Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, c. 1273

Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274) was the son of an Italian count who became a Dominican friar, a graduate and teacher at universities in Paris and Rome and a prolific writer. To this day, he is the single most important Catholic theologian. His masterpiece, the Summa Theologiae *is a massive and detailed treatment of Christian doctrine.*[1]

Prologue

…Students in this doctrine have often been hampered by what they have found written by other authors, partly on account of the multiplication of useless questions, articles, and arguments, partly also because those things that are needful for them to know are not taught according to the order of the subject matter, but according as the plan of the book might require, or the occasion of the argument offer, partly, too, because frequent repetition brought weariness and confusion to the minds of readers. Endeavouring to avoid these and other like faults, we shall try, by God's help, to set forth whatever is included in this sacred doctrine as briefly and clearly as the matter itself may allow.

Part 1, Question 93: The end or term of the production of man

Article 1. Whether the image of God is in man?

Objection 1. It would seem that the image of God is not in man. For it is written (Isaiah 40:18): "To whom have you likened God? or what image will you make for Him?"

Objection 2. Further, to be the image of God is the property of the First-Begotten, of Whom the Apostle says (Colossians 1:15): "Who is the image of the invisible God, the First-Born of every creature." Therefore the image of God is not to be found in man.

Objection 3. Further, Hilary says (De Synod [Super i can. Synod. Ancyr.) that "an image is of the same species as that which it represents"; and he also says that "an image is the undivided and united likeness of one thing adequately representing another." But there is no species common to both God and man; nor can there be a comparison of equality between God and man. Therefore there can be no image of God in man.

On the contrary, It is written (Genesis 1:26): "Let Us make man to Our own image and likeness."

I answer that, As Augustine says (QQ. 83, qu. 74): "Where an image exists, there forthwith is likeness; but where there is likeness, there is not necessarily an image." Hence it is clear that likeness is essential to an image; and that an image adds something to likeness--namely, that it is copied from something else. For an "image" is so called because it is produced as an imitation of something else; wherefore, for instance, an egg, however much like and equal to another egg, is not called an image of the other egg, because it is not copied from it.

But equality does not belong to the essence of an image; for as Augustine says (QQ. 83, qu. 74): "Where there is an image there is not necessarily equality," as we see in a person's image reflected in a glass. Yet this is of the essence of a perfect image; for in a perfect image nothing is wanting that is to be found in that of which it is a copy. Now it is manifest that in man there is some likeness to God, copied from God as from an exemplar; yet this likeness is not one of equality, for such an exemplar infinitely excels its copy. Therefore there is in man a likeness to

[1] Introduction and text both taken from New Advent.org: http://www.newadvent.org/summa/1093.htm

God; not, indeed, a perfect likeness, but imperfect. And Scripture implies the same when it says that man was made "to" God's likeness; for the preposition "to" signifies a certain approach, as of something at a distance.

Reply to Objection 1. The Prophet speaks of bodily images made by man. Therefore he says pointedly: "What image will you make for Him?" But God made a spiritual image to Himself in man.

Reply to Objection 2. The First-Born of creatures is the perfect Image of God, reflecting perfectly that of which He is the Image, and so He is said to be the "Image," and never "to the image." But man is said to be both "image" by reason of the likeness; and "to the image" by reason of the imperfect likeness. And since the perfect likeness to God cannot be except in an identical nature, the Image of God exists in His first-born Son; as the image of the king is in his son, who is of the same nature as himself: whereas it exists in man as in an alien nature, as the image of the king is in a silver coin, as Augustine says explains in De decem Chordis (Serm. ix, al, xcvi, De Tempore).

Reply to Objection 3. As unity means absence of division, a species is said to be the same as far as it is one. Now a thing is said to be one not only numerically, specifically, or generically, but also according to a certain analogy or proportion. In this sense a creature is one with God, or like to Him; but when Hilary says "of a thing which adequately represents another," this is to be understood of a perfect image.

