

# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

VOL. XIV.—APRIL, 1889.—No. 54.

---

## MYTHS AND LEGENDS OF THE "REFORMATION."

**H**OW much light modern research has thrown on the Middle Ages is known to all students of history. They also know how strong has been the testimony borne by modern scholarship to the beneficent activity of the Popes and the Church in those often misjudged times. In the October number of the REVIEW we have given some of the most striking results of modern investigation on this period. The aim of the article referred to, however, was not only to throw light on the "Dark" Ages; it was broader and more comprehensive. Our aim was to prove to our readers, by an appeal to the facts, that the Church has nothing to fear, but much to hope, from historical science. Lest, however, the premises appear too narrow for this conclusion, we shall extend our researches, and study another great historical question, the question of the "Reformation."

Of course, we shall not enter into an examination of Luther's doctrines, of their truth or consistency. This is foreign to our purpose, and besides it is useless to slay the dead; Luther's most cardinal doctrine, that of justification by faith alone, was buried by his own disciples centuries ago, and not a few of his other doctrines have followed that to the grave. To-day the world is little interested in Luther the constructive theologian; but the history of Luther's movements has by no means lost its interest. No book, of late, has so exasperated and dismayed the German supporters of the "Reformation" as Janssen's "History of the German

VOL. XIV.—13

People." Still Janssen never enters into theological discussions, never attempts to analyze or refute Luther's teachings. Whence, therefore, the dismay of the "Reformer's" friends? Because Janssen mildly and mercilessly demolishes the traditional Luther; because historical truth compelled him to draw attention to some very inconvenient features in Luther's career. In the nineteenth century, in the days of the Rothschilds and the Bleichröders, it is inconvenient for his followers to be regaled with an authentic picture of the "Reformer's" brutal intolerance, not only of Catholics—that would not have stung the men of the *Cultur-Kampf*—but of Jews; in the days of the new German empire it is inconvenient to be reminded of the "Reformer's" repeated faithlessness to the old German empire; in the days of Deroulède and the French Patriotic League it is inconvenient to read of the "Reformer's" approval of the coquetting, nay, the alliance of his friends with Germany's arch-enemy. The "Reformation" meant tolerance, we have heard re-echoed in every key, major and minor. But the arch-"reformer's" own words prove him a brutal denouncer of Catholic, Calvinist, and Jew. Luther was the great German patriot, sang his admirers in loud chorus. Alas! that men's writing will live after them; for Luther had written himself down—well, we shall not use harsh words—a friend of Germany's hereditary foe. Strange, indeed, and unlikely does it appear that error and falsehood should entwine themselves around so public, so stupendous a series of events as that comprised in the word "Reformation." But history cannot be based on assumptions, and the new historical school takes nothing for granted. Already it has overhauled a great part of what passed for the history of the "Reformation." It has re-examined old witnesses, and brought new witnesses on the stand. It has put aside second-hand authorities, and gone to the sources. And though it is hard for human nature to lay aside long-cherished opinions, even non-Catholic followers of the new school have not wilfully closed their eyes to the light, nor sealed their lips, when truth brushed away the inherited error of ages. We shall review a few of their conclusions.

"At one time," says Prof. K. Pearson, "not only the German Protestants believed, but leading Protestant historians stated as a fact, that Luther had translated the Bible for the first time. Then when the existence of eighteen previous editions (printed German translations are meant) could no longer be disguised, it was broadly hinted that they never reached the people, that they were based only on the Vulgate, that the language is awkward, heavy, and neither precise in sense nor happy in expression.<sup>1</sup> So Goedeke.

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Pearson here gives the German text: "Die Sprache ist unbeholfen schwerfällig und weder genau im Sinn noch treffend im Ausdruck."

This was met by the proof that their language was a perfect mine of folk-expression, homely and true; nay, further, it was shown that Luther, so far from translating from the original Greek, had in the New Testament, to a great extent, only modernized the old German Vulgate. The September Bible was only a natural growth out of the version of the *Codex Teplensis* of the fourteenth century."<sup>1</sup> "Where Luther does differ from the (pre-'Reformation') German Vulgate is very often in those passages in which his own strong sense of the righteousness of his own dogma has led him to pervert the text. Against Emser's 2400 'heretical errors, lies, and wrong tense-renderings,' I may cite Bunsen's 3000 inaccuracies. . . . Mr. Hutchinson tells us that Luther probably began Greek in 1512. We happen to know that he began it in August, 1518. Let me cite what was written two years ago, and remind the reader that to *revise*, not translate, cost our thorough Greek scholars ten years' work, 1870-1880. On the 25th of August, 1518, Melancthon arrived in Wittenberg; then, for the first time, Luther, attending the lectures of Melancthon, began to study Greek. This is shown not only by Luther's letters, but Melancthon in a speech to the students, recommending the study of Greek, points out to them Luther's example in Luther himself, who, already advanced in years (*quamvis jam senex*), has learned the Greek tongue. In June, 1519, we have the famous Leipzig disputation with Eck, and in April, 1521, Luther arrives in Worms; he is in bitter and prolonged controversy with Eck and Emser, he is writing book after book against the Pope and his bull, and he is contesting the condemnation of the leading universities of Christendom. In 1520 alone he publishes three epoch-making works, and yet he must find time to study Greek. On December 21st, 1521, Luther wrote to Lange of his determination to translate the New Testament, and within a less period than three months the work is completed. Returning on March 1st from the Wartburg to Wittenberg, he managed to review the translation with Melancthon notwithstanding the Carlstadt difficulties, and on the 21st of September the New Testament is issued completed from the press. To translate, revise, and print occupied less than nine months, and this notwithstanding Luther's three most broken years of Greek study. Does not such external evidence fully confirm internal coincidences and point to Luther's dependence on his predecessors?"<sup>2</sup>

"Luther," says Paulsen, "appreciated the old (classical) writers, especially the Roman, which were almost the only classics he knew."<sup>3</sup> "The Greek authors," says O. Schmidt, in a pamphlet

<sup>1</sup> K. Pearson in *Academy* of September 26th, 1885.

<sup>2</sup> K. Pearson in *Academy* of October 10th, 1885, pp. 240-1.

<sup>3</sup> Paulsen, *l. c.*, p. 147.

on "Luther's acquaintance with the Classics," "were little known to him."

