said above, Nr 32, the generative power lies in the spirit that comes from the generator at the same time as the spumy and viscous matter; it follows that, although most liquid, the sperm of the Demon, being nevertheless material, can very well mix with the material spirit of the human sperm, and bring about generation.

108. It will be retorted that, if the generation of Giants had really come from the combined sperms of Incubi and Women,
nunc quoque Gigantes nascerentur: non de-
sunt enim mulieres coeuntes cum Incubis,
ut patet ex gestis SS. Bernardi et Petri
de Alcantara, et aliarum historiarum, quæ
passim ab auctoribus recitantur.

109. Respondeo, quod prout ex Guaccio
dictum fuit supra n° 81: alii sunt hujus-
modi Dæmones terrei, alii aquei, aerei
alii, et alii ignei, qui respective in propris
eorum elementis habitant. Videmus autem
animalia eo majora esse quo majus est
elementum in quo degunt, ut patet in pis-
cibus, inter quos licet multi sint minuti, ut
etiam sunt plura animalia terrestria minu-
tissima, et tamen quia elementum aquæ
majus est elemento terræ (utpote continens
majus semper est contento), ideo pisces a
tota specie superant in magnitudine molis
animalia terrestria, ut patet in balenis, or-
cynis, pistis seu pistricibus, thynnis, ac
aliis piscibus cetaceis, seu viviparis, qui
quodvis animal terrestre longe superant.
Porro cum Dæmones hujusmodi animalia
sint, ut hucusque probatum est, eo erunt
maiores in magnitudine quo elementum
majus pro sui natura inhabitabunt. Et cum
aer excedat aquam, et ignis aere major
sit, sequitur, quod Dæmones ætherei ac
Giants would still be born in our time, since there is no lack of women who have intercourse with Incubi, as is shown by the Acts of St Bernard and Peter of Alcantara, and other stories related by various authors.

109. I reply that, as has been said above, No 81, from Guaccius, some of those Demons are earthly, some aqueous; some aerial, some igneous, and they all dwell in their respective element. Now, it is well known that animals are of larger size, according to the element they live in; thus with fishes, many of which are diminutive, it is true, as happens with animals that live on land; but, the element water being larger than the element earth, since the container is always larger than the contents, fishes as a species, surpass in size the animals that dwell on land, as shown by whales, tunnies, cachalots, and other cetaceous and viviparous fish which surpass by far all animals that live on land. Consequently, these Demons being animals, as has been shown, their size will be proportionate to the extent of the element they dwell in, according to their nature. And, air being more extensive than water, and fire than air, it follows that ethereal and
ignei longe superabunt terrestres et aqueos, tum in mole corporis, tum in virtute. Nec contra hoc facit instantia de avibus, qui licet incolant aerem, qui major est aqua, tamen corpore minores sunt a tota specie piscibus et quadrupedibus, quia aves, licet per aerem volatu spatientur, revera tamen pertinent ad elementum terrae, in qua quiescunt; aliter enim pisces nonnulli qui volant, ut hirundo marina, et alii, dici deberent animalia aerea, quod falsum est.

110. Advertendum autem, quod post diluvium aer iste terraqueo globo citissimus magis incrassatus est ex humiditate aquarum, quam fuerit ante diluvium, et hinc forte est, quod ex tali humido, quod est principium corruptionis, fiat, quod homines non aetatem ita producant, ut faciebant ante diluvium. Ex ista autem aeris crassi tie fit, quod Daemones aeris, ac ignei, caeteris corpulentiores, nequeunt diutius manere in hoc aere crasso, et si descendunt aliquando hoc fit violenter, et eo modo quo urinatores ad ima maris descendunt.
igneous Demons will by far surpass their earthly and aqueous fellows, both in stature and might. It would be to no purpose to instance, as an objection, birds which, although inhabitants of the air, a more extensive element than water, are smaller, as a species, than fishes and quadrupeds; for, if birds do indeed travel through the air by means of their wings, they no less belong to the element earth, where they rest; otherwise, some fishes that fly, such as the sea-swallow, would have to be classed among aerial animals, which is not.