Francesco Petrarch (1304-1374), Letter to Thomas Caloria[2]

If there was a single "founder" of humanism, it was Petrarch (1304-1374). He was a very successful poet as well as a scholar; he perfected the sonnet and pioneered Italian literature along with a couple other poets. Many humanists wrote letters that were not only personal, but later revised and published as literature.

[Letter to Thomas Caloria of Messina in Sicily]…It takes nerve to engage an enemy who is less interested in victory than in a fight. You tell me of an elderly dialectician who has got violently excited over a letter of mine, thinking I had denounced his craft. So he fumes and rages in public, with threats to attack our method in a letter of his, and you have been waiting for many months for this letter. Do not any longer expect it; believe me, it will never materialise. He has so much sense left: whether in embarrassment at their clumsy style or in confession of their ignorance, these adver-saries, so implacable with their tongues, never fight with their pens. They do not like to show up the feebleness of their armament and therefore use the Parthian tactics of battling in flight, throwing their light words about as though committing arrows to the winds. Well, as I said, it takes nerve to engage with such people in their own kind of warfare, especially because they derive supreme satisfaction from the struggle; they do not mean to get at the truth but to enjoy the debate. However, as one of Varro's sayings has it, "In excess of debate the truth is lost" You need not fear that they will descend to the open ground of written papers and scholarly discussion.

There is one thing, my friend, that I want to tell you: if you wish to follow virtue and truth, avoid such people. But where shall we find refuge

[2] G.R. Elton, *Renaissance and Reformation, 1300-1648* (New York: Macmillan, 1976), 53-55. Translated from Petrarch's *Opera* (Basel, 1554), 644 ff.

from this gang of madmen if not even islands are safe any more? Not even Scylla and Charybdis can stop this plague from swimming across to Sicily. Indeed, it would seem to be a disease to which islands are particularly susceptible, seeing that the British army of dialecticians[3] now finds itself rivalled by a new race of one-eyed Cyclopses on the slopes of Etna. One thing of which you remind me I had indeed noticed before: they use the glorious name of Aristotle to protect their sect, maintaining that Aristotle employed their method of argument. Admittedly it is a sort of excuse to follow in the footsteps of famous leaders, and even Cicero says that, if need be, he would not mind erring in company with Plato. But this is a mistake. Aristotle was a fiery spirit who discussed and wrote about the ultimate problems. And why do these gentry stray so variously from their alleged leader? Why, I ask you, do they like to be called Aristotelians when they should be ashamed of using the name? Nothing is more entirely unlike that great philosopher than a man of their kind who writes nothing, knows little, but yells much and off the point. How utterly ridiculous these allegedly educated men are, with their futile points of argument with which they bore themselves and others.

You know that story of Diogenes when a troublesome dialectician started arguing with him. Says he: What I am you are not," and Diogenes nodded. He continued: "But I am a man." When Diogenes did not deny this either, the sophister slipped in this conclusion: "Thus you are not a man." "This last bit," replied Diogenes, "is unhappily false; if you want to make the syllogism come true, start with me." Much of their logic is as utterly absurd as this. What they hope to gain by it-fame, amusement, help towards a good and bounteous life- they themselves perhaps know; I have no idea. To noble minds money is no fit reward for intellectual pursuits. Manufacturers are quite right to look for cash: the liberal arts have a finer end in view. When they hear this they get wild, for the volubility of quarrelsome men is always very dose to anger. "So you write off the dialectic method," they say.

Of course not. I know how much it was valued by the Stoics, a strong and masculine race of philosophers of whom our Cicero has much to say, especially in his book on "The Last Things." I know it is one of the liberal arts, a step along the road to higher accomplishments and not at all a useless weapon for those who wish to penetrate the thickets of philosophical enquiry. It trains the intellect, shows the way to the truth, teaches one to avoid fallacies; lastly, if it does nothing else, it makes people quick and sharp.