The fact that in Germany at least fourteen high-German and four low-German translations of the Bible had been printed before the "Reformation" could no longer be denied. It was a bitter dose for the old-fashioned worshippers of Luther. Must they concede that their prophet was wrong? that he had slandered the Catholic Church? that the Church had not withheld from her children the saving nourishment of the Bible? It was too much to expect such an admission at once. They set their wits to work, and lo! they thought they had found a way to escape the disagreeable inference. The eighteen editions were printed—that could not be denied; the books were in evidence. But were they printed by Catholics and for Catholics? Was the translation a Catholic translation? For whom, suggested common sense, if not for Catholics should they be printed? Was not Germany, as a whole, Catholic before Luther? The censorship of books existed in the electorate of Mainz since 1486, and Archbishop Berthold, of Mainz, bid the censors withhold their approval from books "if perchance they cannot be correctly translated, if they rather beget scandal and error, or offend modesty." Nevertheless, twelve out of the eighteen German Bible translations were printed in the province of Mainz. Were the censors asleep? or how could fourteen editions of a heretical Bible be published there, and for heretics, too?

Serious difficulties these. Still they did not appal the zealous defenders of Luther. In 1885 a Protestant clergyman, Keller by name, published a work on "The Reformation and the Older Reform Parties." He had made a discovery. "The opinion heretofore prevailing, that the German Bible translation sprang from orthodox Roman Catholic sources, is wholly false; the German people owes it to the Bible-believing heretics, the Waldensians." Protestant critics, even such as otherwise condemned the book without mercy, admitted this conclusion. Keller's arguments, however, were by no means convincing. So, in the same year, Dr. H. Haupt published a new work to correct and complete the reasoning. But, alas! for the futility of human endeavors! Scarcely had Haupt placed his book before the public when forthwith comes forward another non-Catholic, Dr. Franz Jostes,<sup>1</sup> and topples over the beautifully constructed house of cards. Keller's and Haupt's arguments, external and internal, are tested and found to

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Paulsen on the same page.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. F. Jostes, *Die Waldenser und die vorlutherische deutsche Bibelübersetzung*. Münster, 1885.

be based on imagination and ignorance. "The writer" (Jostes), says Prof. Pearson, "subjects the Keller-Haupt hypothesis to a fairly searching criticism, which will do much to assuage that sectarian enthusiasm which has swept through the Protestant press of Germany. . . . We shall note with some curiosity whether the remarkable interest, recently manifested by Lutheran theologians for the pre-Lutheran Vulgate, will now begin to subside."

So much for the German pre-Lutheran Bible translations. But what of Haupt's assertion that the Church had forbidden wholly the use of Bible translations? It is true that in certain places and for good reasons certain translations were forbidden in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. But "in Spain only were Spanish translations generally prohibited by *royal* edict since the end of the thirteenth century."<sup>1</sup> "In Germany, the only prohibition (which was no prohibition at all) is contained in a decree of Berthold, Archbishop of Mainz, establishing a preventive censorship."<sup>2</sup> "By the Council of Trent, and not before, the use of German Bibles by laymen was greatly restricted, though not wholly forbidden. But the proscription was by many not regarded as binding. The Bavarian catalogue of forbidden books for 1566, for example, mentions among the most useful books for laymen the Bibles of Eck and Dietenberger, the New Testament of Emser, and the very old translation of the Bible or of some extracts therefrom. . . . which, however, are not often printed now. As late as 1612 the Jesuit Serarius says: "If anyone in Germany reads without special permission the Bible of Eck or Dietenberger, this is not only not censured or punished by bishops, pastors, and confessors, but rather approved and praised, as if a general permission had been given."<sup>3</sup>

How bitterly opposed Catholic priests were to the reading of the Bible in the fifteenth century may be inferred from a fact recorded at Leyden, in the Netherlands, at that time a part of the German Emperor's possessions. "There, in the year 1462, Willem Heerman, a respected burgher, presented to the city a copy of the complete German Bible, prepared by his own hand. This copy was placed in St. Peter's Church for the use of 'all good honest men, who wish to read therein and study something good.' During the Middle Ages the churches were always open throughout the day."<sup>4</sup> "Regarding the spread of our old Bible translation," says W. Moll, Professor of Protestant Theology at Amsterdam, "we can report but little. As far as the lay world is concerned it was

<sup>1</sup> Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, vol. i., p. 43, quoted in Jostes, *Die Waldenser*, p. 21. Reusch is an Old Catholic.

<sup>2</sup> Jostes, *l. c.*, p. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Jostes, *l. c.*, p. 231.

<sup>4</sup> Jostes, *l. c.*, p. 281.

probably most often used in women's convents, in Beguin houses, and in assemblies of Sisters of the Common Life, and moreover in men's convents, which, besides monks, also included uneducated lay brothers. That since the middle of the fifteenth century it existed in many, if not in all, convents, either complete or in extracts, is likely in view of the copies which exist in our public and private libraries, which are numerous, and generally bear the proofs of coming from convents.<sup>1</sup> The history of the French Bible during the Middle Ages has recently been traced by M. Samuel Berger in his work, *La Bible Française au Moyen Age*. He found a French version of the books of Samuel and the Kings dating back as early as 1150 A.D. In the thirteenth century the whole Bible was translated, some books being accompanied with a commentary. "About 1300 A.D., Desmoulins, Canon of Aire in Anjou, wrote in the Picard dialect his '*Bible Historiale*,' made up of the text of the Bible with some omissions and a free translation of the *Historia Scholastica* of Petrus Comestor. . . . The first volume of Desmoulins, and the second volume of the Century Bible, make up the received French Bibles of the Middle Ages, which spread in countless copies over Europe, from England to Italy."<sup>2</sup> Here, too, as recently in Germany, the Waldenses were called in to account for the numerous French Bibles. "During this period" (eleventh century to St. Louis), says Mr. Wicksteed in the same article, "falls that attack on the Bible readers of Metz under Innocent III., round which a romantic legend has grown up, tempting uncritical critics to identify every version of the Bible with the supposed work of Pierre Valdue, '*La Bible des Vaudois*.' M. Berger shows, with admirable diligence, that no such work ever existed. . . . So ends '*la Legende de la Bible des Vaudois*.'"<sup>3</sup> In England the venerable Bede translated parts of the Scriptures as early as the eighth century, and the Psalms were translated by King Alfred. After the Norman Conquest, besides partial translations, we know of a complete one dated 1290, and in the fourteenth century the new version of John of Treviso was made. Such of our readers as desire to know more of the vernacular versions of the Bible we refer to Spalding's *History of the Reformation* (vol. i., p. 292). One more fact may be cited to show how false it is that the Church forbade the reading of the Bible. "How great a number of readers," says the Protestant Geffcken, "is presupposed by ninety-eight editions of the whole Latin Bible, which are catalogued by Hain up to A.D. 1500 as numbers 3031-3128." In the fifty years immediately succeeding the

<sup>1</sup> Moll, *Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland vor de Hervorming*, ii., 334, quoted in Jostes, *l. c.*, p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> P. H. Wicksteed in *Academy*, No. 647.

