

said Mr. Gladstone, "out of the history of England, and the history of England becomes a chaos without order, without life, without meaning." Leave the Church of England where she is, support her, enrich her, enable her to reform, to carry on her noble work, unhindered and unimpeded, and you will retain the history of England an intelligent whole, and keep the nation alive to its spiritual birthright, with its face set towards the golden spot in the distance, and its heart atuned to that

"One far-off Divine event
Towards which the whole Creation moves."



Anglo- and Roman Catholic Responsibility for Truth.

BY G. G. COULTON, M.A.

THE popular conception of extreme High Churchmen as crypto-Romanists, however unjust, is really fostered by many of those who are loudest in their complaints. The attachment of certain ritualists to Roman uses, as such (including certain customs which have neither antiquity nor piety to recommend them), revolts even the majority of their own party. These extremists, moreover, as their principles draw them necessarily far closer to the Romanist than to the Nonconformist, are likewise tempted to follow the Romanist policy of setting "authority" above facts, which is simply the frank medieval preference of "edification" to veracity. Canon Rashdall's scathing phrase, "their appalling indifference to truth," will not seem too strong to any unprejudiced reader who labours to track the "Church Times" through some of its devious ways. With all its ability and fairness in many cases, that journal frequently commissions, and shields from open criticism, articles of startling unveracity. It hesitates no more than the "Tablet" to burke the plainest documentary evidence; while an article may appear to-day in the Anglican organ, and to-morrow as a

“Catholic Truth Society” pamphlet.¹ Moreover, both parties make the same unfair use of the anonymous press. The editor of the “Tablet” quotes from the “Saturday Review” as from the impartial judgment of an outsider, though he knows all the time that the unsigned article conceals a bitter Romanist controversialist. And an attentive reader can scarcely avoid the conviction that the anonymous F.S.A. of the “Church Times” and the Catholic Truth Society is identical with a critic who carries the same views and the same style into the pages of the “Athenæum.” Nor is he the only critic who is allowed to carry on a similar campaign under the shelter of that journal, the secular character of which ought to guarantee its impartiality. Nearly all its reviews of Church history are characterized by great unfairness. The advantage of anonymity is exploited to the utmost, facts and references are seldom given, nor does the editor admit even a few lines of protest when these are falsely given. Moreover, such references are not usually to contemporary documents, but to modern authorities, some of whom have little claim to distinction beyond the fact that they are also favourites with the “Church Times” and “Tablet.” One of these, however, is a writer of real eminence, Dr. James Gairdner; and, if here again I discuss one of his conclusions, it is only because these anonymous reviewers persist in confounding their own cause with his.

Let me give two specimens from the “Athenæum”; not as the worst—far from it—but as the most recent. On December 11 appeared a review of Mr. M. W. Patterson’s “History of the Church of England.” The reviewer’s main gravamen against the author is this: that he treats again, on the same scale, a subject already treated thirteen years ago by Wakeman; and that the present book, though written “carefully, judiciously,

¹ “The Suppression of the Monasteries” (Catholic Truth Society; one penny). The preface says: “The author is a well-known antiquary, who writes under the initials F.S.A., and it is thought that an estimate of the work of Henry VIII., coming as it does from an Anglican source, may carry weight with some who are unwilling to accept the testimony of Roman Catholics.” This pamphlet began life in the columns of the “Church Times.”