That this is true I do not deny. However, an honorable road is not necessarily a praiseworthy dwelling-place, and surely a traveller who over the attractions of the road forgets his destination is a bit of a fool. The right approach to travel involves a rapid journey through long distances without any stops before the end. And who among us is not a traveller? We are all on a long and difficult journey, to be finished in a short time and in adverse weather, as it were on one rainy winter's day; and of this journey dialectic can be a part, provided it be not the goal. It can be a part of that day's morning, not of its evening. In our time we have done many things quite properly which it would now be quite improper still to be doing. If in our old age we cannot get away from the schools of dialectic

[3] William of Ockham and his followers.

just because we played in them as boys, we should not by the same token blush still to play hopscotch, or ride a hobby-horse, or let ourselves be rocked in a cradle. Not a man but would dislike and despise an old fellow playing like a child, or marvel at a grey-haired boy with gout. I ask you, what is more useful, even necessary, than a first attempt at learning to read, the absolute foundation of all studies? On the other hand, what more laughable than an old man still engaged in that exercise?

Do you therefore work on that old man's pupils with my words. Do not scare them off; rather encourage them to make haste, not indeed just to study dialectic but to pass through it to higher things. And tell the old man himself that I condemn not the liberal arts but childish old men. For if, as Seneca says, there is nothing more dis- graceful than an elderly schoolboy, so there is nothing more unpleas- ing than an andent logic-chopper. And if he starts spewing syllogisms, I should advise you to run away and tell him to argue with Encheladus.[4]

Francesco Petrarch (1304-1374), ***Letter To Marcus Tullius Cicero***[5]

[*Here Petrarch writes a letter to Cicero, who died in 43 BCE.*] [You may have been offended by my last letter, but] it was your life that I criticised; not your mind, nor your tongue; for the one fills me with admiration, the other with amazement…Your life does awaken my pity, as I have said; but your talents and your eloquence call for nothing but congratulation. O great father of Roman eloquence! not I alone but all who deck themselves with the flowers of Latin speech render thanks unto you. It is from your well-springs that we draw the streams that water our meadows…

Are you hoping to hear of your books also; what fate has befallen them, how they are esteemed by the masses and among scholars? They still are in existence, glorious volumes, but we of today are too feeble a folk to read them, or even to be acquainted with their mere titles. Your fame extends far and wide; your name is mighty, and fills the ears of men; and yet those who really know you are very few, be it because the times are unfavourable, or because men's minds are slow and dull, or, as I am the more inclined to believe, because the love of money forces our thoughts in other directions…you will wish me to tell you something about the condition of Rome and the Roman republic…But indeed it were better that I refrained. Trust me, Cicero, if you were to hear of our condition to-day you would be moved to tears, in whatever circle of heaven above, or Erebus below, you may be dwelling. Farewell, forever.

Written in the world of the living; on the left bank of the Rhone, in Transalpine Gaul; in the same year, but in the month of December, the 19th day.

[4] a mythical giant buried by Jupiter under Mt. Etna

[5] James Harvey Robinson, ed. and trans. *Francesco Petrarca: The First Modern Scholar and Man of Letters*, (New York: G.P. Putnam, 1898), from Hanover Historical Texts Project; http://history.hanover.edu/texts/petrarch/pet11.html

Petrarch, *Letter To Posterity*[6]

Greeting.---It is possible that some word of me may have come to you, though even this is doubtful, since an insignificant and obscure name will scarcely penetrate far in either time or space. If, however, you should have heard of me, you may desire to know what manner of man I was…I was, in truth, a poor mortal like yourself, neither very exalted in my origin, nor, on the other hand, of the most humble birth, but belonging, as Augustus Caesar says of himself, to an ancient family.