<sup>3</sup> Wicksteed in the same article.

invention of printing, so extensive a work as the Latin Bible—the complete Latin Bible—is published ninety-eight times, besides eighteen German translations, and men will still believe Luther's assertion, that "the Biblia were unknown to people under popery." "In the fifteenth century," says Prof. Pearson, "it (the Catholic Church) certainly did not hold back the Bible from the folk. And it gave them in the vernacular a long series of devotional works, which for language and religious sentiment have never been surpassed. Indeed, we are inclined to think it made a mistake in allowing the masses such ready access to the Bible. It ought to have recognized the Bible once and for all as a work absolutely unintelligible without a long course of historical study, and so long as it was supposed to be inspired, very dangerous in the hands of the ignorant."<sup>1</sup>

The immorality of the ancient clergy has always been a favorite theme with the "Reformers" and their admirers. This immorality, we are told again and again, was undoubtedly one of the chief causes of the "Reformation." Let us hear, however, one of the best informed authorities on the condition of England in Henry VIII.'s time, the late Prof. Brewer. "Nor considering the temper of the English people, is it probable that immorality could have existed among the ancient clergy to the degree which the exaggeration of poets, preachers, and satirists might lead us to suppose. The existence of such corruption is not justified by authentic documents, or by an impartial and broad estimate of the character and conduct of the nation before the Reformation. There is nothing more difficult than for contemporaries to form, from their own limited experience, a just estimate of the morality of the times in which they live; and if the complaints of preachers and moralists are to be accepted as authoritative on this head, there would be no difficulty in producing abundant evidence from the Reformers themselves that the abuses and enormities of their own age under Edward VI. and Elizabeth were far greater than in the ages preceding."<sup>2</sup>

Later researches strongly support Prof. Brewer's views. The results of these researches are laid down chiefly in the Benedictine Dom Gasquet's work on "Henry VIII. and the Suppression of the English Monasteries," and in the tenth volume of the "Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.," edited by James Gairdner. That sensitively moral monarch, bluff King Harry, appointed a commission to visit the monasteries, and it is chiefly on the strength of its report that the grossest vices have been imputed to

---

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Pearson in *Academy*, August 7th, 1886, p. 85.

<sup>2</sup> Brewer, "The Reign of Henry VIII.," vol. ii., p. 469.

the English monks of Henry's time by historian after historian. What is the verdict of scientific history on these charges? There is no more fair and competent authority on this period of English history and on this question than the Protestant editor of the records of the reign of Henry VIII., James Gairdner. Here is his opinion as laid down in a criticism of Dom Gasquet's work in the *Academy* of February 25th, 1888, p. 125. "A mysterious Black Book is supposed to have been compiled when the monasteries were visited in the reign of Henry VIII.; and such extraordinary revelations were then made of the dissolute lives of monks and nuns, that an indignant Parliament insisted on the suppression of these dens of vice. That the Black Book had disappeared with all its damning evidence, was a fact which occasioned no difficulty to a writer like Burnet, who found that in the reign of Queen Mary a commission was granted to Bonner and others to examine the records of "divers infamous scrutinies in religious houses." The commission itself, indeed, said nothing about the destruction of these records when found; but rather that they should be 'brought to knowledge.' Still it was clear to the Protestant mind (at least in the days of Bp. Burnet) that the only object of inquiring after such things could be to destroy the evidences of things casting such deep discredit on the papal system. Well, whatever may have become of the 'Black Book' itself, it is clear that the destruction of evidence could not have gone very far; for at least three or four documents still exist (and were referred to by Burton in his "Anatomy of Melancholy" long before Burnet wrote), giving a black enough account of the state of the monasteries in Henry VIII.'s time just before their suppression. These three or four separate documents were possibly intended to form parts of a comprehensive book reporting on monasteries throughout England; but altogether they embrace only certain districts, and it is clear only a minority of the houses are reported on even in these. These reports contain accusations of the foulest character—often of unmentionable crimes—against several of the inmates, in a considerable number of the houses. But they are accusations merely, unaccompanied by a particle of evidence to support them; and we know quite well now-a-days by whom and under what circumstances they were drawn up. They are in the hand-writing of John ap Rice, a notary who accompanied Cromwell's visitor, Dr. Legh, in the work of inspecting the monasteries; and we can distinctly trace in the correspondence of Dr. Legh himself and his fellow visitor, Dr. Layton, the dates at which each of these separate reports was transmitted to their master. . . . It appears that the whole work was done with such amazing rapidity that it is simply out of the question to suppose that anything like the



enormities reported were proved by anything like a judicial inquiry.

. . . . That the case against the monasteries was prejudiced, appears clearly from some of the letters of the visitors themselves. When Layton, in a fit of comparative honesty, had spoken well of the monastery of Glastonbury, he was admonished that his report did not give satisfaction; so he wrote immediately to apologize for his 'indiscreet praise,' acknowledging that the Abbott appeared 'neither to have known God, nor his prince, nor any part of a good Christian man's religion!' And to avoid a similar mistake at St. Mary's, York, he writes that he 'supposes to find evil disposition both in the Abbott and convent, whereof, God willing, I shall certify you in my next letters.' It is needless to say that the testimony of such an accuser is absolutely worthless. And as for his fellow, Dr. Legh—even his associate Ap Rice felt compelled to write to Cromwell of his tyranny and extortion, begging him at the same time not to disclose that he had done so, else his life would hardly be safe from the bullies and serving men in Legh's employment.

"Finally the accusations, when they had served their purpose, were discredited even by a royal commission issued immediately afterwards to report upon the condition of the monasteries with a view to their suppression. . . . Strange to say, the returns of this commission, so far as they have been collected hitherto, give the monks in almost all the houses a high character for probity, zeal, hospitality, and sometimes (we may add) for particular kinds of industry, such as writing, embroidery, or painting. Nor is this all; for it stands no less clearly recorded that several of these monasteries which look worst in the reports of the visitors, stood highest in the esteem of the neighbors—the country gentlemen who had the duty imposed upon them of making these returns. The huge mass of scandal compiled by Drs. Legh and Layton was clearly believed by no one, not even by the King or Cromwell, or, we may add, by the visitors themselves." "Something much worse than the grossest exaggerations," says the *Athenæum* (Feb. 18th, 1888), "something much more like impudent and enormous lying—is the rule and not the exception in the returns of the King's first inquisitors. . . . Perhaps the strongest impression that this (tenth) volume of the Calendars produces upon the reader is not that the history of Henry VIII. will have to be re-written, but that it has never been written at all."