accurately," is less vigorous and enthusiastic than its predecessor. Wakeman was a very strong and extreme High Churchman, and vigour comes easily to a declared partisan. But to imply that the past thirteen years have disclosed no fresh facts of importance in Church history, and left no excuse for an impartial writer to cover the same ground again, is to betray either great ignorance or great prejudice. And when, after a paragraph of generalities, the reviewer descends for once to particulars, he is still more unfortunate. Tyndale's translation of the Bible restored to their literal sense certain words which had been mistranslated in the Vulgate. To choose, perhaps, the most flagrant instance: the Vulgate had altered the Greek *μετανοεῖν* into *pœnitentiam agere*, and thus perverted an inward change of mind into an outward doing of penance. Mr. Patterson naturally regrets that a scholar like Dr. Gairdner should condemn Tyndale for a change so imperative in itself, and so unreservedly approved by modern scholarship. This regret the "Athenæum" reviewer loftily condemns as a "temerarious assault," in which Mr. Patterson has only shown his own ignorance. No details or vouchers are given; if the readers had been allowed a glimpse of the facts, they would simply have laughed the reviewer out of court. "Catholic Truth" no more admits of historical argument in the pages of the "Athenæum" than in the "Tale of a Tub." A certain historian disagrees with Mr. Patterson. That historian "is a good man; he is a safe man; he is one of Us!" therefore Mr. Patterson is temerarious and ignorant. Yet Dr. Gairdner would be the last man to claim or enjoy this role of infallibility; he always thinks and writes with the modesty of a true scholar. Even in his latest publication, after admitting in the face of criticism that "there are faults all through the book," he makes very important retractations, which the "Athenæum" characteristically ignores. This brings me to my second point.

Having had for many years a strong interest in the monastic question, further quickened by the discovery in 1901 that Abbot Gasquet had no references to give for some of his most

important statements, and had given misleading references for others, I have been specially interested in the attitude of the "Athenæum" on this question. For some years it has gone strangely out of its way, not only to bolster up the monastic legend, but to vituperate those students who are trying to thresh out the real contemporary evidence and get at the facts. There was once a long disquisition on the subject, full of gross and easily verifiable misstatements, under the heading of "Fine Arts." This time I sent a brief protest, which, of course, was ignored. Another time a reviewer appealed to a MS. document among the Canterbury archives. I wrote asking him to give me, without prejudice to his anonymity, the briefest reference enabling me to look this document up: here again I got no answer. Meanwhile the same tirades, bolstered up with the same falsehoods and often bearing internal evidence of their connection with the "Church Times," appear regularly three or four times a year in the "Athenæum." The latest of these (would that it might be the last!) appeared on December 25, in a review of Mr. Jennings's "The Medieval Church and the Papacy." "Nor is there" (writes the critic) "any known evidence, beyond the vague generalities constantly reiterated, and once again enunciated by Mr. Jennings, to support the view that there was *a general decadence of the monastic standard towards the end of their days in England.*"¹ On the contrary, a distinctly opposite opinion is maintained by such competent students as Dr. Gairdner and Dr. Jessopp, as the result of their wide researches." It would be possible, I think, to find at least half a dozen parallels to this sentence, almost in the same words, within the last three or four volumes of the "Athenæum"; and it is really worth while at last to carry the case into a court where the real evidence may be discussed. With regard to Dr. Jessopp, the reviewer evidently refers only to his inaccurate edition of the Norwich Visitations, and knows nothing of his "Penny History" (S.P.C.K.), on p. 54

¹ Throughout this article, the italics by which contradictory statements are emphasized are my own.

of which Dr. Jessopp writes of the fifteenth century : " Among all classes the conviction was growing silently, but surely, that during the centuries that had passed since the Norman Conquest the monastic system had developed as a parasitic growth upon the Church, and that the Church could do without the monasteries." Again, he has not even read with care Dr. Gairdner's histories, which do not bear out his appeal. And, thirdly, he entirely ignores the article in the " Nineteenth Century and After " for July, 1909, in which Dr. Gairdner confesses to a significant change of views in the face of documentary evidence. " I fear," he writes, " that there is much to be said about the state of matters in a considerable number of monasteries, to show that they were no good schools of delicacy or chastity ;" and again, as if to give the lie direct to these parasites who would fain find a refuge in him from the verdict of medieval documents : " I must confess that my treatment of monasticism is exceedingly defective. . . . First, I feel that I should have said something about *such a well-known fact as the decline of monasticism before Henry VIII.'s time.*" It is not likely that the " Athenæum " reviewer, even if he should discover Dr. Gairdner's true views, would desist from his steady ignoring of the truth. In a journal which admits no protest on the point, he can safely go on quoting Dr. Gairdner as chief authority for statements which Dr. Gairdner himself would reprobate. The most successful policy for a controversialist who writes from an established position is to retract nothing. In this, the reviewer need only follow the steps of the master at whose feet he has evidently learned the monastic legend—Dr. Gasquet, Abbot President of the English Benedictines.