Now, it must be observed that, after the flood, the air which surrounds our earthy and aqueous globe, became, from the damp of the waters, thicker than it had been before; and, damp being the principle of corruption, that may be the reason why men do not live as long as they did before the flood. It is also on account of that thickness of the air that ethereal and igneous Demons, more corpulent than the others, can no longer dwell in that thick atmosphere; and if they do descend into it occasionally, do so only by force, much as divers descend into the depths of the sea.
111. **Ante diluvium autem, cum adhuc aer non ita crassus erat, veniebant Dæmones, et cum mulieribus miscabantur, et gigantes procreabant, qui magnitudinem corpoream Dæmonum generantium amulabantur. Nunc vero ita non est: Dæmones enim Incubi, qui fœminas incessunt, sunt aquei quorum corporis moles magna non est: et proinde in forma homuncionum apparent, et quia aquei etiam salacissimi sunt; luxuria enim in humido est: ut proinde Venerem e mari natam Poetæ finxerint, quod Mythologi explicant de libidine, quæ oritur ab humiditate. Cum ergo Dæmones, qui corpore parvi sunt his temporibus mulieres impreægnent, non gigantes, sed staturæ ordinariorum filii nascuntur. Sciendum porro quod si miscentur corporaliter cum mulieribus Dæmones in sua ipsorum corpulentia naturali, nulla facta immutatione aut artificio, mulieres illos non vident, nisi tanguam umbram pæne incertam, ac quasi insensibilem, ut patet in muliere illa, de qua diximus supra n° 28., quæ osculabatur ab incubo, cujus tactus vix ab ea sentiebatur. Quando vero volunt se visibiles amasiis reddere, atque ipsis delectationem in congressu carnali afferre, sibi indumentum visibile assumunt, et corpus crassum reddunt. Qua vero hoc
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III. Before the flood, when the air was not yet so thick, Demons came upon earth and had intercourse with women, thus procreating Giants whose stature was nearly equal to that of the Demons, their fathers. But now it is not so: the Incubi Demons who approach women are aqueous and of small stature; that is why they appear in the shape of little men, and, being aqueous, they are most lecherous. Lust and damp go together: Poets have depicted Venus as born of the sea, in order to show, as explained by Mythologists, that lust takes its source in damp. When, therefore, Demons of short stature impregnate women nowadays, the children that are born are not giants, but men of ordinary size. It should, moreover, be known that when Demons have carnal intercourse with women in their own natural body, without having recourse to any disguise or artifice, the women do not see them, or if they do, see but an almost doubtful, barely sensible shadow, as was the case with the female we spoke of, N° 28, who, when embraced by an Incubus, scarcely felt his touch. But, when they want to be seen by their mistresses, atque ipsis decelationem in congressu carnali afferre, they assume a visible disguise and a palpable
arte fiat, ipsi norunt. Nobis cura nostra Philosophia hoc non pandit. Unum scire possimus, et est, quod tale indumentum seu corpus ex solo aere concreto constare nequiret, hoc enim esse debet per condensationem, et proinde per frigus; unde oporteret, quod corpus illud ad tactum esset veluti glacies, et ita in coitu mulieres non delectaret, sed torqueret, cum tamen contrarium eveniat.

112. Visa igitur differentia Daemonum spiritualium, qui cum sagis coeunt, et Incuborum, qui cum feminis minime sagis rem habent, perpendenda est gravitas hujus criminis in utroque casu.

113. In coitu sagarum cum Daemonibus, eo quia non fit nisi cum apostasia a Fide, et Diaboli cultu, et tot aliis impetatibus quas recensuimus supra a n° 12. ad 24., est maximum quorumque peccatorum, quae ab hominibus fieri possunt: et ratione tantae enormitatis contra Religionem, quae praeponitur coitu cum Diabolos, protesto Daemonialitas maximum est crinium carnalium. Sed spectato delicto carnis ut sic, et ut abstracto a peccatis
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body. By what means this is effected, is their secret, which our short-sighted Philosophy is unable to discover. The only thing we know is that such disguise or body could not consist merely in concrete air, since this must take place through condensation, and therefore by the influence of cold; a body thus formed would feel like ice, *et ita in coitu mulieres non delectaret*, but would give them pain; and it is the reverse that takes place.

112. Being admitted the distinction between spiritual Demons, which have intercourse with witches, and Incubi, who have to do with women that are nowise witches, we have to weigh the grievousness of the crime in both cases.