So much on the corruption of the clergy in England. In Germany similar charges were first made against the clergy, and above all against the university men in the famous "*Epistola Obscurorum Virorum*." These "obscure men," to wit, Ulrich von Hutten, Mutianus and his friends of the Erfurt University, where

Luther formed one of the circle, poured forth the most unmeasured abuse against the morals, the ignorance, and the shabby ragged dress of the university clergy. "Was this a true picture of the university men?" asks Prof. Paulsen. "As regards their hatred of poetry, of pure Latin, of the Greek language, in short of humanism, the account which follows will prove that the universities did not all deserve this reproach. As regards profligacy and disgraceful neglect of dress, no one will be surprised that then, as at all times, they were met with at the universities. About one circle of university men we are specially well informed on this point, the circle to which the authors of this satire belonged. What Mutianus, otherwise a respectable man, thought of sexual relations, we may read in the letters, hitherto unpublished, given by Janssen and Krause, in which he advises his young friends to help themselves. That Hutten needed no adviser on this point is well enough known. On the ragged appearance, poverty, and beggary of the same men (the dark men) the same works give us manifold, but by no means pleasant, information. It is strange that Strauss (the author of the "Life of Christ") could represent as the champion of human liberty and German culture the Franconian Knight (Von Hutten), who, wasting of a wretched disease, always penniless, but full of magnificent pretensions, roamed from place to place and stimulated the generosity of lords, spiritual and temporal, with Latin verses. But he assailed Rome. I think better weapons and better men were needed, and are still needed every day in the struggle for German liberty and culture."<sup>1</sup> How much faith the unblushing effrontery of Hutten and his friends deserves, it takes no Solomon to determine. On many other points of their indictment, Paulsen has convicted the "dark men" of exaggeration, falsehood, and slander. Is it rash to infer that they exaggerated on this point also? True, the leading "Reformers," many of whom were by no means vestal virgins, were mostly run-away monks and apostate priests; true, likewise, that the German clergy of the time, whose bishops were princes first, and, in not a few instances, princes first, last, and all the time—men who too often did not watch over their flocks and their pastors—were far less worthy men than the German clergy of to-day. On the other hand, we should not forget that opportunity makes thieves. Many of these men, in other more peaceful days, with no Luther and Carlstadt issuing trumpet call after trumpet call to monks and nuns, summoning them to cast aside their promises and break their vows, might have lived in honest obscurity, instead of becoming firebrands of scandal and preachers

---

<sup>1</sup> Paulsen, *l. c.*, p. 51.

of sedition. On the whole, then, whilst admitting many abuses, it is safe not to place implicit trust in the unblushing accusers of the Von Hutten type, and to make great allowance even when we read the invectives of honest satirists and zealous preachers.

Protestant historians of the past have generally represented the "Reformation" as a movement that swept over England and Germany like a whirlwind; the word "whirlwind" hardly did justice to the rapidity of the movement. It leaped from end to end of Germany like an electric flash. Reading these writers, you fancied the whole German and English peoples, standing like hungry birdlings, anxious to be fed with the pap of the new and pure "gospel." It was a heart-moving picture: it was more, it was an appeal to the jury on the *vox populi vox Dei* principle. In these days of universal suffrage, who could doubt that the "Reformers" were right, when they had the majority? But unluckily the muse of history cannot be won with sentimental imagery. She brushes the pictures away like cobwebs and probes the facts. And what are the facts? "The Reformation" (in England), says Prof. Brewer, "did not owe its origin to Tyndale or to Parliament, to the corruptions of the clergy or the oppression of the ecclesiastical courts. There is no reason to believe that the nation as a body was discontented with the old religion. Facts point to the opposite conclusion. Had it been so, Mary, whose attachment to the faith of her mother was well known, would never have been permitted to mount the throne or have found the task comparatively easy, seeing that the Reformers under Edward VI. had been suffered to have their own way unchecked and to displace from power and influence all who opposed their religious principles. Long down into the reign of Elizabeth, according to the testimony of a modern historian, the old faith still numbered a majority of adherents in England. The experiment would have been hazardous at any time from Henry VIII. to the Spanish invasion if a plebiscite could have been impartially taken of the religious sentiments of the people. This rooted attachment to the old faith and the difficulty everywhere experienced by the Government and the bishops in weaning the clergy and their flocks from their ancient tendencies, is a sufficient proof that it was not unpopular."<sup>1</sup>

"I think," says Bishop Stubbs, "that after what I have said, you will allow me to say that I have grounds for believing that Henry VIII. was the master, and in no sense the minister, of his people; that where he carried their good (?) will with him, it was by forcing, not by anticipating or even educating it. I am obliged altogether to reject the notion that he was the interpreter in any

---

<sup>1</sup> Brewer, "The Reign of Henry VIII.," vol. ii., p. 469.

sense of the wishes of his people; the utmost that he did in this direction was to manipulate and utilize their prejudices to his own purposes."<sup>1</sup> At the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, after Henry VIII. had used both force and money to wean his nobles and people from their allegiance to Rome, after the Protector Somerset and the other statesmen of Edward VI. had striven by hook or crook to make England Protestant, after Mary's short and in many respects unfortunate reign, "in number the laity, who preferred the mass to the prayer-book, and perhaps the Pope to the Queen as a spiritual head, have been reckoned at nearly two-thirds of the whole population."<sup>2</sup>

In Germany, the birth-place of the "Reformation," Luther's innovations were by no means received by the people with universal acclaim. Luther himself was fully aware of this. He did not abolish the Mass at once: not even in the electorate of Saxony, where he was permitted by the Elector to wield almost unbounded power in religious affairs. He bade the preachers omit the words in the Canon and Collect that implied a sacrifice. "But the priest may omit this readily, without its being noticed by the common people, and without giving scandal."<sup>3</sup> So Luther in 1526. "During a visitation held in the districts of Borma and Tenneberg in January, 1526, by order of the Elector of Saxony, it became apparent how Lutheranism, at that time, had made far from general progress. In Tenneberg, which included twelve parishes, not a single clergyman preached 'the Gospel,' *i.e.*, Luther's doctrine. Only an odd parish desired a change in the sense of the Reformers."<sup>4</sup> In 1528 Melancthon made an official visitation of Thüringen. He found the people attached neither to the new doctrine nor to its preachers. "We see," he wrote in 1528, "how the people hate us."<sup>5</sup> In 1530 things had not improved. Luther's father lay critically ill at Mansfeld; the son was anxious, consoled his father, but dared not visit him, fearing the people might kill him. "I am exceedingly anxious," he wrote to his father, "to come to see you in person; but my good friends have advised against it and dissuaded me, and I, myself, was forced to think that I must not risk danger and tempt God, for you know how lords and peasants love me." The people were still so devoted to the old Church that Luther maintained: "Were I willing, I am easily

<sup>1</sup> W. Stubbs, "On the Study of Mediæval and Modern History," p. 289.