Space would fail me to enumerate even briefly one quarter of the patent misstatements, exploded by plain documentary evidence, which have been, not only not retracted, but even boldly republished without justification or apology by this Romanist champion, " our only historian," to quote a phrase from the " Manchester Guardian." I have already exposed

several of these in the first, sixth, and seventh of my "Medieval Studies."¹ Let me here quote two from a quite different field. In the "Dublin Review" of 1894 he printed an article designed to prove that the so-called Wycliffite translation of the Bible was really an ancient Catholic version, the credit for which had been usurped by Protestantism. This essay was answered by Dr. F. G. Kenyon, Mr. F. D. Matthew, and the "Church Quarterly" (October, 1900, and January, 1901). Apart from many other errors sufficiently serious to shake any author's credit, it was shown that the Abbot had based his case upon three separate misstatements of fact very startling in themselves, quite indefensible when once pointed out, and yet almost essential to his argument. I need only quote the last of these; the others may be found in the "Church Quarterly."

Richard Hun was condemned for heresy in 1514, and a Bible taken from him which, as both Sir Thomas More and the Bishop of London testified, contained in its Prologue at least thirteen heretical articles. On this case Abbot Gasquet lays great stress. If the so-called "Wycliffite Bible" lacks these heretical articles, then there is at any rate some small presumption that it may be an orthodox pre-Wycliffite production—a presumption small enough in itself, but of desperate importance in default of better evidence. He therefore declares roundly: "We shall look in vain, in the edition of Wycliffite scriptures published by Forshall and Madden, for *any trace* of these errors." Yet, incredible as it may seem, the first of these articles stares us in the face at the very beginning of the Prologue, and the other twelve, one after the other, in the succeeding pages of that document. Nor are they difficult of recognition; they occur often in the very words in which the condemning Bishop summarized them! It is only necessary here to give the first article, from the very books to which the Abbot himself appeals; the rest are equally plain.

¹ Simpkin, Marshall and Co. No. 1, "The Monastic Legend," is published separately.

Article condemned in Hun's Heretical Bible (Foxe, "Acts and Monuments," ed. Townsend, iv. 186).

"First, The said book damneth all holy canons, calling them *ceremonies and statutes of sinful men and uncunning*, and calleth the pope *Satan*, and *Antichrist*."

The same article on p. 3 of the book in which Abbot Gasquet declares it is *not* to be found. (Forshall and Madden, "Wycliffite Versions," vol. i.).

"It semith opyn heresie to seie, that the gospel with his treuthe and fredom suffisith not to salvacioun of cristen men without keyping of *ceremonyes and statutis of sinful men and unkunmynge, that ben maad in the tyme of Sathanas and of Antecrist*."

After an exposure like this, men wondered what Abbot Gasquet would do. Would he continue to sell an essay which so plainly said the thing that is not? Would he not publicly admit that he had rested his case on a series of very strange blunders? On the contrary, he has not only continued to sell these unabashed misstatements, but has deliberately reprinted his essay twice since, down to the very last falsehood. In the preface to the last edition he regrets that he has had no time to write more on this subject, though he has discovered fresh (but unspecified) evidence in his own favour! Was it not Newman who complained that, after a discussion with Cardinal Manning, he scarcely knew whether he stood on his head or his heels?

The personal aspects of a case like this are inconsiderable; the real significance lies in its public aspect, and its bearing on the prospects of religion in general. For Abbot Gasquet has many accomplices in his own Church. Having frequently drawn public attention to other Roman Catholic controversialists who permit statements to go under their names which they must know to be false, I will give only one more example here.