113. The intercourse of witches with Demons, from its accompanying circumstances, apostasy from the Faith, worshipping of the Devil, and so many other ungodly things related above, *N*° 12 to 24, is the greatest of all sins which can be committed by man; and, considering the enormity against Religion which is presupposed by coition with the Devil, Demoniality is assuredly the most heinous of all carnal crimes. But, taking the sin of
contra Religionem, Dæmonialitas redigenda est ad simplicem pollutionem. Ratio, et quidem convincentissima, est quia Diabolus, qui rem habet cum sagis, purus spiritus est, et est in termino ac damnatus ut dictum supra fuit; proinde si cum sagis coit, hoc facit in corpore assumpto, aut a se formato, ut sentiunt communiter Theologi. Porro corpus illud quamvis moveatur, non tamen vivens est; sequitur ergo quod coiens cum tali corpore, sive mas sive fæmina fuerit, idem delictum committit, ac si cum corpore inanipato aut cadavere coiret, quod esset simplex mollities, ut alias demonstravimus. Verum est, quod, ut observavit etiam Cajetanus, talis coitus effective potest habere deformitates aliorum criminum juxta corpus a Diabolo assumptum, et vas: si enim assum meret corpus virginis consanguineæ, aut sacræ, effective esset tale crimen incestus aut sacrilegium, et si in figura bruti coiret, aut in vase præpostero, evaderet B至於ialitas aut Sodomia.

114. In coitu autem cum Incubo, in quo
the flesh as such, exclusive of the sins against Religion, Demoniality should be reduced to simple pollution. The reason is, and a most convincing one, that the Devil who has to do with witches is a pure spirit, has reached the goal and is damned, as has been said above; if, therefore, he copulates with witches, it is in a body assumed or made by himself, according to the common opinion of Theologians. Though set in motion, that body is not a living one; and it follows that the human being, male or female, coiens cum tali corpore, is guilty of the same offence as if copulating with an inanimate body or a corpse, which would be simple pollution, as we have shown elsewhere. It has, moreover, been truly observed by Cajetanus, that such intercourse can very well carry with it the disgraceful characteristics of other crimes, according to the body assumed by the Devil, and the part used: thus, if he should assume the body of a kinswoman or of a nun, such a crime would be incest or sacrilege; if coition took place in the shape of a beast, or in vaso praepostero, it would be Bestiality or Sodomy.

114. As for intercourse with an Incubus,
nulla habetur qualitas, vel minima, crimini contra Religionem, difficile est rationem invenire, per quam tale delictum Bestialitatem et Sodomia gravior esset. Siquidem gravitas Bestialitatis pra Sodomia, prout supra diximus, consistit in hoc, quod homo vilificat dignitatem sua speciei jungendose cum bruto quod est speciei longe inferioris sua. In coitu autem cum Incubo diversa est ratio: nam Incubus ratione spiritus rationalis, ac immortalis, æqualis est homini; ratione vero corporis nobilioris, nempe subtilioris, est perfectior, et dignior homine; et hoc modo homo jungens se Incubo non vilificat, immo dignificat suam naturam, et ita, juxta hanc considerationem, Daemonialitas nequit esse gravior Bestialitate.

115. Tamen gravior communiter censeitur, et ratio, meo videri, potest esse: quia peccatum contra Religionem est, quævis communicatio cum Diabolo, sive ex pacto, sive non; puta habendo cum eo consuetudinem aut familiaritatem, seu ab eo petendo auxilium, consilium, favorem, aut ab ipso quærendo revelationem futurorum, relationem praeteritorum, absen-
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wherein is to be found no element, not even the least, of an offence against Religion, it is hard to discover a reason why it should be more grievous than Bestiality and Sodomy. For, as we have said above, if Bestiality is more grievous than Sodomy, it is because man degrades the dignity of his kind by mixing with a beast, of a kind much inferior to his own. But, when cooping with an Incubus, it is quite the reverse: for the Incubus, by reason of his rational and immortal spirit, is equal to man; and, by reason of his body, more noble because more subtil, he is more perfect and more dignified than man. Consequently, when having intercourse with an Incubus, man does not degrade, but rather dignifies his nature; and, taking that into consideration, Demoniality cannot be more grievous than Bestiality.