<sup>2</sup> T. G. Lows in the *English Historical Review*, vol. i., p. 514.

<sup>3</sup> Luther, *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 28, p. 304-5, quoted by Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, iii., p. 62.

<sup>4</sup> Janssen, *l. c.* iii., p. 56.

<sup>5</sup> Janssen, *l. c.*, p. 64.

confident that I could, by two or three sermons, preach back my people into popery and establish new pilgrimages and masses." "I know for certain that here in Wittenberg there are hardly ten that I could not mislead, were I willing to practise again such holiness as I practised in popery, when I was a monk."<sup>1</sup> Even in 1535 Luther and "the Saxon theologians would not concede the demand of the Zwinglian preachers to do away with the Elevation, the Mass vestments and the altar candles, because they feared thereby to call forth excitement among the people."<sup>2</sup> About the religious feeling in Brunswick two official Lutheran visitors wrote to Bugenhagen in 1543: "In all churches and country parishes, though lying near each other, each one wishes to teach and administer the sacrament after his own head and fashion. Many parsons complain that the people will not go to the Lord's supper, nay contemn sermons and sacraments, and say publicly: the parsons are not at one about the Gospel, why should we heed them? I will hold to my old faith."<sup>3</sup> "The greatest part of the people," said Court-preacher Hieronymus Rauscher of Amberg in 1552, "in deep sorrow, turns its eyes to Godless popery, foams and gabbles at all times: 'Since the new doctrine began its course, there has been no luck and happiness in the world: people grow worse, not better, in consequence of evangelical preaching.' Even a generation later Preacher George Steinhart, at Ottersdorf, heard people say: "Ah! Away with this doctrine! Under the Pope's rule things went well, those were good times, and we had all things in plenty; but since the Gospel sprang up, leaves and grass, luck, rain, and blessings have disappeared."<sup>4</sup> In the Netherlands things looked very ill for the "Godly" undertaking of the house of Nassau; every effort was made to Calvinize the Provinces, but met with little success. "Of the general states and the noblest of the land," wrote Count John (of Nassau), on March 13th, 1578, to Count William of Hesse. "no one has hitherto publicly declared for 'religion,' nor seriously worked for it; of the people only now and then the poor common man."<sup>5</sup>

In England, Germany, Holland, we see, there was no violent hunger after the "new gospel," and yet these three countries were the birthplace, the home and the hot-bed of the "Reformers," "Where Protestantism was an idea only," says Bishop Stubbs, "as in Spain and Italy, it was crushed out by the Inquisition; where, in conjunction with political power and sustained by ecclesiastical

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Janssen, *l. c.* iii., p. 188.

<sup>2</sup> Janssen, *l. c.* iii., pp. 494-5.

<sup>3</sup> Janssen, *l. c.* v., p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Janssen, *l. c.* iii., p. 355.

<sup>5</sup> Janssen, *l. c.* iii., p. 702.

confiscation, it became a physical force, there it was lasting. It is not a pleasant view to take of the doctrinal changes, to see that where the movement toward it was pure and unworldly, it failed; where it was seconded by territorial greed and political animosity, it succeeded."<sup>1</sup>

How unfounded was Luther's assertion that before his day little preaching was done, we have shown in the article on the "Myths of the Middle Ages," published in the October number of the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY*, last year (p. 604). The lack of preaching could not have caused the "Reformation" and its spread. Indeed, it is far from true that, even at the beginning of the "Reformation" there was everywhere more preaching of the new faith than there had been of the old. In Germany and Holland, no doubt, there was no lack of preachers damning the Pope and the Papists up and down, and the Protestant dissidents down and up; if damning up and down was preaching the new faith, the new faith was abundantly preached. In England, however, "what contrasts strangely with the reforming movement in Germany," says the *Saturday Review*, "so far from any pains being taken to present the new doctrine to the people, the pulpit stood silent, *partly by order*, as well as from lack of preachers. The Council ordered the bishops to prevent a thing so inconsistent as the preaching of itinerant ministers, and even the licensed preachers, of whom there were very few, were forbidden to discourse except on certain fixed days. Bucer complained that there were parishes where no sermon had been preached for years. Whether from distrust of the clergy, or from a desire to keep the mass of the people in ignorance of the real nature of the religious innovations being forced upon them with a high hand till all was over, preaching was in every way discountenanced or suppressed, so that in truth the great destitution of preaching, *which the Reformation produced*, was the main cause of the beginning of English Dissent."<sup>2</sup>

"But, perhaps," says the same writer, "what will most startle those who have been used to take a rose-colored view, we do not say of the 'Reformation'—that largely depends upon religious convictions—but of the English 'Reformers,' is the evidence here produced of the unscrupulous tyranny and obscurantism of their whole method of procedure. . . . What is curious, and will to many readers be a surprise, is that every means was taken by those in authority, as though of deliberate intent, to discourage learning

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Stubbs, "Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History," p. 233.

<sup>2</sup> *Saturday Review*, July 3d, 1886, p. 22, in an article on Rev. R. W. Dixon's "History of the Church of England."

and foster ignorance, alike in the higher classes and among the masses of the people. Thus, to begin with the two universities, a royal commission visited them in 1549, which, under pretence of reforming, went far to destroy them altogether, and Oxford and Cambridge seemed in danger of actually sharing the fate of the monasteries. Ridley, whose name stood on both commissions, attempted some ineffectual resistance, but was easily overborne. . . . Dr. Cox, Chancellor of Oxford, who was on the commission, won with too good reason the unenviable nickname of Cancellor of the University! Under his auspices whole libraries at Oxford were destroyed; 'a cart load of manuscript on theology and the sciences,' from Merton, and 'great heaps of books from Balliol, Queen's, Exeter, and Lincoln' were publicly burnt in the market-place. Meanwhile the choristers and grammar-school boys of the different College schools at both universities were turned out and the schools themselves suppressed."