…I have taken pride in others, never in myself, and however insignificant I may have been, I have always been still less important in my own judgment. My anger has very often injured myself, but never others. I have always been most desirous of honourable friendships, and have faithfully cherished them. I make this boast without fear, since I am confident that I speak truly…In my familiar associations with kings and princes, and in my friendship with noble personages, my good fortune has been such as to excite envy…

I possessed a well-balanced rather than a keen intellect, one prone to all kinds of good and wholesome study, but especially inclined to moral philosophy and the art of poetry. The latter, indeed, I neglected as time went on, and took delight in sacred literature. Finding in that a hidden sweetness which I had once esteemed but lightly, I came to regard the works of the poets as only amenities. Among the many subjects which interested me, I dwelt especially upon antiquity, for our own age has always repelled me, so that, had it not been for the love of those dear to me, I should have preferred to have been born in any other period than our own. In order to forget my own time, I have constantly striven to place myself in spirit in other ages, and consequently I delighted in history; not that the conflicting statements did not offend me, but when in doubt I accepted what appeared to me most probable, or yielded to the authority of the writer…My style, as many claimed, was clear and forcible; but to me it seemed weak and obscure…

Lorenzo Valla, *On the Donation of Constantine*[7]

Lorenzo Valla (1406-1457)was a scholar of the Latin language. This treatise concerns a document called the Donation of Constantine. Constantine was 4th century Roman emperor; the document talks about how papal power is higher than royal power, and was used by the church to argue that popes outranked kings. It was included in Gratian's Decretum, which was the major compendium of church law. Valla's treatise showed that it was a forgery. In fact, modern historians agree that it was written in the 8th century. [8]

But I want to take the forger himself, truly a "straw" man without wheat, by the neck, and drag him into court. What do you say, you forger? Whence comes it that we do not read this grant in the *Acts of Sylvester*? This book, forsooth, is rare, difficult to get, not owned by the many… Gelasius testifies that it was read by many of the orthodox; Voragine mentions it; we also have seen thousands of copies of it, and written long

[6] From James Harvey Robinson, ed. and trans. *Petrarch: The First Modern Scholar and Man of Letters* (New York: G.P. Putnam, 1898), 59-76. From Hanover Historical Texts Project; http://history.hanover.edu/texts/petrarch/pet01.html

[7] Valla *Discourse on the Forgery of the Alleged Donation of Constantine*, transl. Christopher B. Coleman (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922). From Hanover Historical Texts Project; http://history.hanover.edu/texts/vallapart2.html

[8] Kagan et al, *Western Heritage*, 289.

ago; and in almost every cathedral it is read when Sylvester's Day comes around. Yet nevertheless no one says that he has read there what you put in it; no one has heard of it…

…"In this privilege, among other things, is this: 'We-together with all our satraps and the whole Senate and the nobles also, and all the people subject to the government of the Roman church-considered it advisable that, as the blessed Peter is seen to have been constituted vicar of God on the earth, so the pontiffs who are the representatives of that same chief of the apostles, should obtain from us and our Empire the power of a supremacy greater than the clemency of our earthly imperial serenity is seen to have conceded to it.'"

O thou scoundrel, thou villain!...What! How do you want to have satraps come in here? Numskull, blockhead! Do the Caesars speak thus; are Roman decrees usually drafted thus? Whoever heard of satraps being mentioned in the councils of the Romans? I do not remember ever to have read of any Roman satrap being mentioned, or even of a satrap in any of the Roman provinces. But this fellow speaks of the Emperor's satraps, and puts them in before the Senate, though all honors, even those bestowed upon the ruling prince, are decreed by the Senate alone…

Come back to life for a little while, Firmianus Lactantius, stop this ass who brays so loudly and outrageously. So delighted is he with the sound of swelling words, that he repeats the same terms and reiterates what he has just said. Is it thus that in your age the secretaries of the Caesars spoke, or even their grooms?..."Choosing the prince of the apostles, or his vicars": you do not choose Peter, and then his vicars, but either him, excluding them, or them, excluding him. And he calls the Roman pontiffs "vicars" of Peter, either as though Peter were living, or as though they were of lower rank than was Peter. And is not this barbarous; "from us and our empire"? As if the empire had a mind to give grants, and power! Nor was he content to say "should obtain," without also saying "conceded," though either one would have sufficed. And that "constant intercessors," is very elegant indeed! Doubtless he wants them "constant" so that they may not be corrupted by money nor moved by fear. And "earthly imperial power"; two adjectives without a conjunction….And how inflated he is with puffed-up pride; as in that phrase "gloriously exalted" by "glory, and power, and dignity, and vigor, and imperial honor"! This seems to be taken from the Apocalypse, where it says, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and divinity and wisdom, and strength, and honor and blessing."