115. It is, however, commonly held to be more grievous, and the reason I take to be this: that it is a sin against Religion to hold any communication with the Devil, either with or without compact, for instance by being habitually or familiarly connected with him, by asking his assistance, counsel or favor, or by seeking from him the revelation of things to be, the knowledge of
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tium, aut alias occultorum. Hujusmodi autem homines, seu mulieres, concumbendo cum Incubis, quos nesciunt animalia esse, sed putant esse diabolos, contra conscientiam erroneam delinquunt; et hoc modo ex conscientia erronea ita peccant cum Incubis se jungendo, ac si cum diabolis coirent: unde et gravitatem ejusdem crimi-
nis incurrunt.

FINIS
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things gone by, absent, or otherwise hidden. Thus, men and women, by mixing with Incubi, whom they do not know to be animals but believe to be devils, sin through intention, ex conscientia erronea, and their sin is intentionally the same, when having intercourse with Incubi, as if such intercourse took place with devils; in consequence, the grievousness of their crime is exactly the same.

FINIS
APPENDIX

The manuscript of Demoniality breaks off with the conclusion just given. In a purely philosophical and theoretical acception, the work is complete: for it was enough that the author should define, in general terms, the grievousness of the crime, without concerning himself with the proceedings which were to make out the proof, nor with the penalty to be inflicted. Both those questions, on the contrary, had, as a matter of course, a place assigned to them in the great work De Delictis et Paenis, which is a veritable Code for the Inquisitor; and Father Sinistrari of Ameno could not fail to treat them there with all the care and conscientiousness he has so amply shown in the foregoing pages.

The reader will be happy to find here that practical conclusion to Demoniality.

(Note by the Editor.)
PROBATIO DÆMONIALITATIS

SUMMARIIUM

1. De probatione criminis Dæmonialitatis, distinguendum est.
2. Indicia probantia coitum Sagæ cum Diabolō.
3. Requiritur confessio ipsius malefici ad plenam probationem.
4. Historia de Moniali habente consuetudinem cum Incubo.
5. Si adsint indicia visa in recitata historia, potest ad torturam deveniri.

1. Quantum ad probationem hujus criminis attinet, distinguendum est de Dæmonialitate, puta, vel ejus, quæ a Sagis seu Maleficis fit cum Diabolis; sive de ea, quæ ab aliis fit cum Incubis.
PROOF OF DEMONIALITY


SUMMARY

1. Distinctions to be made in the proof of the crime of Demoniality.

2. Signs proving the intercourse of a Witch with the Devil.

3. The confession of the Sorcerer himself is requisite for a full eviction.

4. Tale of a Nun who had an intimacy with an Incubus.

5. If the indictment is supported by the recitals of eye-witnesses, torture may be resorted to.

1. As regards the proof of that crime, a distinction must be made of the kind of Demoniality, to wit: whether it is that which is practiced by Witches or Wizards with the Devil, or that which other persons perpetrated with Incubi.