In Germany, we know of no equally wanton destruction of books and schools. Still the effects of the "Reformation" movement were equally fatal to learning and education. As early as 1526, the Saxon visitors report the almost universal destruction of the parish schools in electoral Saxony.<sup>1</sup> The younger humanists had hailed Luther as a saviour and welcomed his revolt. "Before long," says Paulsen, "the young humanists, who just then so gaily accompanied Luther to the war, and considered Erasmus as a timid old man, were disappointed. As early as 1524 even the dullest had their eyes opened. The universities and schools almost came to nothing amidst the tempests of the religious struggle." It is instructive to look at a few details. "The university of Erfurt was the only one of the German universities which adopted the new doctrine; it was also the first that was undone by it. . . . After 1523 immatriculation stopped altogether; the university almost ceased to exist. . . . In 1524 the Erfurt town-council cut down the salary of the rector of the university, Eobanus Hessus, and in 1526 he went to Nuremberg. He returned in 1533, but the university never regained its strength; after wasting for 300 years it died." At the beginning Melanchthon's Greek lectures at Wittenberg were crowded; in 1524 four attended his lectures on Demosthenes; in 1527 the attendance was less; in that year, however, the plague drove Melanchthon to Jena. Leipzig suffered greatly; Frankfort on the Oder died out entirely between 1520-30, partly because of the religious troubles, partly in consequence of the plague. At Rostock the number of students sank rapidly after 1523; in 1529 not a single matriculation; from 1530-36 the university was practically dead. In a report of 1530 the council of the university

<sup>1</sup> Janssen, *Gesch. des deutschen Volkes*, iii., p. 63.

pronounced the Martinian, *i.e.*, Lutheran faction to be the cause. At Greifswald no matriculants between 1525 and 1539. At Cologne the number of matriculations fell from 3-400 to between 36 and 96 in 1527-43. About 1515 Vienna matriculated 600 per year; in 1530 the whole number of students was 30. The university records, as early as 1522, claim that the cause of the decline is that the Lutheran sect advises against studies and the taking of degrees. At Heidelberg there were more professors than students, whilst at Basel the university was suspended in 1529. In both universities the "Reformation" was charged with their ruin. Ingolstadt, which under the leadership of Eck destroyed every trace of the *virus Lutheranism*, fared best. The average of the matriculations from 1518-1550 was 136, only 36 less than in the period immediately preceding.<sup>1</sup> "The same decline appeared in the lower schools."<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Dixon's as well as Paulsen's statements are based on the most careful original research. They show not only what the religious revolution of the sixteenth century did to destroy, but what the Church of the Middle Ages had done to build up, learning. All the universities mentioned, besides others in Italy, France, Poland, had been founded by Catholic princes or cities, and none without the co-operation of the Pope.

That Luther, so to say, rediscovered the Bible, that he first translated it into German, that before him little preaching was done in the vernacular, that the "Reformation" was a popular movement, that it promoted learning and literature,—all these well-worn assertions modern research has pronounced to be myths. There remain a few claims and statements which, while they do not, like the foregoing, assail the Church, are nevertheless interesting. They illustrate Lutheran hero-worship, and show how dangerous it is to accept without careful critical examination many points of Protestant tradition, no matter how often and how confidently repeated. They are legends that grew up not all in Luther's day, but many of them much later, perhaps as late as after the Thirty Years' War. Indeed, in some cases, Luther's own writings refute the claims made for him by his admirers. The first of these legends is the story that Luther closed his speech before the Diet of Worms in 1521 with the memorable words: "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise." Again and again they have called forth the admiration of Protestant writers; again and again they have been praised as the expression of the Reformer's manly and earnest determination. Like the famous *e pur si muove* of Galileo, however, Luther's heroic expression turns out to be unhistorical. This was

<sup>1</sup> These details are taken from Paulsen, *Gesch. des gelehrten Unterrichts*, p. 138 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Paulsen, *l. c.*, p. 143.



proved by Burkhardt, a Protestant, in the "Theologische Studien und Kritiken" (1869, p. 517-31).<sup>1</sup> Burkhardt's proposition is confirmed by Balan, who, in his *Monumenta Reformationis Lutheranae*, gives the contemporary report of Luther's speech. It does not contain the famous traditional words.

That Luther invented the new high-German language, is a legend which has been repeated even quite recently over the names of such men as Von Treitschke, Mommsen, Droysen, and Virchow. Luther himself says quite the reverse, and his words are confirmed by the best authorities on the history of the German language, such as the brothers Wilhelm and Jakob Grimm. "In reply to the question, whence Luther took this language" (the German of his Bible and other writings), says Osthoff, "he himself informs us that 'he uses no particular or peculiar language in German,' *i.e.*, no special dialect, but 'the language of the Saxon Chancery,' which is used by all the kings and princes of Germany."<sup>2</sup> Latin ceased to be used for documentary purposes in the first half of the fourteenth century. For some time thereafter the dialect of each principality was used in its official papers. Under Karl IV. and Wenzel (1347-1400), of the Luxemburg-Bohemian line, the Imperial Chancery used a language based on the German spoken at Prague, but modified; this was gradually adopted in upper and central Germany. In the second half of the fifteenth century the Saxon Chancery gradually discarded the words peculiar to central Germany, and used only such as were common to central and upper Germany. The accession of Frederick the Wise (1485), according to the latest researches, marks the time when the approximation of the language used by the Saxon Chancery to that used by the Imperial Chancery was carried out. "The language, therefore, which Luther introduced into general literary and private use as that of the Saxon Chancery, did not differ from the language of the documents spread by Maximilian I. and his secretaries throughout the Empire. . . . Luther did not create the unity of German speech as if by a single stroke. Only the first firm and lasting foundation thereof was laid by him and the Reformation. For a long time after in low-German countries, low-German was spoken in pulpit, school, and court. The Bible, catechism, and hymn-book were even translated from Luther's text into the several dialects. On Catholic Germany, the larger half of the Empire, the effect of Luther's language as well as of the Reformation itself was slight. And Luther's language, in spite of its universalizing tendency, was still too provincial, nay too individually colored, to be fitted to be

<sup>1</sup> Cited in *Geschichtslügen*, p. 432.