Erasmus, Letter to Wolfgang Capito, 1517[9]

Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536) was one of the towering figures of the Renaissance. He was a canon (like a monk) but received special permission not to live in a cloister. He travelled throughout Europe and corresponded with many political leaders and scholars. He published a large number of writings, ranging from theology to grammar exercises to satires to treatises on contemporary social issues. Capito was a cleric and Hebrew Scholar at Basel, and later a reformer at Strasbourg.

In 1516, Erasmus published a printed edition of the New Testament in its original Greek, with a new Latin translation by Erasmus. Erasmus also

[9] From *Erasmus and His Age: Selected Letters of Desiderius Erasmus*, ed. Hans Hillerbrand (Harper and Row, 1970), 108-111. Original language: EE 541 (1-9; 29-93; 118- 125; 133-151).

corrected and standardized the Greek text based on different manuscript copies.

Antwerp, February 26, 1516/17

It is not part of my natural disposition, dear Wolfgang, to be excessively fond of life. Perhaps I have lived long enough, having entered my fifty-first year, or possibly I see nothing so splendid or delightful in this life as to merit desire by one who is convinced that a happier life awaits those who in this world earnestly seek after piety. But I almost wish to be young again, and this for the reason that I expect the coming of a golden age: we clearly see how rulers, as if changed by inspiration, devote all their energies to the pursuit of peace. . .

I see that the leaders of the world—King Francis of France, Charles the Catholic King, King Henry of England, and Emperor Maximilian—have made a drastic cutback on their armaments and have established a secure and, I hope, lasting peace. Therefore I am encouraged to entertain the expectation that there will be a renascence or even an efflorescence, not only of good morals and Christian piety, but also of the purer and genuine kind of learning and the finest branches of knowledge. The basis for my hope lies in the fact that this goal is being pursued with equal enthusiasm in various parts of the globe: in Rome by Pope Leo, in Spain by the Cardinal of Toledo[10] in England by King Henry VIII, a scholar himself of no mean ability; in our country by King Charles, a young man of superhuman gifts; in France by King Francis, who was born so to speak for this very purpose, and who is also offering rich rewards to invite and attract from other lands men who are eminent for virtue and learning. In Germany this is the goal of many outstanding rulers and bishops, and especially of the Emperor Maximilian, who, aged and weary of many wars, has decided to seek rest in the arts of peace, a decision more suitable for a man of his years and also more fortunate for all of Christendom. It is due to the piety of such rulers that we see gifted men all over the world awakening to the sound of the signal and rising up and joining forces to revive the best learning.

How else can one explain the fact that all these learned scholars from various lands are sharing their efforts, and pursue this wonderful work not only with vigor but also with a fair degree of success, with the result that there is almost a sure hope that all branches of learning will blossom forth in a much purer and more genuine condition?

First of all polite letters, which were long ago all but extinct, have for some time now cultivated and cherished by the Scots, the Danes, and the And medicine-think of all the champions it has! In Rome, Nicolaus Leonicenus, in Venice Ambrose Leo of Nola, in France William Cop and John Ruell, and in England Thomas Linacre. Roman law is being revived in Paris by William Budé and in Germany by Ulrich Zasius, and mathematics in Basel by Heinrich Glareanus.