20
2. Quoad primam, probato criminis facto cum Diabolo, probata remanet Daemonialitas ex consequentia necessaria; nam scopus tum Sagarum, tum Maleficorum in ludis nocturnis, ultra convivia, et choreas, est hujusmodi infamis congressus: aliter, illius criminis nullus potest esse testis, quia Diabolus, qui Sagerae visibilis est, aliorum oculos effugit. Verum est, quod aliquoties vise sunt mulieres in sylvis, agris, et nemoribus, supinae jacentes, ad umbilicum tenus denudatae, et juxta dispositionem actus venerei, divaricatis et adductis cruribus, clunes agitare, prout scribit Guacc., lib. 1, cap. 12, v. Scien- dum est sœpius, fol. 65. Tali casu emerget suspicio vehemens talis criminis, dummodo esset aliunde adminiculata, et crederem talem actum per testes sufficienter probatum, sufficere Judici ad indagandam tormentis veritatem; et hoc maxime, si post alicuam moram in illo actu, visus fuisset a muliere elevari quasi fumus niger, et tunc mulierem surgere, prout ibidem scribit Guaccius; talis enim fumus, aut umbra, Daemonem fuisset concumbentem cum feminâ inferre potest. Sicut etiam, si mulier visafuisset concumbere cum homine, qui post actum de repente evanuit, ut non semel accidisse idem auctor ibidem narrat.
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2. In the first case, the compact entered into with the Devil being proved, the evidence of Demoniality follows as a necessary consequence; for, the purpose, both of Witches and Wizards, in the nightly revels that take place after feasting and dancing, is none other but that infamous intercourse; otherwise there can be no witness of that crime, since the Devil, visible to the Witch, escapes the sight of others. Sometimes it is true, women have been seen in the woods, in the fields, in the groves, lying on their backs, _ad umbilicum tenus nudae, et juxta dispositionem actus venerei_, their legs _divaricatis et adductis_, _clunes agitare_, as is written by Guaccius, book I, chap. 12, v. _Sciendum est sapius_, fol. 65. In such a case there would be a very strong suspicion of such a crime, if supported by other signs; and I am inclined to believe that such action, sufficiently proved by witnesses, would justify the Judge in resorting to torture in order to ascertain the truth; especially if, shortly after that action, a sort of black smoke had been seen to issue from the woman, and she had been noticed to rise, as is also written by Guaccius; for it might be inferred that that smoke or shadow had been the Devil himself, _concumbens cum_
3. Cæterum ad probandum concludenter aliquem esse Maleficum, seu Maleficam, requiritur propria confessio; nullus enim haberi potest de hoc testis, nisi forte sint alii Malefici, qui in judicio deponunt de complicibus; sed quia socii criminis sunt, eorum dictum non concludit, nec etiam ad torturam sufficit, nisi alia existent indica, puta, sigillum Diaboli impressum in eorum corpore, prout diximus supra num. 23.; et in eorum domibus, facta perquisitione, inventant signa, ac instrumenta artis diabolicæ, ut ossa mortuorum, præsertim calvariam; crines artificiose contextos; nodos plumarum intricatos; alas, aut pedes, aut ossicula vespertilionum, aut bufonum, aut serpen- tum; ignotas seminum species; figuras cereas; vasculos plenos incognito pulvere, aut oleo, aut unguentis minime notis, etc., ut ordinariæ contingit reperiri a Judi- cibus, qui, accepta accusatione de hu- jusmodi Sagis, ad capturam, et domus visitationem deveniunt, ut scribit Del-
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fœmina. Likewise if, as has more than once happened, according to the same author, a woman had been seen concumbere cum homine, who, the action over, suddenly disappeared.

3. Moreover, in order to prove conclusively that a person is a Wizard or a Witch, the own confession of such person is requisite: for there can be no witnesses to the fact, unless perhaps other Sorcerers giving evidence at the trial against their accomplices; from their being confederates in the crime, their statement is not conclusive and does not justify the recourse to torture, should not other indications be forthcoming, such as the seal of the Devil stamped on their body, as aforesaid, Nr 23, or the finding in their dwelling, after a search, of signs and instruments of the diabolic art: for instance, bones and, especially, a skull, hair artfully plaited, intricate knots of feathers, wings, feet or bones of bats, toads or serpents, unfamiliar seeds, wax figures, vessels filled with unknown powder, oil or ointments, etc., as are usually detected by Judges who, upon a charge being brought against Sorcerers, proceed to their apprehension and the search of their houses.
bene, de Off. S. Inquis., par. 2. dub. 206, num. 7.

4. Quantum vero ad probationem congressus cum Incubo, par est difficultas; non minus enim Incubus, ac alii Diaboli effugiunt, quando volunt, visum aliorum, ut videri se faciunt a sola amasia. Tamen non raro accidit, quod etiam visi sint Incubi modo sub una, modo sub alia specie in actu carnali cum mulieribus.

In quodam Monasterio (nomen ejus et urbis taceo, ne veterem ignominiam memoriae refricem) quaedam fuit Monialis, quae cum alia Moniali, quae cellam habebat sua contiguam, simulatem ex levibus causis, ut assolet inter mulieres, maxime Religiosas, habebat. Hec sagax in observando quascumque actiones Monialis sibi adversae, per plures dies vidit, quod ista in diebus aestivis, statim a prandio non spatiiabatur per viridarium cum aliis, sed ab iis sequestra, se retrahebat in cellam, quam sera obserabat. Observatrix igitur aemula curiositatis investigans, quid ali tempore illa facere posset, etiam ipsa in propriam cellam se recipiebat; caput autem audire submissam quasi duorum insimul colloquentium vocem (quod facile erat, nam cella parvo simplicis, scilicet lateris unius,
4. The proof of intimacy with an Incubus offers the same difficulty; for, no less than other Demons, the Incubus is, at will, invisible to all but his mistress. Yet, it has not seldom happened that Incubi have allowed themselves to be surprised in the act of carnal intercourse with women, now in one shape, now in another.