<sup>2</sup> Osthoff, *Schriftsprache und Volksmundart*, p. 4.

a universal means of communication, to become the natural German written and book language, without further changes."<sup>1</sup>

Another flower which Luther's admirers have striven to weave into the legendary chaplet of his fame, is that he was the father of German congregational singing. But one by one the petals have fallen from the flower, and to-day it is uncertain whether more than five or six hymns, and whether a single one of the melodies formerly ascribed to him, can justly and fully be called his. Luther was fond of singing and music, but he himself never claimed to have written and composed all the hymns published in his hymn-book. In the preface to the edition of 1535, he says: "Now follow some sacred songs made by our forefathers (*von den alten gemacht*). These old songs we have taken with us as a testimony of some pious Christians that lived before our time in the great darkness of false doctrine, that it may be seen how there have always been people who rightly knew Christ and by God's grace were miraculously preserved in this knowledge." In the preface to his book of "Christian song, Latin and German, for burial," published in 1542, Luther says: "We have also taken as a good example the fine *musica*, or songs, which were used in popery at vigils, requiems, and burials, had some printed in this book, and in time will take more of them. The song and the notes are beautiful; it were pity, should they perish. As in all other points they (the Catholics) far excel us, have the finest divine service, fine, glorious convents and monasteries. . . . so, too, they have in truth much splendid music or song, especially in the monasteries and parishes." Notwithstanding Luther's own clear words, it became a legend among German Protestants that he first introduced German hymns in the divine service. Many Protestants believe in this legend to the present day; not a few writers continue to repeat it even now. Still, as early as 1784, General Superintendent Bernhart, of Stuttgart, saw the folly of this claim. "How could so busy a man," he says, "have taken up the writing of songs, composition, and notes? A man who held an office at the university, published numerous writings, and was overwhelmed with questions, letters and opinions from all quarters. Luther in his first hymn-book (1524) made only the first hymn, which bears his name. The rest were composed by Sperato and some unknown writers." Schauer, also a Protestant, reduced the number of original hymn-texts written by Luther to six. The others are paraphrases of the Psalms, modifications of old German hymns, and translations from the Latin of such hymns as the *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, the *Te Deum*, etc. Even the most famous of all, "*Eine veste Burg ist unser*

<sup>1</sup> Osthoff, *Schriftsprache und Volksmundart*, pp. 4-7.

*Gott*," "A tower of strength our God doth stand," is only a paraphrase of the 46th Psalm.

As a hymn composer, Luther has fared even worse than as a text writer. In the eighteenth century he was regarded as the writer of all the hymn-book melodies; historical investigation gradually despoiled him of air after air, until only three melodies were left to his credit. But now W. Bäumker has shown that there is good reason to doubt his authorship of even these three, and Bäumker is endorsed by some of the best musical authorities in Germany. We shall content ourselves with citing the opinion of the non-Catholic editor of the *Allgemeine Deutsche Musik-Zeitung*, Herr Otto Lessmann: "In addition to Luther's other great qualities, tradition has attributed to him great creative power in music; but after the results of the latest Luther researches, the old legend of Luther's importance as a composer may be referred to the realm of inventions. Positive proof of Luther's authorship of a single choral melody does not exist. Even the most important of the hymns ascribed to Luther, that song so full of strength and splendor, '*Eine feste Burg*' ('A tower of strength our God doth stand'), which is said to have been written and composed by Luther at Coburg, in 1530, can hardly be regarded as his intellectual property—as far as the music goes, if we believe a manuscript note of the Reformer on one of his '*Stimmbücher*.' The author of this melody is probably Luther's friend, Cantor Johann Walther of Torgau. He presented to 'the dear man of God' a manuscript collection of sacred songs, in which exists the first copy of that grand melody. . . . Probably Luther's work as a hymn composer consisted in providing new texts for old Catholic church hymns and fitting some of the melodies to his songs. It is notorious that a series of the hymns ascribed to Luther existed long before the Reformation, as, e.g., the melodies, '*Gott sei gelobet und gebenedeiet*,' '*Komm heilger Geist*,' '*Herre Gott*,' '*Mitten wir im Leben sind*,' '*Gelobet seist du Jesu Christ*,' and others, which in 'the choral books' of Kuhnau and Gebhard are set down as certainly written by Luther. Some melodies of Luther's hymn-book were borrowed by Luther without a change, in others the alteration from pre-Lutheran Latin hymns can be shown, as, e.g., the melody '*Jesus Christus unser Heiland*' is manifestly taken from an old pilgrimage song, '*In Gottes Namen fahren wir*,' which occurs in Oleari's third Hymn-Book of 1525, and as late as 1610 in a collection of old Catholic hymns published at Cologne. The melody, '*Der du bist drei in Einigkeit*,' is an old song, '*O lux beata Trinitas*' and the two melodies '*Christum wir sollen loben schon*,' and, '*Komme Gott Schöpfer, heilger Geist*,' are adaptations of the Latin hymns, '*A solis ortus cardine*' and '*Veni Sancte*

*Spiritus.*' The hymns '*Nun komm der Heiden Heiland,*' and '*Herr Gott, dich loben wir,*' may easily be traced back to the hymns, '*Veni Redemptor gentium*' and '*Te Deum laudamus.*'"<sup>1</sup>

Thus has historical research dealt with the legends of Luther and the Reformation. In the face of these results it was natural that even men born and trained in the Protestant faith should doubt the benefits and necessity of Luther's schism. "Could not the Church have been reformed from within?" asks Prof. Paulsen. "The attempts in the fifteenth century to reform the clergy and the monasteries had not been as unsuccessful as is often asserted. Might not the abuses in church government and worship (*Kultus*) have been put down without breaking up the unity of the Church? The use of spiritual powers for secular purposes, probably the worst among all the evils of the Church, depended perhaps not so much on the nature of the institution as on certain transient political conditions. . . . It would be foolish, also, to maintain that without Luther's intervention things would have remained as they were. Humanism would have continued its action; 'barbarism' would have been banished by 'culture,' and 'culture' would not have been the result. The historico-philological and mathematico-physical investigations started by humanism would have gone on and produced their results. The Church would have cherished in her bosom the new sciences as she had cherished the old, and all the wretched struggle against science, in which the Church has wasted her strength, would not have taken place. The peace which existed between the hierarchy and science up to the outbreak of the Church revolution would have continued, and the historical development of man would have gone forward more easily and more gradually."<sup>2</sup>

What inference must be drawn from our study of the results of modern historical science? That the Church and the Papacy have reason to fear true scientific and impartial historical criticism and research? that their safety lies in darkness and concealment? On the contrary, our study leads us to infer that Leo XIII. knew thoroughly what he was saying when he maintained that history is "one of the arms most fit to defend the Church." Already modern historical science has tracked and run down many errors and fables; already it has confuted many slanders and scattered much prejudice; already it has surrounded the Church with a halo of glory to which even non-Catholics cannot close their eyes. History, profane and ecclesiastical, as we have said above, does not directly attack or defend the essentials or main sup-

<sup>1</sup> Allg.; Deutsche Musik-Zeitung, November 9th, 1883,—Luther und die Musik—for the fourth centenary of Luther by Otto Lessmann, quoted in *Geschichtslügen*, p. 353.