Alzog, a distinguished German Catholic, wrote a Church history which was translated by two Catholic dignitaries, Pabisch and Byrne, and warmly recommended to the faithful by two Archbishops. The translators, in their preface, protest with perhaps suspicious emphasis that they have made every effort to render the original faithfully. Yet, in fact, they have not only permitted themselves numerous falsifications throughout the book, but at the end, when we come to the Vatican Council, they have perpetrated a deliberate literary fraud.

The German Catholic's frankness had often been inconvenient in former cases: here it was simply impossible. Alzog had tried to write, not Catholic truth, but the truth; and here the translators were compelled to cast aside all reserve. Quite apart from added footnotes (in which they might fairly have expressed their dissidence), they have interpolated into the actual text, without the least warning to the reader, pages and pages of their own writing, in a sense directly contrary to that of Alzog.¹ This would naturally result in a series of obvious discrepancies, which they have carefully removed by suppressing large quantities of the original text.² By dint of these wholesale interpolations, falsifications, and omissions, they produce the desired effect. Alzog had summed up dead against the Papal policy, and his translators turn him into an approver. The original and the translation might be printed separately as controversial pamphlets on opposite sides. It was a bold stroke. But "Catholic Truth" required it, the Archbishops of Cincinnati and Baltimore approved it, and the faithful have now got a Church history after their own heart. The Pope, if he had time to look into these things, might cry with Jeremiah: "A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land; the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so."

Yet the Pope himself is not altogether guiltless in the matter. However vicious the system, he might break through it if he turned his full energies that way. His present efforts, however well-meant, simply tend to foster the evil. If President Pabisch or Abbot Gasquet had supported pertinaciously the

¹ Alzog's own text contains roughly 11,000 words; the "translation" contains 18,000.

² Here is a specimen of these omissions (Alzog, 9th edit., vol. ii., p. 529: it is part of the formal and official declaration of the German Bishops to pacify those who were disquieted by the rumour that Infallibility was about to be proclaimed). "Never and never will even an Ecumenical Council proclaim doctrines which stand in contradiction with the first principles of justice, with the rights of the State and her authorities, with civilization, and with the true interests of science"! and so on for ten lines more. The omitted passages, quite apart from others which are deliberately garbled, number at least eleven, and would probably fill more than four pages of the *CHURCHMAN*.

modern critical view of the Pentateuch, for example, then they would certainly have been severely punished ; and the Pope's undoubted right by Canon Law to burn them would have been tempered only by mercy and expediency. Yet the one may publicly state that he has been conscientiously faithful to an author whom he has in fact deliberately falsified ; the other may in cold blood assure the public that they will vainly search the Wycliffite Bible for sentences which, in fact, he knows to be there. And their reward is not only popularity with the multitude, but the highest official recognition. So long as these things are written and approved under the Pope's eyes—if only he had eyes for them—so long will partisans like the "Church Times" and "Athenæum" critics continue to circulate this base historical coin.



Bishop Gore on the Ministry.¹

BY THE EDITOR.

AT the present day there is no Bishop, perhaps no Churchman, whose words are more generally and more carefully heeded than those of the Bishop of Birmingham, whether by men who agree with him or by men who do not. And when he tells us that his motive in writing the present book has been the frequency of the assertion that recent criticism "has weakened and rendered untenable the position that the episcopate is the necessary and divinely given link of continuity and cohesion in the Church universal," we give all the more earnest attention to what he writes because of the vital importance of the subject. This must be the justification, if any be needed, of another article in our pages after the two that appeared in the last number. It seemed necessary, in view of the general attention given to the Bishop's book, to endeavour to convey some impressions of one who earnestly desired to see and to face the latest and best that

¹ "Orders and Unity." By Charles Gore, D.D. London: *John Murray*. Price 3s. 6d. net.