In a Monastery (I mention neither its name nor that of the town where it lies, so as not to recall to memory a past scandal), there was a Nun, who, about trifles, as is usual with women and especially with nuns, had quarrelled with one of her mates who occupied a cell adjoining to hers. Quick at observing all the doings of her enemy, this neighbour noticed, several days in succession, that instead of walking with her companions in the garden after dinner she retired to her cell, where she locked herself in. Anxious to know what she could be doing there all that time, the inquisitive Nun betook herself also to her cell. Soon she heard a sound, as of two voices conversing in subdued tones, which she could easily do, since the two cells were divided but by a
distorminio dividebatur), mox sonitum pop-
pyssmatum ¹, concussionis lecti, gannitus,
ae anhelitus, quasi duorum concubentium;
unde aucta in æmula curiositate stetit in
observatione, ut sciret, quinam in illa cella
essent. Postquam autem per tres vices vi-
dit, nullam aliam Monialem egressam e
cella illa, præter æmulam, dominam cellæ,
suspicata est Monialem in camera abscon-
ditum aliquem virum. clanculum introduc-
tum, retinere; unde et rem detulit ad Abba-
tissam, quæ consilio habito cum discretis,
volut audire sonitus, et observare indicia
relata ab accusatrice, ne praecipitarit et
inconsiderate ageret. Abbatisa igitur cum
discretis se receperunt in cellam observ-
ataricis, et audierunt strepitus, et voces,
quas accusatrix detulerat. Facta igitur
inquisitione, an ulla Monialium potuisset

¹. Poppysmatum. — That word being but
little used, it may be useful to record here
the definition given of it by the Glossarium
eroticum linguae latinae (auctore P. P., Paris,
1826):

Poppysma. — Oris pressi sonus, similis illi quo
permulcentur equi et canes. Obsene vero de
sussurro cunni labiorum, quum frictu madesc-
cunt.

Father Sinistrari, well versed in classical
slight partition), then a peculiar friction, the cracking of a bed, groans and sighs, *quasi duorum concumbentium*; her curiosity was raised to the highest pitch, and she redoubled her attention in order to ascertain who was in the cell. But having, three times running, seen no other nun come out but her rival, she suspected that a man had been secretly introduced and was kept hidden there. She went and reported the thing to the Abbess, who, after holding counsel with discreet persons, resolved upon hearing the sounds and observing

literature, had turned to account the following epigram of Martial (book VII, 18):

**IN GALLAM**

*Quum tibi sit facies, de qua nec fœmina possit*

*Dicere, quum corpus nulla litura notet;*

*Cur te tam rarus cupiat, repetatque futuro,*

*Miraris? Vitium est non leve, Galla, tibi.*

*Accessi quoties ad opus, mixtisque movemur*

*Inguinis, cumus non tacet, ipsa taces.*

*Di facerent, ut tu loquereris, et ipse taceret!*

*Offendor cumi garrulitate tui.*

*Pedere te mallem: namque hoc nec inutile dicit*

*Symmachus, et risum res movet ista simul.*

*Quis ridere potest fatui poppysmata cumi?*

*Quum sonat hic, cui non mentula mensque cadit*

*Dic alliquid saltem, clamosque obstrepe cumno:*

*Et si adeo muta es, disce vel inde loqui.*

*(Editorial Note.)*
secum in illa cella clausa esse, et reperto quod non, Abbatissa cum discretis fuit ad ostium cellae clausae; et pulsato frustra pluries ostio, cum Monialis nec responderere, nec aperire vellet, Abbatissa minata est, se velle ostium prosterni facere, et vecte aggredi opus fecit a quadam conversa. Tunc aperuit ostium Monialis, et facta perquisitione, nullus inventus est in camera. Interrogata Monialis cum quonam loqueretur, et de causa concussionis lecti, arhelitum, etc., omnia negavit.