<sup>2</sup> Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts*, p. 132.

ports of the Church ; these are in the hands of theology. But history has great power to open men's eyes and to dispel their prejudices. Review the roll of eminent historians that have been led back to the Church by their studies. Ekkard, Voigt, Hurter, Gfrörer, Onno Klopp, Schlosser, Bowden, the Stevensons, occur to our memory without effort. Bear in mind the powerful impression produced by Janssen's "History of the German People," the many conversions reported to have been wrought by it. Nor need we wonder at these effects. The hate of Rome and the Church has always been as much the product of political defamation as of religious invective, of politics as of bigotry. Read the history of Henry VIII. and his minister, Cromwell, of Elizabeth, of Philip of Hesse, of Maurice of Saxony. Do they impress us as religious zealots, or as astute ambitious politicians? Read the history of the Thirty Years' War; are Wallenstein, Richelieu, Mansfeld, Gustavus Adolphus, Oxenstierna, types of self-denying apostles, disinterested missionaries, or even of religious enthusiasts? Give us rather Amru and Omar; their deeds have at least a ring of honest, if brutal, fanaticism; but the heroes of the Thirty Years, the Wallensteins and the Mansfelds, will impose on no one who does not wish to be deceived. And yet perhaps nothing has created deeper religious hate in Germany than this dreadful war. Before the Thirty Years' War, Canisius and his Jesuit brethren brought whole towns and districts back to the old faith; before the war, as we have seen, though sixty years after Luther's revolt, the people sighed for the good old faith and the good old times; after that deadly struggle there is nothing but bitterness and hate. Again in England, before the great Spanish Armada, two-thirds of all England were still Catholic; afterwards there remain only scattered remnants in a few counties. Now, therefore, that historians are gradually feeling the dignity and lofty mission of their science, and see that it is one thing to be a religious or national pamphleteer, another to be a true votary of Clio, the much abused Church of Rome, as the results hitherto obtained show, will reap the benefits of the change. True, it will take years for the truth revealed by scholars to percolate down to the masses or even to the ordinary teachers of the masses. Many a pulpit will hereafter reverberate with threshed out lies; many a godly but ignorant journal will continue to diffuse long refuted error. But even now better informed journals, more carefully compiled school-books, blush to sully their pages with all the antiquated trash; they do honor to the truth; they teach their readers how their fathers and grandfathers were fooled and gulled in many particulars. Even this partial acknowledgment of the truth, this partial rejection of oft repeated historical falsehoods, will teach their readers not to

take on trust every silly statement, every outrageous attack on Rome and "Romanism."

In face of results so useful, so favorable to the Church, historical science has a double claim on the attention and the respect of Catholics. They should love and cultivate it, because, as the Holy Father says, it is a witness to the truth and because it is a means most fit to defend the Church. Much, very much, remains to be done in this field. Most of the work that has relieved the Church of her odium, and awarded to her the credit that is justly her due, has been done by non-Catholics. Much of it can be found only in learned periodicals or voluminous publications, unfit for general reading. If we look into the historical reading available to the English reading Catholic, the demand, we find, is far greater than the supply. Lingard's great work is the one historical classic of which we may be proud. More than fifty years have passed since it was written; still, only a few years ago a non-Catholic firm found it profitable to publish a new edition of this ten-volume work, finer and more attractive than any previous edition. How eloquent a testimony to its worth! Brilliant writers like Macaulay and Froude have been found wanting; but Lingard enjoys the respect of Catholic and Protestant. On Church history we have the translations of Darras, of Alzog, and of Brueck, and they have supplied a crying want. But where is the English reading Catholic to go for the history of France, Germany, and Italy, the great continental European peoples whose history is the marrow of modern European history, the peoples whose history has been especially made the weapon of attack against the Papacy and the Church? There is hardly a comprehensive non-Catholic English history of these nations, nothing but monographs and fragments. Catholic works, deserving the name of history, are wholly lacking. It is precisely this condition of things that protects and prolongs the life of many an effete slander. Here, then, is a glorious field for Catholic scholars. Let them master the last results of recent research, let them analyze them carefully, let them, as the Holy Father says, dread to state an untruth, let them not fear to state the truth, and they will do yeoman's service to the Church and to their countrymen. They will have great advantages. In studying the history of pre-"Reformation" times, they will look at them, so to say, from within. A great effort must be made by the most honest non-Catholic to appreciate justly those times and their spirit; he is as far removed from them as England is from China. The Catholic, on the other hand, is much nearer to the Middle Ages, nearer, that is to say, to their religious and moral spirit. And after all, on the morality and the religion of a nation or an age, must its history chiefly hinge. Art has its glories,

learning its fame, science its grandeur; but art, and science, and learning without morality and religion cannot secure the prosperity of nations, nor stay their downfall. So the Catholic historian has a great advantage in dealing with pre-"Reformation" times, and this is often silently acknowledged by non-Catholic scholars. Let Catholic scholars, then, profit by these advantages. Let them fill up the gaps in English historical literature. Let them work in the spirit of Leo XIII., guided by the love of truth; filled with charity and moderation, let them state facts with vigor, but without venom. If they will thus set forth historic truth, they will reap the respect of all truth-lovers, Catholic and non-Catholic; they will overturn many prejudices against the Church that are already tottering, and will contribute most effectively to defend the Church.

So much for Catholic historical scholars. The layman, on his side, once he realizes the importance of history, once he clearly sees how much it can do to promote the cause of truth and religion, and to place the Church in her proper light before his non-Catholic fellow-citizens, will not fail in his duty. He will himself, no doubt, become an earnest reader of history, and will strive to interest his children in this attractive and useful, we may almost say necessary, branch of learning. He will aid and encourage historical workers, not only with his purse, but, what is more important, with his appreciation. He will help them to rescue from oblivion the noble deeds of unsung heroes and patriots and the past glories of the Church. He will learn again and again the lesson that cannot be too often taught, that all true greatness, whether in Church or State, must have its foundation in morality and religion. In fine, he will find in history new reasons to cherish and admire his Mother Church, that has done so much for mankind.

---