On the other hand, theology has presented a little more of a problem, because until now professors of theology have generally had a deep abhorrence of good learning and have covered up their ignorance all the more successfully by doing so under the guise of piety. As a result these fellows have convinced the illiterate masses that it is a violation of

[10] Francisco Ximenes, outstanding Spanish churchman and reformer, from January 1516 regent of Castille and Aragon.

religion for anyone to assail their barbarism. They complain bitterly to the unlettered populace in particular and appeal for stoning whenever they see any danger of their ignorance being exposed. But I am confident that this situation too will tum out well, once the study of the three languages[11] gains public acceptance in the schools, as it has begun to. The most learned and least spiteful members of this profession are either actively supporting this project or are favorably inclined toward it. Jacques Lefevre of Etaples, as well as others, has devoted considerable energy to this matter; you are like him not only in name but also in your rich endowments.[12]

As for me, the humblest portion of this task has fallen to my lot, and rightly so; I am not sure if I have made any real contribution.[13] At any rate I have so roiled these fellows who are opposed to having the world regain its senses that apparently my poor little efforts have had some effect. However, I did not undertake this labor in the belief that I had some extraordinary teaching to propose; rather, it was my desire to pave the way for those destined to strive toward higher things, so that they could more easily convey their brilliant, lofty discoveries without stumbling over rough spots or through swampy places. Nevertheless, not even these poor efforts of mine are spurned by men who are learned and open-minded. The only ones who carp at them are a few fellows so stupid that they are hooted at even by those of the common rabble who have a little intelligence. Not long ago a man complained bitterly to the people here, in a tearful voice, and of course in a sermon, that the Scriptures were done with, as also the theologians who up to now had borne the Christian faith upon their shoulders—now that men had appeared who were emending the text of the Holy Gospel and even of the Lord's Prayer—as if I were finding fault with Matthew or Luke instead of discovering the original correct text. In England, one or two persons are screaming that it is a shameful thing for me to try to teach an outstanding man like St. Jerome—as if I were altering and not restoring his original text. And yet these growlers with their dirges, which a common fuller with an ounce of intelligence would laugh to scorn, consider themselves mighty theologians…

It is not that I want the kind of theology which is commonly accepted in the schools today to be completely abolished, but I want to have it enriched and purified by the addition of the ancient and true learning. Neither the authority of Scripture nor of the theologians will be shaken if some readings are emended which up to now have been considered defective, or if some texts are more correctly understood which up to now have been the occasion of sheer drivel on the part of the common run of professors. In fact, their authority will be all the greater if their understanding of Sacred Scripture is more genuine…

[11] Latin (which had been the standard scholarly language throughout medieval Europe), plus Greek and Hebrew, the original languages of the Old and New Testaments.

[12] Erasmus refers to the fact that Capito's middle name was Fabricius, which paralleled Lefevre's Latinized name Faber Stapulensis.

[13] Erasmus refers to his edition of the New Testament. It was in fact a towering achievement; Erasmus is being self-deprecating here.

There is one thought that causes me anxiety; it is the fear that under the appearance of a renascence[14] of ancient learning paganism may attempt to rear its head, for even among Christians there are some who acknowledge Christ practically in name only, while within their hearts they breathe the spirit of paganism;[15] I am also afraid that Judaism may plan to use the renascence of Hebrew learning as an occasion for revival. There is no plague so opposed and so hostile to the teaching of Christ. Such has always been the condition of human affairs. Whenever anything good has succeeded, something bad has immediately used it as a pretext for trying to intrude itself. I would like to see those chilly subtleties completely lopped off—or at least they should not be the only interest of theologians—and Christ in all His simplicity and purity deeply planted in the hearts of men. I think the best way to accomplish this is to use the knowledge of the languages in order to penetrate deeply into the meaning of the sources themselves. I only hope we can avoid this evil without perhaps falling into something else that is worse. Recently some works have been published that smack of pure Judaism. I realize how hard St. Paul worked to liberate Christ from Judaism, and I am aware that some people are quietly slipping back into that position. Then, too, I hear that some have other plans in mind which would add nothing whatsoever to an understanding of Christ and would only throw up a cloud of smoke before the eyes of men.

[14] renascence: a general term for resurgence or rebirth. With a different spelling, this term is applied to *the* Renaissance.
[15] Erasmus' dialogue of 1527, *Ciceronianus*, while addressing itself to the problem of the conflict of two cultures, ancient and modern (Christian), was a warning against the unquestioning worship of classical antiquity.