Cum vero res perseveraret, accuratior, ac curiosior reddita Monialis amula perforavit tabulas lacunaris, ut posset cellam introspicere; et vidit elegantem quendam juvenem cum Moniali concumbentem, quem etiam eodem modo ab aliis Monialibus vendendum curavit. Delata mox accusatione ad Episcopum, ipsaque Moniali omnia negante, tandem metu tormentorum com-
Demonicity

the indications that had been denounced her, so as to avoid any precipitate or inconsiderate act. In consequence, the Abbess and her confidents repaired to the cell of the spy, and heard the voices and other noises that had been described. An inquiry was set on foot to make sure whether any of the Nuns could be shut in with the other one; and the result being in the negative, the Abbess and her attendants went to the door of the closed cell, and knocked repeatedly, but to no purpose: the Nun neither answered, nor opened. The Abbess threatened to have the door broken in, and even ordered a convert to force it with a crow-bar. The Nun then opened her door: a search was made and no one found. Being asked with whom she had been talking, and the why and wherefore of the bed cracking, of the sighs, etc., she denied everything.

But, matters going on just the same as before, the rival Nun, became more attentive and more inquisitive than ever, contrived to bore a hole through the partition, so as to be able to see what was going on inside the cell; and what should she see but an elegant youth lying with the Nun, and the sight of whom she took care to let the others enjoy by the same
minatorum adacta, confessa est se cum Incubo consuetudinem habuisse.

5. Quando igitur adessent talia indicia, sicut in recitata historia intervenuerant, posset utique in rigoroso examine rea constitui; sine tamen ejus confessione, non censendum est delictum plene probatum, quantumvis a testibus visus fuisset congressus; siquidem aliquando accidit, quod Diabolus, ut infamiam alicui innocenti pararet, praestigiose talem concubitionem re-presentaverit. Unde in his casibus debet Judex Ecclesiasticus esse perfecte ocularatus.
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means. The charge was soon brought before the bishop: the guilty Nun endeavoured still to deny all; but, threatened with the torture, she confessed having had an intimacy with an Incubus.

5. When, therefore, indications are forthcoming, such as those recited above, a charge might be brought after a searching inquiry; yet, without the confession of the accused, the offence should not be regarded as fully proved, even if the intercourse were testified by eye-witnesses; for it sometimes happens that, in order to undo an innocent female, the Devil feigns such intercourse by means of some delusion. In those cases, the Ecclesiastical Judge must consequently trust but his own eyes.
PÆNÆ

Quantum ad poenas Dæmonialitatis, nulla lex civilis, aut canonica, quam legerim, reperitur, quae poenam sanciat contra crimen hujusmodi. Tamen, quia crimen hoc supponit pactum, ac societatem cum Dæmone, ac apostasiam a fide, ultra veneficia, atque alia infinita propemodum damna, quae a Maleficiis inferuntur, regulariter, extra Italiam, suspendio et incendio punitur. In Italia autem, rarissime traduntur hujusmodi Malefici ab Inquisitoribus Curiae sæculari.
PENALTIES

As regards the penalties applicable to Demoniality, there is no law that I know of, either civil or canonical, which inflicts a punishment for a crime of that kind. Since, however, such a crime implies a compact and fellowship with the Demon, and apostasy of the faith, not to speak of the malefices and other almost numberless outrages perpetrated by Sorcerers, as a rule it is punished, out of Italy, by the gallows and the stake. But, in Italy, it is but very seldom that offenders of that kind are delivered up by the Inquisitors to the secular power.
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Mons. Isidore Liseux,
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I have gone through the work you sent me yesterday, and have, indeed, been satisfied with the edition; the time has not yet arrived for me to give my opinion on the value of the work itself. Here you would have met with no other works of the Rev. Father Sinistrari of Ameno than his book: Practica criminis Minorum; De Delictis et Pennis is to be found, I believe, in another of our convents; but you would have been given a most welcome reception.

I believe that Des Grieux can hardly have resided in the present St-Sulpice, which dates but from the year 1816. ... So far as a superficial glance has enabled me to ascertain, there are some other mistakes; but, altogether, the work is a good one, and you may accept of the congratulations of

Your very little servant,

Fr. A...
o. m. c.
m. p.

Convent of Capuchins, rue ....