Peter Paul Vergerius, *On the Morals that Befit a Free Man*, c. 1400[16]

P.P. Vergerius the Elder (1370-1444) was a teacher at Florence, Bologna, and Padua. He was present at the Council of Constance, and later worked for the Emperor Sigismund. Soon after 1400, he wrote a treatise on education for Ubertino, the son of Francesco Carrara, lord of Padua, his patron.[17]

We call those studies liberal which are worthy of a free man; those studies by which we attain and practice virtue and wisdom; that education which calls forth, trains and develops those highest gifts of body and of mind which ennoble men…

In your own case, Ubertinus, you had before you the choice of training in Arms or in Letters…It would have been natural that you, the scion of a House ennobled by its prowess in arms, should have been content to accept your father's permission to devote yourself wholly to that discipline. But to your great credit you elected to become proficient in both alike: to add to the career of arms traditional in your family, an equal success in that other great discipline of mind and character, the study of Literature...

Books indeed are a higher-a wider, more tenacious-memory, a store-house which is the common property of us all…I attach great weight to the duty of handing down this priceless treasure to our sons unimpaired by any carelessness on our part. How many are the gaps which the ignorance

[16] http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/vergerius.html; From Petrus Paulus Vergerius, *De ingenues moribus et liberalibus studiis*, trans. by W. H. Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre and other Humanist Educators*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897), 102-110.
[17] Kagan et al, *Western Heritage*, 285.

of past ages has willfully caused in the long and noble roll of writers! Books-in part or in their entirety-have been allowed to perish. What remains of others is often sorely corrupt, mutilated, or imperfect. It is hard that no slight portion of the history of Rome is only to be known through the labors of one writing in the Greek language: it is still worse that this same noble tongue, once well nigh the daily speech of our race, as familiar as the Latin language itself, is on the point of perishing even amongst its own sons, and to us Italians is already utterly lost, unless we except one or two who in our time are tardily endeavoring to rescue something-if it be only a mere echo of it-from oblivion…

We come now to the consideration of the various subjects which may rightly be included under the name of "Liberal Studies." Amongst these I accord the first place to History, on grounds both of its attractiveness and of its utility…Next in importance ranks Moral Philosophy, which indeed is, in a peculiar sense, a "Liberal Art," in that its purpose is to teach men the secret of true freedom. History, then, gives us the concrete examples of the precepts inculcated by philosophy…The third main branch of study, Eloquence, which indeed holds a place of distinction amongst the refined Arts. By philosophy we learn the essential truth of things, which by eloquence we so exhibit in orderly adornment as to bring conviction to differing minds.…

The importance of grammar and of the rules of composition must be recognized at the outset, as the foundation on which the whole study of Literature must rest: and closely associated with these rudiments, the art of Disputation or Logical argument. …Rhetoric…takes the third place amongst the studies specially important in public life…in the Law-Court, in the Council, in the popular Assembly, in exposition, in persuasion, in debate, eloquence finds no place now-a-days: speed, brevity, homeliness are the only qualities desired. Oratory, in which our forefathers gained so great glory for themselves and for their language, is despised: but our youth, if they would earn the repute of true education, must emulate their ancestors in this accomplishment.

As to Music, the Greeks refused the title of "Educated" to anyone who could not sing or play…

Arithmetic, which treats of the properties of numbers, Geometry, which treats of the properties of dimensions, lines, surfaces, and solid bodies…The science of the Stars, their motions, magnitudes and distances…The knowledge of Nature…

I may here glance for a moment at the three great professional Disciplines: Medicine, Law, Theology. Medicine, which is applied science, has undoubtedly much that makes it attractive to a student. But it cannot be described as a Liberal study. Law, which is based upon moral philosophy, is undoubtedly held in high respect. Regarding Law as a subject of study, such respect is entirely deserved: but Law as practiced becomes a mere trade. Theology, on the other hand, treats of themes removed from our senses, and attainable only by pure intelligence.